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DEDICATION

To my Reading Recovery colleagues, and especially my research participants, who inspire me with their dedication and commitment to First Readers.

First Reader
I can see them standing politely on the wide pages
that I was still learning to turn,
Jane in a blue jumper, Dick with his crayon brown hair,
playing with a ball or exploring the cosmos
of the backyard, unaware they are the first characters,
the boy and the girl who begin fiction.
Beyond the simple illustration of their neighborhood
the other protagonists were waiting in a huddle:
frightening Heathcliff, frightened Pip, Nick Adams
carrying a fishing rod, Emma Bovary riding into Rouen.
But I would read about the perfect boy and his sister
even before I would read about Adam and Eve, garden and gate,
and before I heard the name Gutenberg, the type
of their simple talk was moving into my focusing eyes.
It was always Saturday and he and she
were always pointing at something and shouting “Look!”
pointing at the dog, the bicycle, or at their father
as he pushed a hand mower over the lawn,
waving at aproned Mother framed in the kitchen doorway,
pointing toward the sky, pointing at each other.
They wanted us to look but we had looked already
and seen the shaded lawn, the wagon, the postman.
We had seen the dog, walked, watered and fed the animal,
and now it was time to discover the infinite, clicking
permutations of the alphabet’s small and capital letters.
Alphabetical ourselves in the rows of classroom desks,
we were forgetting how to look, learning how to read.

Billy Collins – Sailing Alone Around the Room, 2001
(Re-printed with permission)
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the discourse of literacy coaching conversations within the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training year. Both Reading Recovery and literacy coaching have been well researched, however there were gaps in the literature concerning the role of the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader within Reading Recovery and the details of literacy coaching interactions, specifically the language of coaching sessions. This study sought to address these gaps in the literature by examining the discourse of Reading Recovery Teacher leaders and their coaches as they participated in literacy coaching sessions during their 2014.2015 training year. Eleven coaching sessions were analyzed through the lens of Discursive Psychology and the Discursive Action Model in order to address the research question What is the nature of literacy coaching conversations within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training? Data from the study included audiorecordings and transcripts from 11 coaching conversations, Reading Recovery lesson artifacts, and coaching notes.

The central finding of the study was that the discourse of coaching conversations within Reading Recovery teacher leader training focuses on improving teacher decision making. Within the coaching conversations, coaches asked questions about decision making, and coachees offered accounts of decision making in response to the questions posed and often without being prompted by questions. Coachees engaged in responsibility taking through coach extended invitations or clear questioning by the coach to highlight teaching actions. There was some responsibility taking on the part of coachees when coaches were posed why questions. There were also instances where why questions did not facilitate teacher accountability and instead elicited hedging, blame, and/or defensive justifications. The findings suggest that questioning approaches are important to consider when attempting to facilitate accountability as teacher responsibility taking.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

There is no shortage of studies relating to teacher professional development and recommendations for quality learning experiences (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Hawley and Valli, 2001; Saxe, Gearheart and Nasir; 2001). From this extensive body of research a number of key characteristics of high quality professional development have emerged. High quality professional development: (1) is ongoing and sustained over time (Borko, 2004; Dall’Alba & Sandberg, 2006; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Gilrane, Russell & Roberts, 2008; Neuman & Cunningham, 2009; Richardson, 2003; Speck, 2002; Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson & Orphanos, 2009; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss & Shapley, 2007); (2) is grounded in real teaching experiences (Borko, 2004; Dall’Alba & Sandberg, 2006; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Hill, 2009; Morrow & Casey, 2004; Neuman & Cunningham, 2009; Richardson, 2003; Speck, 2002; Yoon et al., 2009); (3) is differentiated to address the concerns and needs of individual learners (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Richardson, 2003; Yoon et al., 2007); and (4) often includes Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Richardson, 2003; Speck, 2002). Additionally, professional development initiatives that impact student achievement positively often include outside facilitators (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Gilrane et al., 2008; Hill, 2009; Richardson, 2003; Yoon et al., 2007). I believe these characteristics of high quality professional development are reflected in the Reading Recovery professional development model.
In addition to providing high quality professional development for teachers, Reading Recovery benefits the students it serves. Reading Recovery is the most highly rated beginning reading intervention on the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). According to the WWC, a government website that reviews the research base of reading interventions, the Reading Recovery intervention receives strong ratings for positive effects in general reading achievement and alphabets, and potentially positive effects in fluency, and comprehension (What Works Clearinghouse [WWC], 2007).

I wondered if perhaps an in-depth look at literacy coaching, an important aspect of this high quality professional development model and successful student intervention, could add to the conversation on high quality professional development, provide meaningful insights, and be of interest to others who are involved in teacher professional development. As such, the purpose of this study was to describe what happens within literacy coaching conversations during the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training year in order to contribute to the gap in the literature on literacy coaching and the role of the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader.

**Chapter Organization**

In this introductory chapter, I will provide both background information relating to my study and detailed information about Reading Recovery: the intervention for students; the teacher professional development model; and the research base. Additionally, I will state the problem my research will address, outline the purpose of my study, provide the broad research question for the study, and explain how this study is of significance. I will also discuss my background and what led me to this study and detail the assumptions I brought into the research study. A brief section to provide definitions of common terms will also be included. Lastly, I will outline the organizational scheme for my dissertation.
Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery: Intervention for Students

Reading Recovery is an international literacy intervention that offers one-on-one tutoring to first grade students who, according to teacher ranking and The Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, are in the bottom 20% of their cohort in terms of literacy achievement (Clay, 2002). Reading Recovery, created by Dame Marie Clay, began in 1976 in Auckland, New Zealand and came to the United States in 1984 via The Ohio State University. Currently, Reading Recovery is implemented in Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and England. Reading Recovery has been translated into Spanish, French, and Dutch for struggling students who are learning to read in those languages.

The goal of Reading Recovery is to accelerate the literacy achievement of struggling students so that they are in the average reading band and can benefit from classroom instruction. The WWC has listed Reading Recovery as a highly rated reading intervention for beginning readers, giving it high marks in fluency, comprehension, phonetics, and general reading achievement (What Works Clearinghouse [WWC], 2007).

The Reading Recovery intervention is grounded in seven key theoretical principles according to Schmitt, Askew, Fountas, Lyons, and Pinnell, (2005):

(1) Reading is a complex problem-solving process.

(2) Children construct their own understandings.

(3) Children come to literacy with varying knowledge.

(4) Reading and writing are reciprocal and interrelated processes.

(5) Learning to read involves a process of reading and writing continuous text.

(6) Learning to read involves a continuous process of changes over time.
(7) Children take different paths to literacy learning (p. 43).

These principles underpin both the teaching and professional development model in Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery professionals learn about and practice the application of these principles through intense professional development opportunities beginning with the initial training year and continuing as long as the Reading Recovery professional is continuing to work in Reading Recovery.

**Reading Recovery: Professional Development for Teachers**

Although the ultimate goal of Reading Recovery is to improve the literacy achievement of struggling first grade readers, this goal is met through the training and professional opportunities provided to the teachers who work with the students. According to Cox and Hopkins (2006):

- to characterize RR solely as an intervention for children who demonstrate difficulty in the early stages of learning to read and write is to ignore the systemic and comprehensive nature of a program that encompasses professional development for its teachers, a network of professional support for teachers and administrators responsible for program implementation, and a research and evaluation component to monitor program effectiveness and ensure accountability. (p. 255)

Clay (2005) believed that only through intense and on-going professional learning opportunities, could teachers develop and refine the necessary skills to accelerate the literacy achievement of struggling students.

The Reading Recovery Professional Development Model is complex and involves professionals at school, school district, and university levels. Reading Recovery Teachers (RRTs) work one-on-one with students in first grade who are struggling to get underway with
literacy learning. RRTs are provided support and training by Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders (RRTLs) who are employed by school systems and serve as school district literacy leaders.

RRTLs are provided support and training from Reading Recovery University Trainers (RRUTs) who provide the initial RRTL training, on-going support through bi-annual two-day professional development retreats, and day-long annual site visits. The Reading Recovery Training Model outlines the roles each class of professional (Table 1).

_Underline: Reading recovery teacher training._ RRTLs provide professional learning opportunities for RRTs in the form of coaching sessions and professional development classes. The teachers experience an apprenticeship during their training year. During this first year, Reading Recovery teachers work daily with students one-on-one, and attend weekly classes with the RRTL to learn literacy theory and literacy practices. These weekly classes always include lessons taught by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Roles of Reading Recovery Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Recovery Professional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Teachers (RRTs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders (RRTLs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery University Trainers (RRUTs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers through a one-way screen. A teacher and child are on one side of the screen having a Reading Recovery lesson. There is a microphone in the teaching room that picks up and projects the sound through a sound system into the room on the other side of the glass; the training room. In the training room, RRTs gather with their RRTL, to view the lesson and discuss the student and teacher interaction. After the Reading Recovery lesson, the teacher who was behind the glass, joins the group to discuss the literacy processing of the child and her teaching decisions. The teacher is often asked to provide rationale for various teaching decisions that were made during the lesson.

Core texts for training include *Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals* (parts one and two), *Becoming Literate, Different Paths by Common Outcomes, and Change Over Time*, all authored by Marie Clay. Additional reading research by various scholars is also included in initial training. In addition to weekly 3 hour classes, RRTs in training participate in a week long assessment workshop to learn the tasks of the Observation Survey in Early Literacy Achievement (Clay, 2002). RRTs also receive a number of visits from their RRTL. During these visits, the RRT teaches one of her students while the RRTL observes. During the course of the visit, the RRTL may model a teaching procedure for the RRT, visit places in the Reading Recovery core texts with the teacher, and or make recommendations for the teacher based on what she observed while the RRT taught. Additionally, RRTs participate in colleague visits (with one additional teacher) or cluster visits (with more than one additional teacher). These visits include teaching of a student by a RRT, and reflection upon theory and practice by all the teachers involved in the visit. RRTs are also required to attend either a regional, national, or international Reading Recovery conference each year. During this initial training year, RRTs
receive nine hours of graduate credit in literacy from the regional Reading Recovery university training center (RRUTC) affiliated with the school district site.

Beyond the initial training year, RRTs attend monthly professional development sessions, often referred to as continuing contact sessions, where they continue to refine their literacy teaching skills and reflect with colleagues. To remain a certified RRT, teachers must attend monthly continuing contact sessions.

**Reading recovery teacher leader training.** RRTLs experience a similar apprenticeship during their initial training year. In order to be eligible for training, they must have a Master’s Degree and have at least five years of teaching experience. RRTLs teach four children daily and individually as part of their training. They also take university classes and receive 27 graduate credits in courses related to literacy instruction, reading program administration, and literacy coaching. RRTLs must live in residency near the regional university training site. For most RRTLs, this means relocation. Generally, school districts pay for the university tuition, salary, and living expenses for the Teacher Leader as she trains. Often, the university training centers secure grant funding for these expenses. As part of the training, a RRTL receives multiple coaching visits from her university trainers. These lessons are similar to the ones described previously for the RRTs. RRTL also attends a yearly Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Institute and a regional, national, or international conference. Regional university training sites also provide learning opportunities twice annually for RRTLs. These learning opportunities are retreat-like and last two or three days. They generally involve reflection upon teaching (through videos or live lessons), discussion of core text, and/or investigation of implementation issues in various site locations.
Beyond the initial training year, professional opportunities for RRTLs continue through conferences, twice yearly two day regional retreats, and annual day long site visits from the university trainers. In addition, articles are exchanged, webinars are available, and email communication among the RRTLs and RRUTs continues. The RRTL’s is responsible for the ongoing facilitation of learning opportunities for RRTs and upholding the Standards and Guidelines of Reading Recovery (2004).

**Reading recovery university trainers training.** Like RRTs and RRTLs, RRUTs also have an apprenticeship training year. To be eligible for RRUT training, an individual must hold a Ph.D. in a literacy field. RRUTs must complete a post-doctoral study experience and live a year in residency in order to attend classes at The Ohio State University, Texas Woman’s University, or The University of Auckland in New Zealand. The training for RRUTs involves the teaching of children daily and reading and reflection on literacy practices. In addition, the trainers learn about program management and site implementation. During the apprenticeship year of training and beyond, RRUTs attend regional, national, and international conferences. They also attend trainers meetings, the North American Trainers Group (NATG) and International Reading Recovery Trainer Organization (IRRTO), several times a year in addition to arranging and facilitating professional learning opportunities for RRTLs.

All Reading Recovery professionals (RRTs, RRTLs, and RRUTs) have core training experiences: (1) daily one-to-one teaching of Reading Recovery students; (2) engagement in both clinical and theoretical reading classes and graduate level course work; (3) immersion in the texts of Marie Clay; and (4) opportunities for collaboration with other Reading Recovery professionals around both practical and theoretical aspects of the Reading Recovery intervention for students. Because of these shared experiences and collaborative opportunities, Reading Recovery
Professionals share the common goal of literacy growth and achievement of at-risk students and establish a Professional Learning Community (PLC) (DuFour & Eaker, 1998).

**Research on Reading Recovery Professional Development**

These characteristics of effective professional development that were proposed by Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) align well with the Reading Recovery Professional Development Model. The characteristics suggested by Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) are: (1) engagement in practical tasks and opportunities to observe, assess, and reflect on teaching practice; (2) driven by the needs of teachers with opportunities for inquiry, reflection, and experimentation; (3) collaboration with opportunities to share knowledge; (4) direct applicability to the teaching of students; (5) intense, on-going, and sustained over time; and (6) includes collective problem solving and support by demonstration and coaching. In the section below, I will review various studies on Reading Recovery professional development and make connections to the characteristics proposed by Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995).

In a study focused on professional development that was modeled after Reading Recovery and designed to support early literacy classrooms, Askew, Fulenwider, Kordick, Scheuermann, Vollenweider, Anderson and Rodriquez (2002) found that through teaching, assessing, and observing, teachers began to form theories about reading and to develop better understandings about student learning. Shannon (1990) as cited in Schmitt et.al (2005) maintained that the opportunity to observe live teaching lessons behind the glass was critical for teachers in the development of the ability to analyze what was happening in the lesson and apply various interpretations to their teaching. In both of these studies, teachers were allowed opportunities to observe, assess, and reflect on teaching practices while engaged in practical
teaching tasks. Additionally, because the sessions involved behind the glass teaching, there were opportunities for inquiry, reflection and experimentation.

A study conducted by Lyons (1991) concluded that the concept of the social construction of knowledge applies to teacher learning and that the Reading Recovery Professional Development model assists teachers in the transformation of psychological processes. Lyons’ (1994) examination of 13 Reading Recovery Teachers in training and found that teachers formed various chains of reasoning which the teachers reported enhanced their instructional decision making. Lyons (1994) also found that the teachers challenged one another by asking for evidence to support claims and proposing alternative explanations for student decision making. As evidenced in these studies by Lyons (1991, 1994) Reading Recovery professional development sessions are collaborative, with teachers having opportunities to share their knowledge and build knowledge with one another.

Each Reading Recovery professional development session includes two live teaching lessons “behind the glass” this standard practice makes each session that teachers participate in directly applicable to their teaching of students. Additionally, lessons behind the glass include collaborative problem solving. In a study by Rodgers, Fullerton and DeFord (2002), twenty-three experienced Reading Recovery teachers participated in focused video-recorded lesson discussion and school visits from their teacher leader in addition to their monthly behind the glass continuing contact sessions. Student outcomes in the year of this change in professional development practice were compared to student outcomes in the previous year. The students made greater gains in the year of the altered professional development practice. The altered professional development allowed for more collective problem solving and support via coaching. Additionally, the coaching sessions were individualized and guided by teacher needs.
In a study conducted by Lyons (1991) the student outcomes from twelve Reading Recovery teachers who experienced the typical Reading Recovery Professional Development Model professional development were compared with twelve teachers who were provided short term professional development in early literacy which did not have as many professional development sessions and no teaching behind the glass. The Reading Recovery trained teachers had higher student outcomes than the teachers who participated in the shorter term professional development. In another study by Lyons (1993), Reading Recovery teacher language and prompting were examined over a three year period. Lyons (1993) concluded that over time, the teacher became more skilled in her use of appropriate prompts in relation to student needs. In a study by Power and Sawkins (1997), teachers described Reading Recovery sessions as “exhausting” and “intense” (Schmitt et al., 2005, p. 99). Each of these studies relate to the Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) characteristic of quality professional development needing to be intense, on-going, and sustained over time.

Statement of the Problem

Though there are an abundance of professional development opportunities that take place in schools throughout the country each and every day, many are neither of high quality, result in student achievement gains, nor are meaningful to teachers. There are ample studies about general principles of effective professional development. There are also a number of studies about Reading Recovery. Missing from the conversation on professional development are studies that focus on the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders and the specifics of literacy coaching within Reading Recovery. Additionally, not enough is known about the specifics of high quality professional development opportunities, particularly literacy coaching. Leaders wishing to design professional learning opportunities or participate in literacy coaching with teachers might
benefit from learning more about the literacy coaching exchanges within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training. For these reasons, I decided to study the discourse of literacy coaching sessions that take place within the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training year.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to understand the nature of the discourse in literacy coaching conversations within the RRTL training year for two RRTLs in training. As my literature review will explain, both RRTLs and the language of literacy coaching sessions have been under researched. In this study, I wanted to investigate the language of the literacy coaching sessions that took place during the RRTL training year. There were a variety of coaching opportunities for the in-training RRTLs. One, there were coaching conversations that took place between a RRTL in training and the RRUT or the RRUT in training before and after the RRTL taught a Reading Recovery student. Two, there were coaching conversations between the two RRTLs in training before and after one of the RRTLs taught a Reading Recovery student. Three, there were coaching conversations that took place among all the participants; RRUTs and RRTLs after RRTLs had led RR professional development sessions.

**Research Question**

Though Potter (2012) explained that questions in discursive psychology are often refined throughout the research study, my broad research question for this study was, *What is the nature of literacy coaching conversations within RRTL training?* Through this study, I was interested in “attempting to explicate the workings of some kind of social practice that is operating in the setting, perhaps with the ultimate aim of making broader sense of the setting as a whole” (Potter, 2012, p. 21).
Reading Recovery professionals are members of a “discursively mediated community” where concepts of best practice in literacy, struggling readers, and identity as a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader are socially constructed (Hruby, 2001, p. 51). It was my intention to use the tools of Discursive Psychology, The Discursive Action Model (DAM) and Conversation Analysis to consider what was taking place within these literacy coaching conversations by looking deeply at these naturally occurring interactions.

Discursive Psychology

Discursive Psychology is concerned with events of everyday life and the social interactions between people that take place in both natural and institutional settings. Discursive psychology is a version of psychology that frames psychological concepts as discursive practices (Potter, 2012). Within discursive psychology, individuals make meaning through interactions with others. Ontologically, discursive psychology focuses upon what is made visible through interaction, and not what might reside internally for individuals. The focus in discursive psychology is on talk as action and not on cognitive constructs. Within discursive psychology, reality is treated as a social construction and truth is that which is produced through language. It is understood that this truth is just one of many representations of truth. Edwards (2006) explains, “DP rejects the assumption that discourse is the product or expression of thoughts or intentional states lying behind or beneath it. Instead, mental states, knowledge thoughts, feelings, and the nature of the external world, figure as talk’s topics, assumptions and concerns” (p. 41). Talk, or discourse, is a primary means of human understanding, action, and intersubjectivity (Potter, 2012). Talk and text are reality and are the major units of study within the field of discursive psychology.
**Discursive Action Model**

The Discursive Action Model was developed by Potter and Wetherall (1987) and Edwards and Potter (1992). This conceptual model focuses on how individuals use language for a variety of functions such as supporting their version of events, managing stake or interest, and managing accountability (Edwards and Potter, 1992). This model is one of action, not cognition (Edwards and Potter, 1992). I chose to analyze my data using this model. More information detailing the use of the DAM will be offered in Chapter Three of this dissertation. The following list outlines the elements of the Discursive Action Model:

**Action**

1. Action, not cognition, is the research focus.
2. Accounts, descriptions, or reports of events take the place of traditionally psychological and cognitive concepts such as memory and attribution.
3. Action, through discourse, takes place within a variety of activity sequences.

**Fact and Interest**

4. Within many actions there exists a dilemma of stake or interest which individuals often manage by factual reporting.
5. Individuals often use a variety of discursive devices to construct factual reports.
6. To undermine alternatives factual reports are rhetorically organized

**Accountability**

7. Agency and accountability are attended to within factual reports.
8. Agency and accountability of the current speaker’s actions are attended to within the factual reports.
9. Numbers 7 and 8 are sometimes connected in that 7 is used for 8 and 8 is used for 7.
Conversations that employ the lens of discursive psychology often use techniques of conversation analysis (CA) to inform analysis and support claims. Conversation Analysis began with the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (ten Have, 2007). It focuses on how talk is organized and allows for close examination of discourse, attending not only to what was said in conversation but how it was said. Conversation analysts attend to micro aspects of speech such as pausing, intonation, rate of speech, and overlapping speech (Jefferson, 2004) and look for patterns within conversational interactions.

Significance of the Study

Reading Recovery has been implemented for more than 30 years, in a number of languages, and across a variety of settings and cultures. Reading Recovery has been studied because of its longevity, its results in positive academic outcomes for students, and its emphasis on quality professional development opportunities for teachers. Though there have been many research reviews of Reading Recovery (D’Agostino & Murphy, 2004; Shanahan & Barr, 1995), effectiveness studies of Reading Recovery (Ashdown & Simic, 1993; Askew, 1993; Askew & Frasier, 1999; Center, Wheldall, Freeman, Outhred & McNaught, 1995; Dorn & Allen, 1995; Elbaum, Vaughn, Hughes & Moody, 2000; Iverson & Tunmer, 1993; Lyons & Beaver, 1995; Pinnell, 1989; Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Byrk, & Seltzer, 1994; Schmitt, 2001; Schmitt, 2003), studies addressing the subsequent performance of Reading Recovery children (Briggs & Young, 2003; Brown, Denton, Kelly & Neal, 1999; Escamilla, Loera, Ruiz & Rodriguez, 1998; Pinnell, 1989; Rowe, 1995), research studies on Reading Recovery teacher and student interactions (DeFord, 1994; Elliot, 1996; Fullerton, 2001; Kaye, 2002; May et. al, 2015) and
studies on the Reading Recovery professional development model (Lyons, 1991; Lyons, 1994; Lyons, 1993; Lyons, Pinnell, & Deford, 1993; May et. al, 2015), however, there has only been one study focused on Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders (Lyons, Pinnell & Deford, 1993).

Within the Reading Recovery Professional Development Model, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders are considered redirecting systems or “change agents” (Fullan, 1993) who support school systems in (1) adopting a stance that focuses resources on preventing reading failure through early intervention, rather than remediating after reading failure, (2) providing high quality learning opportunities for teachers, and (3) having the expectation that all students can reach average or better achievement in reading regardless of the reason for the reading challenges (May et. al, 2015).

The present study on coaching sessions within RRTL training addressed an area in Reading Recovery that had not been previously explored. Additionally, my literature review on professional development in primary literacy, which is detailed in Chapter 2, demonstrates that there is a gap in the research when it comes to specifics of literacy coaching interactions (Heineke, 2013; Hunt & Handsfield, 2013; Vanderberg & Stephens, 2010; Biancarosa, Byrk & Dexter, 2010).

Reading Recovery is a successful intervention for children that may, in part, be due to the professional development opportunities experienced by their teachers. RRTLs serve as district literacy coaches who both receive and create rich professional development opportunities. This study contributes to the conversation on Reading Recovery, as it found that the focus of literacy coaching conversations was on teacher decision making and questions and invitations that had more or less success in facilitating accountability defined as responsibility taking of teachers. Perhaps the major finding of this study might be of benefit to others who design similar types of
professional learning opportunities for teachers. It may also be of benefit to the international Reading Recovery community, as they seek to both define and refine specific practices that benefit both students and teachers.

**Background Experiences, Beliefs, and Assumptions**

I am taking a number of beliefs, ideas, and experiences into this study. My decision to research this specific topic came directly from my prior experiences as a RRTL. Prior to that decision, a number of other experiences have influenced my beliefs and ideas. In the section below, I will detail these beliefs, ideas, and experiences in order to be transparent with my readers about the assumptions I hold and brought into this study.

**Background Experiences**

In my high school yearbook from my sophomore year, there is a picture of me tutoring a first grader. Every day during my study hall period, I would work with a little boy called Tank. I would appear at his classroom door and upon seeing me through the glass cut out of the wooden door and he would pop up from his desk and begin gathering his things – reading book, paper, pencil and crayons. We would walk together down the hallway to the cafeteria, talking about his favorite things – most often soccer or the animals on his farm. We’d sit side by side on the round cafeteria table seats and work together on his reading book stories and writing stories about his soccer team or his farm. Occasionally, Mr. Rebert, the first grade teacher, would give me certain assignments to help Tank complete, but most of the time Tank and I (and the students that followed in my subsequent high school years) would just read and write. I loved tutoring students and delighted in the progress they made in the time we had together. Little did I know that about the same time there was a reading intervention for first grade students, Reading Recovery, that had made its way from New Zealand to The Ohio State University.
After graduating from college with a degree in psychology, I worked at a residential treatment center for children with behavior problems. I worked for the facility in a number of capacities; as a residence hall manager, as a classroom teacher, as a recreation therapist, and eventually a shift supervisor. The children I worked with had significant behavior problems and almost all of them had difficulties learning, with reading being the central struggle. I remember helping students with homework after dinner and being surprised by how far behind they were and how frustrated they became when trying to read. I can only remember one student, in the 5 years that I worked there, who did not have academic problems. I remember wondering then if there was a connection between their behavior problems and their learning issues.

I returned to school in 2000 to work on a Master’s Degree in Special Education. My early experiences with Tank and subsequent first graders, and the students at the residential treatment facility helped me to consider a career in education. I chose special education because I believed that all children could learn with the right teacher and in the right circumstances. In my practicum placements in my Master’s Program, I was surprised to see teachers who spent most of their time writing Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) or attending meetings. Teaching assistants in my special education placements actually taught the students and the special education teachers simply managed the activities and the paperwork. I knew that I wanted to actually teach – to work with students and not paperwork. I completed my elementary endorsement and eventually found a job as a third grade teacher who had the inclusion class. This was a perfect fit for me, as I was able to work with struggling students, to actually teach children, and to teach the general curriculum.

My students who struggled taught me how little I actually knew about teaching them to read. My Master’s Degree program in Special Education taught me how to modify the
curriculum, how to accommodate for learning differences, and how to follow the IEP plans the special education teachers had written, but it didn’t prepare me to teach them to read. My struggling students made progress and I was proud of the progress they made and my contribution to that progress, but, at the time, I fell into believing what everyone else around me believed – that these struggling students had some internal deficit that prevented them from learning as quickly or as well as peers who were not struggling. I still believed they could learn, but I didn’t expect them to learn as quickly as their peers without disabilities. The IEPs I signed and implemented confirmed these ideas, as did meetings with parents who talked about their child’s internal deficits and problems. There was nothing in my environment to encourage me to consider an alternative. The problem was simply with the children. I did the best I could to help them, but I never expected them to actually catch up to their peers without disabilities.

I carried these ideas into my training as a literacy coach at Ohio State University. I learned about balanced literacy and literacy coaching practices. I learned how to work with adults, how to listen to their needs, how to build trusting professional relationships, and how to help them reflect on their classroom practices. During my training as a Literacy Collaborative Literacy Coach there was very little time devoted to helping struggling readers or how to help classroom teachers with struggling readers. I came up lacking when I later worked with colleagues whose major questions and concerns were around what they could do with the students who were behind. I carried their questions and my discomforts into my training as a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader.

I had heard about Reading Recovery from some of my colleagues. I had even had some conversation with the teacher leader from my district about how to help a student in my class who was struggling with reading. We stood in the workroom and she drew connected boxes on a
blank sheet of paper and talked about “pushing sounds”. I remember walking away from my conversation from her thinking that she knew a lot about reading but that I didn’t understand much of what she said. I had no idea what she meant or how the actions she described and demonstrated would help my student become a better reader. At the time, it seemed to me that Reading Recovery was an elite club of really smart people who got together often to watch kids read and discuss it. I didn’t see much connection between what they did and my life as a third grade teacher.

On a spring Saturday morning of 2005, I received a phone call from the Federal Projects Director of my school district. She asked me to become the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader for the district and commit to the year-long training at a university site more than three hours from my home. I wasn’t sure if I wanted to leave my home and commit to training in something I knew very little about. After talking with the Federal Projects Director and my dad, I accepted the position and agreed to the year-long training.

Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training was a transformative experience for me and the best professional development I have had as an educator. The training gave me skills and confidence to work with struggling students – to actually teach them to read, to make accelerated progress, and to catch up with their classmates. The training taught me more about how to work with other teachers and help them refine their practice. The training made me question my beliefs about struggling students, about learning disabilities, and about reading instruction in general. As a result of my background experiences and especially my Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training, I am taking a number of overarching beliefs and assumptions into my study.
Beliefs and Assumptions

First, I question labels that define students as “learning disabled”. I understand the Special Education laws and the criteria that are used to determine the learning disability status of students. I also understand the intent of the law and the necessity to offer students who are behind additional opportunities. However, I believe that the vast majority of students do not have internal deficits that prevent them from learning or learning at the same pace as their non-disabled peers. I believe that most students labeled as learning disabled are instructional casualties who haven’t had the opportunities they need to succeed, the teachers they need to succeed, or the appropriate instruction they need to succeed. I agree with Clay (1987) that most students learn to be learning disabled through lack of adequate and appropriate opportunity.

Second, I believe that some students will require one-to-one expert instruction in order to learn how to read. Just as those in critical care medically need the attention and expertise of a surgeon or doctor to survive when in grave condition, I believe some students need a comparable intervention educationally.

Third, I believe that RRTL training is challenging, meaningful, and qualitatively different from the training experiences that most teachers have. I can’t say that I loved every moment of my RRTL training experiences. In fact, there were moments that were incredibly difficult. There were moments where I questioned my abilities, my competence, and my future as an educator. The training was long – a full academic year of course work (classes in reading theory, classes in clinical practice, classes about working with adults) with many days that began at 7:00 am and ended well past 8:00 pm. The training was challenging in that it made me do things I didn’t think I was ready for, like leading a behind-the-glass session when the teachers I was leading had more experience teaching Reading Recovery students than I did. The training also made me
question the beliefs I held about struggling readers. If I believed that the problem didn’t reside with the child, then I had to acknowledge that I could potentially be the problem. For someone who had built an identity around being a successful teacher and a successful literacy leader in her district, this was a hard pill to swallow.

Literacy coaching is a critical aspect of Reading Recovery professional development. RRTLs have ample opportunity to teach children and have feedback from a more knowledgeable other, the RRUT. The feedback within the coaching session is timely as it occurs before, during and/or immediately after teaching sessions. The feedback is tied to Clay’s literacy processing theory specifically and reading theory in general, usually by revisiting aspects of the core reading text *Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals, parts 1 and 2*. Additionally, the feedback includes questioning of teaching decisions, exploration of ideas or concerns related to student achievement and student responses, and information sharing to enhance knowledge and practice.

Lastly, I believe that Reading Recovery training has applicability for others. In my experience, classroom teachers see Reading Recovery professionals as living in their own little world, disconnected from the work others do as classroom teachers. This perception is a harmful one which diminishes opportunities for children and negatively impacts the implementation of Reading Recovery in school districts. Knowing both worlds intimately, I believe there is a connection and the potential for Reading Recovery training to influence others that are interested in reading instruction and professional development for teachers. I wish all teachers had the opportunity for training that is similar to Reading Recovery – to develop the needed skills to feel confident to work successfully with students, to know more about literacy processes and research, and to be pushed beyond the limits they have for themselves.
Definitions of Terms

In this section, I will provide definitions of terms that are used within the Reading Recovery community and may be used in sections of this dissertation.

Acceleration is a key concept in Reading Recovery, and refers to a desired increase in the pace of reading progress by the Reading Recovery Student throughout the course of his or her lesson series.

Behind the Glass Teaching takes place in all Reading Recovery Sessions. Two Reading Recovery teachers bring their students and teach full lessons behind a two way mirror. On the other side of the mirror, Reading Recovery Teachers gather with their Reading Recovery Teacher Leader and discuss the lesson as it is taking place.

Emergent Literacy is a phrase coined by Marie Clay that describes the behaviors young children use on their way to becoming literate and before they develop conventional reading and writing skills.

Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement is the diagnostic reading assessment designed by Marie Clay and used in Reading Recovery. The survey is comprised of six tasks including: Letter Identification, Ohio Word Test, Writing Vocabulary, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words, Concepts about Print, and Running Records of Text Reading. The survey is designed to identify first grade students who may be in need of intervention services.

Professional Development refers to the opportunities that in-service teachers have to refine their practice and learn more about quality instruction.

Reading Recovery is an international reading intervention for first grade students who are performing in the lowest 30% of their grade level cohort as identified by the six tasks of the Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement.
*Reading Recovery Student* is a first grader who is identified by the Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement as low performing and is selected for individual 30 minute literacy lessons.

*Reading Recovery Teacher* is the tutor who, during a half a day, works individually with four low performing first grade students in daily lessons for 30 minutes each day. The Reading Recovery Teacher is trained in her school district by the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader. Reading Recovery Teacher Leader is the coordinator of the Reading Recovery program within a school district. The Reading Recovery Teacher Leader teaches two Reading Recovery students daily, visits and coaches with Reading Recovery teachers, and plans and implements Reading Recovery professional development sessions. The Reading Recovery Teacher Leader is trained at a Reading Recovery University Site by the Reading Recovery Trainer.

*Reading Recovery Trainer* is the University professor at a Reading Recovery University Site who trains Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders. After receiving a Ph.D., the Reading Recovery Trainer participates in a year-long training at either Ohio State University, Texas Women’s University, or University of Auckland in New Zealand to become certified as a Reading Recovery University Trainer.

*Reading Recovery Training* refers to the year-long apprenticeship learning that takes place for Reading Recovery professionals (teachers, teacher leaders, trainers) at every level. This training involves daily teaching of Reading Recovery students, graduate level reading theory courses, and weekly clinical class where there is a focus on live teaching and discussions of live lessons.
Dissertation Organization

In chapter one of my dissertation I have provided an introduction to my study, some background on professional development in early literacy, a statement of the research problem, the purpose and significance of my study, the research question I intend to answer, assumptions I carry into the study, and definitions of terms that might be helpful for my readers to be familiar with before they read the dissertation. In chapter two of my dissertation, I will present a review of the literature on professional development in primary literacy. Chapter three will focus on both the methodology and methods I used to conduct the study. Chapter three will include substantive theories, my methodological theory, a rationale for my methodological choices, information on participants and the research setting and how I chose them. Chapter three will conclude with information about data collection and analysis procedures. In chapter four, I will provide my findings in the form of extracts and explanations, as is common in studies using discursive psychology and conversation analysis. In chapter five, I will provide a discussion of the overall findings of my study and provide some implications for professional development.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Organization

In this chapter, I will review the literature on teacher professional development in literacy instruction. Prior to the review of the articles, I will describe my literature search process in detail. In this literature review on teacher professional development in primary literacy, an overview of each article and the significant findings will be provided. I will begin by discussing the impact of professional development through literacy coaching, then will move to a discussion of specific professional development implementations, and will conclude with information concerning teacher knowledge, beliefs and dispositions. Within each cluster of articles, I will discuss strengths and weaknesses of the articles in terms of both content and methodological practices. After discussing the content, findings, and offering a critique as described above, I will provide a review of the call for additional research from the authors of these articles and will conclude with a discussion of other themes across the articles including the ideas of coherence, active learning, sufficient duration, collective participation, reform and connecting teacher professional development to student outcomes (Yoon et al., 2007). Lastly, I will provide a brief chapter summary.

Search Process

“Reviewing the literature is the process of becoming and remaining familiar with what others have done before us to make sense of the world – be it through generating theories, synthesizing the findings of others, or conducting original research” (Paulus, Lester, & Dempster, 2013, p. 49). To review the literature on professional development in primary literacy learning, I relied on two sources: searches with UTK research librarians and the collection of articles I have been gathering over the last 3 years of my doctoral studies.
With the assistance of the UTK research librarians, I searched various databases to find peer reviewed articles related to teacher professional development, literacy, emergent literacy, teacher in-service, continuing education, reading, primary education, and teacher training. In various combinations, these terms were used to search a number of databases including Academic Search Premier, Google Scholar, ERIC, Education Source and PsychInfo. In addition to the search terms, my search was limited by the criteria of peer reviewed full text articles that were published in the past 10 years.

The searches yielded more than one hundred and thirty two articles connected to my search terms. I read through the abstracts of each of the articles and eliminated articles that were exclusively concerned with pre-service teacher education, focused on middle or high school education, written in a language other than English, or focused on technological literacy. After surveying the articles, I decided that 21 of the articles were appropriate. To that collection, I added an additional eight articles from those I had collected over my two years of doctoral education. These eight articles fit my search criteria and related to professional development of teachers in primary literacy education. Of the 29 articles covered in this review, one was a research report, six were general or theoretically oriented pieces, and 22 were empirical research studies using a wide range of methods to investigate teacher professional development in primary literacy.

**Literature Review Process**

After determining the 29 articles that would be included in this literature review, I uploaded each of the articles into ATLAS.ti. ATLAS.ti is a qualitative data analysis software package that allows researchers to create a “textual laboratory” where observation notes, transcripts, and research literature can be housed and analyzed (Konopasek, 2008). I used
ATLAS.ti to read through each of the articles and "code" them according to themes, questions, or noticings I had as I read. Codes included but were not limited to: call for additional research, study description, findings, professional development, and methodology. I also used the memo feature of the software to copy and paste each of the article abstracts or summaries and to make reflective notes as I made connections between articles and recurring themes and topics across the articles. The memos were critical in determining an organizational scheme for the literature review. As I was writing, I used the memo and code managers to help me group and locate particular quotes that I had connected to codes. Using these features enabled me to easily access pertinent information to include in this review.

**Key Themes and Topics**

As I read and considered the content of the 29 articles relating to professional development for primary literacy teachers, I noticed the articles tended to cluster around three broad themes. From this search, I determined that 28 of the articles were concerned with either literacy coaching (13 articles), specific professional development initiatives (7 articles), or teacher knowledge, beliefs, and expertise (8 articles). An additional article about effective teaching for struggling readers offered general reflections about teacher professional development and teacher expertise (Allington, 2013).

**Professional Development through Literacy Coaching**

Of the 29 articles reviewed, thirteen are concerned with professional development through literacy coaching. Two make general recommendations about principles of literacy coaching (Kent, 2005; L’Allier, Elish-Piper, Bean, 2010). Three explore the discourse of literacy coaching professional development (Hunt & Handsfield, 2013; Heineke, 2013; McLean, 2010). Four additional articles study the connection between literacy coaching and teaching practices
including the challenges of literacy coaching, aspects of coaching that teachers find valuable, and coaching factors and teacher instructional factors (Al Otaiba, Hosp, Smart & Dole, 2008; Pomerantz & Pierce, 2013, Vanderberg & Stephens, 2010; and Walpole, McKenna, Uribe-Zaraine, Lamitima, 2010). The remaining four articles investigate the impact of literacy coaching on student achievement outcomes (Biancarosa et al., 2010; Garet, Cronen, Eaton, Kurki, Ludwig, & Sztejnberg, 2008; Porche, 2012; Vernon-Feargans, 2013).

**Principles of Literacy Coaching**

In their 2010 standards, the International Reading Association (IRA) defines literacy coaching/reading specialists as “professionals whose goal is to improve reading achievement in their assigned school or district position” (IRA, 2010 standards). Responsibilities of a literacy coach vary depending upon the employment context, but could include providing professional development opportunities for teachers, leading reading initiatives, teaching students, or serving as advocates for struggling students. In addition to having a valid teaching certificate and teaching experience, IRA recommends that literacy coaches have a Master’s degree and graduate coursework in reading, writing, and language arts and experiences supporting teachers and leading reading initiatives.

Kent (2005) and L’Allier, Elish-Piper, and Bean (2010) offered additional ideas about effective literacy coaching in their articles. Both of these articles were not research studies, but rather pieces about best practices in literacy coaching. Kent (2005) stressed the importance of collaborative relationships between educators and literacy coaches. She emphasized the importance of availability on behalf of the literacy coach and an understanding of the literacy coaches’ role on behalf of the classroom teacher. Kent also discussed the challenge that literacy
coaches face when they are charged with bringing together teachers who have very diverse knowledge bases.

L’Allier, Elish-Piper, and Bean (2010) suggested that though literacy coaching is a promising practice for improving student achievement and enhancing teacher knowing, it requires guidance regarding roles of literacy coaches, their necessary qualifications, and activities literacy coaches should lead. With research findings as their base, L’Allier et al. (2010) offered seven guiding principles for literacy coaching:

1) Coaching requires specialized knowledge

2) Time working with teachers is the focus of coaching

3) Collaborative relationships are essential for coaching

4) Coaching that supports student reading achievement focuses on a set of core activities

5) Coaching must be both intentional and opportunistic

6) Coaches must be literacy leaders in the school

7) Coaching evolves over time

**Discourse of Literacy Coaching**

Articles by Heineke (2013), Hunt (2013), and McLean (2010) concerned the language of literacy coaching. Heineke (2013) examined ‘coaching discourse’ in four elementary coach/teacher dyads in order to investigate how coaching fosters professional development of teachers. To examine coaching discourse, Heineke (2013) conducted both an interpretive and structural analysis. The interpretive analysis was comprised of reading, rereading, and reviewing the transcripts from both the coaching episode and interview transcripts (a total of 18 episodes). As the reading, rereading, and reviewing took place, Heineke (2013) looked for important features that related to the research questions of:
(a) What are the contexts in which one-to-one coaching discourse occurs?

(b) What is the nature of the discourse between school-based reading coaches and teachers during one-on-one coaching?

(c) What patterns of discourse are seen within coaching interactions?

(d) How do the patterns of discourse found within coaching interactions support teachers in their learning? (p. 115)

She constructed a matrix of her marginal notes, important information, research questions etc. as a way of organizing the data.

Heineke (2013) organized her findings according to her research questions which addressed context, the nature of coaching episodes, patterns of discourse, and how patterns of discourse support teacher learning. Heineke (2013) found that the discourse of coaching is influenced by a variety of contextual factors. She also asserted that coaches dominate talk and should be more reflective about their verbal exchanges with teachers.

Hunt and Handsfield (2013) investigated the experiences of first year literacy coaches and their negotiation of power as they are participating in literacy coach professional development and providing professional development opportunities to teachers. Data from Hunt and Handsfield (2013) included interviews, observations, and artifacts from five professional development sessions. In this study, each coach participated in two 60 minute semi-structured interviews that were later transcribed. During observations, the authors attempted to capture information from conversation and verbatim comments when possible (Hunt & Handsfield, 2013). Observations also noted gestures and physical positioning. Artifacts included samples from participant reflection journals, documents from training sessions, and information about assignments. Hunt and Handsfield (2013) used a constant comparative analysis to look for broad
themes and to code the field notes from professional development sessions and the interview
transcripts. Three small moments, one from each primary participant, were transcribed using
adapted conventions from Green and Wallat (1981) and Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto and
Shuart-Faris (2005) so that volume, changes in stress and pitch, turn taking etc. could be coded.
A three level positioning analysis was conducted on the three small stories. The first level of
analysis sought to determine what the story was about, who the characters were, and how they
were positioned (p. 62). The second level of analysis looked at what the story tellers might be
attempting to accomplish with their story. The third level of analysis attempted to answer the
question “Who am I vis-à-vis what society says I should be?” (p. 62). The authors make the case
that literacy coaches need quality professional development opportunities that include
conversation around the emotional aspects of the literacy coaching position.

An article by McLean, Mallozzi, Hu, and Dailey (2010) focused on Reading First
curriculum redelivery by literacy coaches. The authors discussed the tensions between the
mandated redelivery of curriculum and coaches’ individual ideas about curriculum decisions
through an examination of their discourses. McLean et al. (2010) relied on interview data from
two Reading First literacy coaches for their investigation of curriculum re-delivery. On two
separate occasions, at the end of the first and second years as a literacy coach, each participant
was interviewed and asked to reflect upon their experiences as a literacy coach.

McLean et al. (2010) clearly outlined their analysis process. Initial analysis involved
listening to audio recorded interviews as individuals, in pairs, or in groups. While listening, team
members were able to make notes, do initial coding and select portions of the interview that
might be appropriate for further analysis later. The research team also met monthly for more
detailed analysis and conversation. Team members also shared writing responsibilities. The
authors state, “Collaboration and consensus guided our research process” (McLean et al., 2010, p. 258). The authors referenced the work of Gee (1999) and report that they followed his framework for analyzing discourse. First, they read transcripts and listened to audio tapes to determine line breaks. They also thematically coded selected data segments. They grouped lines into stanzas based on the discovered themes. Second, the stanzas were coded according to research question. Third, key story lines were determined. Fourth, specific descriptive evidence of how the literacy coach explained her job was located. Lastly, two extracts were selected from each literacy coach. The selections were chosen based on how well they described the curriculum redelivery. In their discussion of literacy coaches who are redelivering mandated curriculum, McLean et al. (2010), included claims about discourses that the coaches were using and extracts from interviews to substantiate their claims. The authors stated that one of the coaches, Hilary, negotiated the tensions around two discourses - an authoritative discourse, which came from the mandated curriculum delivery model, and an internally persuasive discourse, which honored her knowledge base and decision making capabilities. By incorporating extracts and referencing specific words within the extracts, the authors were able to show the reader the basis for their claims. Findings of the research showed how the literacy coaches both shaped and were shaped by their role as literacy coach. The authors conclude that literacy coaching is a complex role and that literacy coaches need professional development that acknowledges the emotional nature of their work.

**Linking Coaching and Teaching**

Articles by Al Otaiba, Hosp, Smart (2008), Pomerantz & Pierce (2013), Vanderberg and Stephens (2010), and Walpole, McKenna, Uribe-Zarain, and Lamitina (2010) offer various ideas about the link between coaching and teaching.
In Al Otaiba et al. (2008), the experiences of a literacy coach as she attempted to provide professional development to 33 teachers are chronicled through a case study. The title of the article, “The Challenge of a Reading Coach: A Cautionary Tale”, in essence captures the author’s findings. By analyzing pre and post teacher knowledge surveys, project documents, focus group interviews, and field notes, the authors concluded that the literacy coach faced a variety of challenges including the differing perspectives of the teachers the coach was charged with guiding, conflict between the teacher’s previous experiences and the new information that the literacy coach was delivering, and the unpredictable nature of reform initiatives. In terms of teacher knowledge, the teachers’ scores averaged 13.52 out of 22 in the fall and 14.67 in the spring on the Teacher Knowledge Assessment (Al Otaiba et al., 2008). Though considered significant growth as determined by the paired samples t test, the authors cautioned, “this should be considered descriptive information and no causal claims inferred because there was no control group” (Al Otaiba et al., 2008, p. 142).

Pomerantz and Pierce (2013) looked at teacher application of the content delivered in professional development sessions and modeled by a literacy coach. The research project took place over the course of two years, included 36 teachers, and focused on comprehension instruction within a failing school. Specifically, the study was constructed to answer the following questions:

(1) How does professional development based on knowledge building, co-teaching, and coaching increase teachers’ application of explicit comprehension instruction?

(2) What are the challenges teachers and coaches face in implementing best practices in comprehension instruction in a low-performing school? (Pomerantz & Pierce, 2013, p.104)
Overall, there were improvements in the comprehension instruction delivered by the teachers as measured by pre and post observations of comprehension strategy instruction in professional development sessions and modeled by the literacy coach. Each observation looked at four factors: description of the comprehension strategy, modeling of the comprehension strategy, guiding the students to use the strategy and monitoring independent use of the strategy by the student. Pre observation data revealed that one teacher showed use of all four aspects, two teachers showed three or four aspects, and two additional teachers didn’t show any aspect. The remaining participants did not describe, model, guide, or monitor independent student strategy use prior to comprehension instruction through professional development sessions and follow up coaching. Post observation data showed that 20 of the 36 teachers used all four aspects of teaching for comprehension strategy use. Additionally, six more teachers were able to describe and model the use of a strategy but were unable to turn it over to the students to practice and use independently (Pomerantz & Pierce, 2013).

Vanderberg and Stephens (2010) sought to understand the specific actions taken by coaches that were deemed helpful by teachers. In the study, interviews from 35 teachers who participated in 3 years of professional learning opportunities with coaches were analyzed using a constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in connection to two research questions: (1) “What do coaches do that teachers find helpful?”, and (2) “What do teachers change about their practice as a result of working with the coach?” (Vanderberg & Stephens, 2010, p. 146). Interestingly, in the interviews, teachers were not asked specific questions related to the research questions, rather the teachers’ spontaneous comments about coaches in relation to the research questions were analyzed by the researchers. The researchers grouped the teachers comments related to the first research question into the following five categories: (1) coach as encourager;
(2) coach as facilitator; (3) coach as demonstrator; (4) accessibility of the coach; and (5) coach helpfulness in a range of tasks (Vanderberg & Stephens, 2010, p. 150). Additionally, the researchers determined that teachers identified 4 different types of change initiated by the coaches and implemented by the teachers: (1) “teacher empowerment to try new practices”, (2) “teachers’ use of more authentic assessment”, (3) “expansion of teachers’ knowledge of theory and research”, and (4) “teachers’ making instructional decisions based on student needs” (Vanderberg & Stephens, 2010, p. 154).

Walpole, McKenna, Uribe-Zarain and Lamitina (2010) both created and validated coaching and teaching observation protocols in their study of Reading First implementation in 116 high poverty schools in Georgia. The researchers wanted to develop measurements that would provide information about which coaching components led to improvements in instructional performance by teachers. The researchers used exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling to link aspects of coaching and teaching (Walpole et al., 2010). Through exploratory and confirmatory analysis the following coaching factors were determined: collaboration with teachers, coaching for differentiation, and leadership support for coaching. Exploratory factor analysis led to the identification of five teaching factors: collaboration, small-group management, effective reading instruction, read alouds and assessment (Walpole et al., 2010). Confirmatory factor analysis, teaching factors were: small group work, effective instruction, read alouds, and management (Walpole et al., 2010). Through structural equation modeling, the researchers found that each coaching factor was linked to at least one instructional factor.
Literacy Coaching and Student Achievement Outcomes

Four of the articles in this section on literacy coaching examine the relationship between literacy coaching and student achievement. Biancarosa, Byrk, and Dexter (2010) reported on the implementation of Literacy Collaborative and its impact on kindergarten, first, and second grade students in 17 schools. Student achievement was measured over the course of the three years of Literacy Collaborative implementation through the use of DIBELS and Terra Nova twice annually. Literacy Collaborative (LC) is a complex coaching model that includes graduate credit hours, a full year of training and the daily teaching of children. In this study, training of the coaches and establishment of baseline data took place prior to the collection of data to measure student outcomes. During LC implementation, there were improvements in student literacy achievement with standard effect sizes of .22, .37, and .43 across years one, two, and three (Biancarosa et al., 2010). The authors suggest these increasing positive changes over time may be a result of an evolution in the professional context of a school around literacy practices. About the overall findings of the study, Biancarosa et al. (2010) stated, “At a minimum, the current study does suggest that well-specified and well-supported coaching initiatives can effect positive changes in student learning” (p. 28).

The results of the Biancarosa et al. (2010) stood in stark contrast to the results of the Garet, Cronen, Eaton, Kurki, Ludwig, Jones, Uekawa, and Falk (2008) study. In the Garet (2008) et al. study, 270 teachers in 90 schools were randomly assigned to one of three groups: treatment group A (which received training), treatment group B (which received training and coaching), or the control group which received only the professional development opportunities offered by the school district. Teachers in treatment groups A and B attended eight institute and seminar days focused on Louisa Moats’ *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling* (LETRS)
(Moats, 2005). Treatment B teachers also received coaching from a half time coach. As training for their role as coaches, the literacy coaches attended all the LETRS training provided by the teachers, received 3 days from the Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE) and participated in 4 site visits through the course of the implementation year (Garet et al., 2008, p. xvii).

After one year of implementation, results of student achievement as measured by the average score from the district’s standardized measure showed that students in the treatment groups did no better than students in the control group. Additionally, there was no added benefit to the coaching intervention (Treatment B) over the professional development intervention (Treatment A). However, there was a positive change in teacher knowledge as measured by the Reading Content and Practices Survey. Teachers in the treatment groups scored higher on this measure than control group teachers and they demonstrated greater implementation of the strategies introduced in the professional development institutes, those changes, however, didn’t result in positive changes in student outcomes. In the year following the treatment, there were no statistical differences on either student or teacher outcome measures.

Porche, Pallante, and Snow (2012) shared information about the professional development model (CLLIP) and the results from their first year of an exploratory, matched comparison study that was carried out with a cohort of twenty–seven kindergarten and 4th grade rural elementary school teachers. This article focused on the first year of implementation of a longitudinal project which included both professional development sessions and coaching opportunities. The professional development sessions consisted of six day long sessions and included the topics of assessment, targeted small group instruction, word reading, fluency, vocabulary, writing, and comprehension. On average, teachers engaged in eight to ten 30 minute coaching visits through the school year (Porche et al., 2012). Coaching visits were either
observational, where the coach took extensive notes and then provided memos to the teacher and administrator with suggestions for improvement, or conferences in which the teacher and coach discussed the notes and memos from previous observational memos. Additionally, coaches modeled lessons and provided support and feedback via emails and memos. The study addressed two research questions:

(1) Do CLLIP students in the emerging (kindergarten) and established (grade four) reading levels make greater gains compared to students in control classrooms on language and literacy outcome measures specifically addressed in CLLIP teachers’ professional development training?

(2) Are gains in language and literacy skills in CLLIP classrooms moderated by student risk status, given the formal small-group instruction strategies integrated into CLLIP teachers’ professional development training? (Porche et al., 2012, p. 652).

Student outcomes were measured by DIBELS and four subtests of the Woodcock Johnson III (WJIII). Performance of students in CLLIP teacher classrooms were compared to the performance of students in non-CLIP teacher classrooms. The researchers in the study also sought to create a coaching checklist through the implementation of the study. Additionally, researchers gathered information from teachers through surveys after each of the professional development sessions and at the end of the school year.

Kindergarten students in the CLLIP classrooms outperformed kindergarten students in non-CLLIP classrooms on measures of letter naming, initial sound, phoneme segmentation, and vocabulary, but the results were not considered statistically significant (Porche et al., 2012,). In the area of word recognition, fourth grade students in CLLIP classrooms scored significantly higher than students in non-CLLIP classrooms. Porche et al. (2012) also report that there were greater gains for at risk peers than non at risk peers, and that this is reflective of the program
emphasis on differentiated, small group instruction. In their discussion, the authors discuss the time and commitment necessary to work together on a common goal and achieve change.

Vernon-Feargans, Kainz, Hedrick, Ginsberg and Amendum (2013) sought to investigate the use of Targeted Reading Instruction (TRI) and webcam coaching on outcomes for struggling students. Researchers explored the following research questions:

1. Do struggling readers who participate in TRI demonstrate better performance on tests of early literacy at the end of the school year than struggling readers who do not participate in TRI?

2. When compared to struggling readers in control schools to non-struggling classroom peers, does the spring performance of struggling readers in the intervention schools indicate that they are catching up to their non-struggling peers? (Vernon-Feargans et. al, 2013, p. 1178).

Experimental and control classrooms were established across fifteen schools, with 75 teachers and 631 children participating (Vernon-Feargans et. al, 2013). Teachers in the experimental group learned the TRI strategies through a three day summer institute that was led by the TRI intervention director and reading coaches. Most of the reading coaches in the study were School of Education doctoral students who had elementary teaching experience or were reading coaches. The coaches received training which included videotaping their teaching with students and getting feedback from the TRI intervention director (Vernon-Feargans et. al, 2013). The teachers in the study received 20 minute biweekly coaching visits from a reading coach via webcam. The use of the web camera enabled reading coaches to provide immediate feedback and guidance to the teacher as she was working one on one with the struggling student.
To answer the first research question, the TRI produced the following effect sizes: .36 and .54 for word reading skills, .63 for spelling, and .48 for reading comprehension (Vernon-Feargans et al., 2013). In response to the second research question, there was no evidence that the TRI intervention allowed struggling students to close the achievement gap and catch up to non-struggling peers (Vernon-Feargans et al., 2013). In the summary section of their article, the Vernon–Feargans et al. (2013) spoke to the promise of webcam coaching which allows for immediate and real time feedback to teachers and allows coaches to reach teachers in areas of geographic isolation.

**Strengths of Literacy Coaching Articles**

There were many strengths among the group of literacy coaching articles. Though the L’Allier et al. (2010) article was not empirical and was a “best practice” piece, it did link suggestions for effective principles of literacy coaching to research in the field. For each suggestion the researchers made, there were research studies referenced to substantiate the suggestion. Hunt et al. (2013) detailed their analysis process for the reader, by describing the three level positioning analysis that they followed. They also discussed their rationale for their method of transcription, which identified speaker turns, speech patterns and changes in pitch and volume. McLean et al. (2010) clearly defined both discourse and their analysis framework. McLean et al. (2010) cited Gee (1996) when stating, “discourse analysis is an attempt to understand the thoughts and social practices of the participants based on talking, listening, reading and writing, values, beliefs, and the use of tools to mediate social positions” (p. 258). They identified Gee’s (1999) framework for analyzing discourse as their tool for investigating the idea of being a literacy coach (McLean et. al, 2010). McLean et al. (2010) also represented their findings clearly through extracts and explanations. In addition, these authors provided
necessary information about the larger context of educational reform, professional development, and literacy coaching. The article also included a section on implications which included recommendations for the training of literacy coaches and the viability of redelivery of mandated curriculum.

Al Otaiba et al. (2008) included a discussion of trustworthiness, relied on many data sources to support their conclusions, and had multiple members analyzing the data. They acknowledged that teacher knowledge improved as a result of the professional development as measured by the *Teacher Knowledge Assessment*, but that teachers continued to struggle with many central topics including: differentiating between phonics and phonemic awareness, determining the number of phonemes in a word, and identifying various concepts including digraphs, diphthongs, and consonant blends.

Vanderburg and Stephens (2010) searched their interview data looking for negative cases and found seven comments that were critical of the project but none that were critical of the coaches. In addition to analyzing for negative cases, the authors also commented on why they found their patterns to be trustworthy. Both of these practices give credibility to the researchers and the conclusions they have drawn (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Biancarosa et al. (2010) offered a detailed description of the Literacy Collaborative coaching model and the coaches training. Porche et al. (2012) clearly described the CLLIP coaching model, offered a detailed description of their analysis procedure, and included a lengthy limitations section where they addressed the possibility of selection bias and cautioned their readers about making interpretations from their data.
Weaknesses of Literacy Coaching Articles

There were various shortcomings of the articles concerning literacy coaching. Kent (2005) maintained that literacy coaches and classroom teachers must have the same ideas about how children learn before they can work productively together. That is highly unlikely given the diversity of experiences and training of educators. Rather, it seems the job of the coach to process through various claims that educators may make in professional development sessions or in their actions in classroom practice in order to determine the effectiveness or appropriateness of a given claim or action. Additionally, and unlike the L’Allier et al. (2010) article, Kent (2005)’s suggestions for practice were not substantiated by research from the field.

Heineke’s (2013) article clearly articulated a theoretical framework that centered on sociocultural theory. In part, this theory involves a tenet that knowledgeable others are needed in a culture to guide more novice learners in their development. In the case of this article, the literacy coach would be viewed as the more knowledgeable other and the classroom teacher as the novice whose learning should be scaffolded (Heineke, 2013). It follows that the more knowledgeable other might talk more than the novice learner, in an effort to provide guidance, support, and information. It was confusing then, as to why dominance of coaching interactions was a major theme in the findings. Based on the sociocultural theory so clearly articulated through the theoretical framework, I would have expected a more dominant knowledgeable other in the literacy coach. I do not find it problematic that a coach dominates an interaction, because the coach is functioning in the role of knowledgeable other. L’Allier et al. (2010) suggested that “Coaches must be literacy leaders in the school” (p. 550). This leadership might include introducing new literacy initiatives, explaining how to administer a particular assessment instrument, or facilitating conversation around student outcome data. This role as “leader” may
require the coach, or knowledgeable other, to talk more than participants. Another weakness of this article was the lack of transcript. Though quotes were offered and line numbers referenced, there was no way to review the analysis. Lastly, though this article referenced the work of Gee and defined discourse analysis, the analysis itself wasn’t clearly articulated. Though Hunt and Handsfield (2013) included a transcript, it was in the appendix instead of the body of the research article. I saw this as a disadvantage. More of an interpretative gap is present when a reader has to rely on the analysis of the researcher instead of her own reading and rendering of what took place within an interaction. The warrants made by the authors were more broad and generalized than if the extract and explanation had been presented together in the body of the article. An example of this generalization was when Hunt and Handsfield (2013) stated, “The coaches, however, were still unhappy and continued to question both the purpose of the assignment and the requirements of the presentation” (p. 69). I wondered if the participants said that they were unhappy or if this was an inference drawn by the researchers. It would have been helpful to see the words or body language that displayed the unhappiness and the continued questioning.

The Al Otaiba et al. (2008) study sought to improve the knowledge base and expertise of teachers in reading. Interestingly, the reading coach that was profiled in the study held a doctorate in school psychology and not reading. Despite this, she was still considered well qualified by the researchers as demonstrated in this comment: “In all likelihood the coach, who had a doctorate in school psychology and was a national reviewer for Reading First, may be more knowledgeable about SBRR than most coaches” (Al Otaiba et al., 2008, p. 149). Additionally, the determination of teacher knowledge and expertise was limited to pre and post data on one 22 item multiple choice measure (Mather, Bos, & Barber, 2001). The Teacher
**Knowledge Assessment** was a single measure of the structure of language that doesn’t consider the various facets of knowledge that reading teachers must hold.

In terms of analysis, the Pomerantz & Pierce study (2013) had two major weaknesses. First, the researchers state that the pre and post teacher observation measures were analyzed with “descriptive statistics” but there is no further detail provided (p. 107). Second, the authors did not explain the process they engaged in to determine themes from the qualitative data.

Many of the coaching articles did not offer information about the kind of coaching model that was represented, the training of the coaches, or what a coaching visit entailed. Porche et al. (2012) did not offer much information about the qualifications or training of the CLLIP coaches. Though the visits were described, detailed information about the content of the visits was not provided. Vernon-Feargans et al. (2013) reported, “These coaches went through an intensive training that included videotaping themselves working with individual children and receiving feedback from the intervention director of the project” (p. 1178). Not enough is known about the nature of this intensive training such as the duration of the training, how often the coaches videorecorded themselves, or how often the coaches engaged in conversation about their teaching.

Vernon-Feargans et al. (2013) cited Elbaum et al., (2000) and Schwartz (2005) when they made the following claim,

On average, teachers worked individually with a child two to three times for six weeks, with an average of 14 sessions for each child over the course of the year. In programs like ‘Reading Recovery’, which used a specialized teacher, both more sessions and longer sessions were needed to achieve rapid progress. (p. 1185)
The comparison of number of sessions and duration of sessions between this study and the studies on Reading Recovery is legitimate. However, how the researchers defined rapid progress is unclear. In this study, the students identified as struggling did not catch up to non-struggling peers (Vernon et al., 2013). This closing of the achievement gap is the central goal of Reading Recovery and only students who achieve this type of accelerated progress and reach the average text reading level of their same age cohort have their lessons discontinued and are considered successes (Clay, 2005). It seemed a stretch on the part of the authors to make this comparison.

**Specific Literacy Interventions**

Four of the studies in this literature review very specifically described interventions and implementation procedures that included professional development for literacy teachers. Each of these studies offered a “blueprint” of sorts of the details of intervention implementation. Two additional studies described particular interventions that included or were professional development initiatives and then made general professional development suggestions. Though some of these studies did employ literacy coaches within the intervention, the use of literacy coaches was secondary to the major focus of each of these studies. In this section, as in the section on literacy coaching, I will summarize the study and significant findings and offer ideas about strengths and/or weaknesses.

**Specific Professional Development Implementations**

Fisher, Frey, and Nelson (2012) chronicled the implementation of an instructional framework and professional development in 44 schools within one California school district over the course of six years. They explained the implementation of the professional development and the development and implementation of an instructional framework that resulted in positive
changes in student achievement outcomes. Fisher et al. (2012) provided background on the Chula Vista district and their motivation to make changes in order to impact student achievement outcomes. They described how the district, prior to intervention, had relied heavily on published reading materials and little on teacher decision making for a number of years and were displeased with the resulting student level of achievement. District leaders enlisted the support of the authors to devise and implement a district wide instructional framework and intense teacher professional development that enhanced and relied upon teacher knowledge and expertise. The instructional framework was designed by a leadership group of teachers, coaches, administrators and the researchers and included the following components: establishing a teaching purpose, modeling for students, providing guided instruction, and allowed for student engagement with the material (Fisher et al., 2012). This framework included a gradual release model in which the teachers changed their level of support over time so that teachers held less responsibility and the students held more. This instructional framework was presented to all of the teachers in the district. The teachers were encouraged to modify their lessons to include this framework. The article provided a detailed time line of the professional development focus, participants, and format (Fisher et al., 2012).

Interviews with administrators and field notes from classroom observations conducted by the researchers and literacy coaches were conducted and collected throughout the course of the intervention in order to provide information on how the project was progressing and suggest changes that needed to be made to the implementation or content for professional development sessions. Fisher et al. (2012) stated, “By looking for patterns across classrooms using a constant-comparative method, we identified when an instructional practice was becoming widespread or when a common set of implementation challenges suggested further attention” (p. 552).
The implementation of an instructional framework, intensive professional development opportunities for teachers, and an emphasis in responsive teaching district wide resulted in positive achievement gains for students. In 2005, the district scored 745 on the Academic Performance Index. By the spring of 2011, the district score on the Academic Performance Index was 861 (Fisher et al., 2012). Additionally, “41 of the 44 schools performed above 800 on the API” (Fisher et al., 2012, p. 560). In terms of the percentage of students who performed at the proficient and advanced level in reading, the district increased from 42.3% in 2005 to 72.3% in 2011 (Fisher et al., 2012). At the conclusion of the article, the authors offered implications for teachers, schools and districts which include: the need for ongoing professional development for teachers, time for teachers to use student assessment results to plan lessons, time for teachers to talk and develop expertise, and sustained focus over time across the district (Fisher et al., 2012).

A study by Lai, McNaughton, Amituanai-Tolaa, Turner, and Hsiao (2009) offered another example of a sustained professional development initiative that resulted in positive academic changes for culturally and linguistically diverse students in reading comprehension. In this three year quasi-experimental design study, Lai et al. (2009) explained how they selected a strong instructional model based on best practice in reading comprehension instruction and paired it with best practice in teacher professional development in order to impact student achievement. Lai et al. (2009) also provided a framework they adopted from the work of Robinson and Lai (2006) to examine teacher’s competing theories: accuracy of the claim, effectiveness, coherence, and improvability. The professional development component was grounded on the premise that in order to achieve and sustain accelerated growth in reading comprehension for culturally and linguistically diverse students, professional learning communities for teachers that examined the effectiveness of instruction must be established and
that through professional learning communities instruction must be continuously fine-tuned to meet student needs (Robinson & Lai, 2006).

The study took place in seven low income schools in New Zealand and included 238 students who were present across all three years of the study and 70 teachers that included literacy leaders and administrators (Lai et al., 2009). Support was provided by the researchers though implementation design and conducting professional development sessions. The researchers conducted observations of classroom instruction before the implementation of the professional development sessions. The researchers used the information gleaned from observations to design professional development opportunities to enhance instructional practices. To examine student outcomes, the researchers collected repeated measures over time on two reading tests (Progressive Achievement Tests and Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading) in February and November of 2003, 2004, and 2005 (Fisher et al., 2012).

As in the Fisher et al. (2012) study described above, Lai et al. (2009) described their implementation process in detail. Phase one focused on analysis of data, feedback from teachers and administrators and critical discussion. Additionally, phase one included a close look at the administrator’s ability to analyze student achievement data. Phase two included targeted professional development for teachers in which 10 professional development sessions were held. Lai et al. (2009) provided a detailed description of the content of the professional development sessions. Phase three of the study focused on sustaining the intervention and transitioning the responsibility from the researchers and literacy leaders to the teachers. In addition, action research projects were generated by teacher teams within the schools.

There were significant positive changes on reading comprehension student outcome measures. Lai et al. (2009) reported that “three phase process was instrumental” in achieving the
change (p. 329). By the end of the three year project, the average student scored in the average band of achievement and 10% of the students were in the average or superior bands. Also, initially low achieving students made greater gains than initially high achieving students.

A study by Scanlon, Gelzheiser, Vellutino, Schatschneider, and Sweeney (2008) investigated the notion that professional development for teachers might be as effective as intervention for children in the prevention of reading difficulties. The study investigated the outcomes for three treatment conditions: (1) Treatment 1-Professional Development for teachers; (2) Treatment 2- Small group intervention for children; or (3) Treatment 3- Professional development for teachers and small group direct intervention for children. Three cohorts of children were studied: a baseline cohort, an implementation cohort (the experimental treatments were implemented with this cohort), and a maintenance cohort. Participants in the study, after accounting for teacher attrition, included four schools, 28 kindergarten teachers, and the students of the 28 teachers (Scanlon et al., 2008). Measurement of student achievement was based on scores from the Phonological Awareness and Literacy Screening Battery both at the beginning and at the end of the kindergarten year. To collect data on classroom instruction, The Classroom Language Arts Systemic Sampling and Instructional Coding was used. Results from student achievement data indicate that all three treatments were successful in reducing the number of students considered at-risk (Scanlon et al., 2008). The researchers anticipated that Treatment 3 (professional development for teachers and intervention for students) would work most successfully. Because the effectiveness of the instruction varied considerably in the cohort groups before treatments began, the researchers could not confidently make the assertion that Treatment 3 worked best. The overall results of the study suggested that professional development for teachers can positively impact outcomes for at risk students.
In a naturalistic case study that included both qualitative and quantitative measures, Gilrane, Roberts, and Russell (2008), in a project funded by a Reading Excellence Grant, designed, implemented, and evaluated the effectiveness of a two year professional development initiative at an elementary school. The purpose of the professional development was twofold: (1) to enhance literacy understanding and skills and (2) to develop a literacy team at the school level (Gilrane et al., 2008). The professional development included a summer institute that all K-3 staff, assistants and administrators attended. Teachers attended five more professional development days through the year and were supported at least twice a month by the lead author through classroom visits. Teachers learned about and implemented the Four Blocks Literacy Framework (Cunningham, Hall & Sigmon, 1999) and had the opportunity to visit other classrooms that used the same framework. Teachers had formal input into the design of their professional development opportunities early, mid-year, and at the end of the 1st year of implementation (Gilrane et al., 2008). Data sources included: observations, semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews, school climate interviews, teacher narratives and teacher questionnaires. The authors reported the following conditions of teacher change and reflection: (1) a voice in determining professional development needs; (2) structures in place to support teaching (materials, time, and space for collaborative planning); (3) availability of support personnel; and (4) access to useful information about student learning (Gilrane et al., 2008).

Though the focus of the Gilrane et al. (2008) study was on teacher professional development, student achievement data was collected additionally, for as the authors state, “The goal of all PD is to increase teachers’ abilities to improve student learning” (p. 341). Tables provided in the results section showing mid-year and year end achievement scores on the basal reading program assessments showed positive changes in total reading growth across the years of
implementation in grades K-2, and a negative change in total reading growth in grade 3 (Gilrane et al., 2008). The authors explain that other reading assessments, like the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) provided evidence of satisfactory student achievement in 3rd grade. Gilrane et al. (2008) contend that this discrepancy in achievement results speaks to the need for multiple assessments to assess student achievement.

**Student Intervention or Professional Development Overview**

Doubek and Cooper (2007) describe the National Urban Alliance for Effective Education (NUA) professional development initiative and make suggestions for the types of research needed to improve teacher practices and ultimately student achievement outcomes. The NUA is a non-profit agency that provides professional development to teachers after conducting an extensive needs assessment and designing an action plan that includes attention to curriculum, teacher instructional practices, and community involvement. Additionally, the NUA gives attention to the role of school leadership in facilitating systemic change. Doubek and Cooper (2007) referenced the work of Haberman (1995) and Levine and Cooper (1991) when they stated, “Without administrative, organizational, and community participation that empowers teachers and students, professional development in reading instruction cannot begin to make the necessary strides that will counteract negative consequences for learners, especially students who are underperforming” (p. 413). Doubek and Cooper (2007) advocated for reading researchers to investigate effective leadership, what they consider to be a precondition of reading achievement. They also called for an examination of the depth and complexity of reading curricula, reading initiatives that result in positive achievement outcomes for students, text selection, and teacher rationale for decision making (Doubek & Cooper, 2007).
In their article, “Reading Recovery 20 years down the track: Looking forward, looking back”, Reynolds and Wheldall (2007) reviewed Reading Recovery, an intervention for first grade struggling readers. In their section on what Reading Recovery has done well, Reynolds and Wheldall (2007) cite the work of Shanahan and Barr (1995) when stating that Reading Recovery teacher training and on-going professional development have been praised. They also quoted Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) who acknowledge Reading Recovery teachers’ deep understanding of the reading process and the implication for reading instruction (Reynolds & Wheldall, 2007).

**Strengths of Literacy Intervention Articles**

Fisher et al. (2012) offered a detailed look at systemic change within a school district that occurred over the course of six years. They outlined the decision making process of the leadership team within the Chula Vista district to achieve positive change for students and provide teachers with quality learning opportunities. This article could support other districts who are interested in making similar improvements.

Like the Fisher et al. (2012) article, the Lai et al. (2009) article described systemic change that took place over several years. The article outlined the steps taken to design meaningful professional development opportunities for teachers and provided a framework (Robinson & Lai, 2006) for facilitators to use with teachers when weighing up claims or making educational assertions. Unlike the Kent (2005) article, Lai et al. (2009) did not expect all teachers to have the same beliefs about how children learn. They provided a way for teachers and facilitators to cope with differences in beliefs, practices, and understanding. The Lai et al. (2009) study was also very specific in their data collection and analysis methods, allowing for replication of their study to take place. Both the Fisher et al. (2012) and Lai et al. (2009) studies offered sufficient details
about their implementation decisions to create systemic change that resulted in positive student achievement outcomes.

The Gilrane et al. (2008) article included a section on trustworthiness in which the length of time spent at the research site, the triangulation of data sources, and efforts to member check are explained. The authors also provided a table that linked their four teacher change conditions to the various data sources (Gilrane et al., 2008).

Another strength of the Gilrane et al. (2008) article was the clear articulation of their beliefs about teacher learning and teacher expertise. The authors' stated, “Central to our beliefs are the importance of a comprehensive approach to teaching literacy and the absolute necessity that teachers be accorded the professional status required to make decisions in their own classrooms about which methods of teaching fit the needs of their diverse students (p. 333).

Weaknesses of Literacy Intervention Articles

Perhaps because their article was written for practitioners and published within The Reading Teacher, little attention was given by Fisher et.al (2012) in describing the data collection and methods of analysis undertaken in the process of implementing an instructional framework and professional development opportunities for teachers.

Reynolds and Wheldall (2007) appeared to be biased in their representation of Reading Recovery, as evidenced by the inaccurate statements about Reading Recovery that appear throughout the article. Reynolds and Wheldall (2007) cited the work of Tunmer and Chapman (2003) when they stated that Reading Recovery was “aligned with the literacy curriculum and the predominantly whole-language approach that is used throughout the country” (p. 202). A quote by Moats (2000) that Reading Recovery is “a whole-language incarnation” was also referenced (Reynolds & Wheldall, 2007, p. 213). The Reading Recovery intervention is not a
whole language approach but a balanced literacy model that incorporates focused instruction on phonics and word study into the processing of continuous text (Clay, 2005). Pressley (2006) acknowledged the inclusion of phonics and word study within Reading Recovery as he describes the use of Elkonin boxes for sound analysis, word work activities, and the use of sound mapping in writing.

**Teacher Knowledge, Belief and Expertise**

Topping and Ferguson (2005) articulated well the differences of opinion about what constitutes teacher knowledge and effectiveness when they stated:

Previous studies into the effectiveness of literacy teaching practices use different definitions of what constitutes a valid measure of effectiveness. Some studies (e.g. Shulman, 1986) simply assumed that those teachers who subscribe to a particular educational philosophy, or who can articulate a more comprehensive or informed knowledge of subject matter or pedagogy, will inevitably be more effective teachers. Others (e.g. Pressley, Rankin & Yokoi, 1996) assumed that teachers nominated as effective are indeed more effective than those not so nominated. Yet others (e.g. Berliner, 1988; Block, Hurt & Oakar, 2002; Brophy & Good, 1986) equated effectiveness with certain types of teaching behaviors or qualities. (p. 125)

This tension was reflected in this group of reviewed articles as well. Camp (2008), Topping and Ferguson (2005), Hoffman, Roller, Maloch, Sailors, Duffy, and Beretuns (2005), and Smith (2009) included teacher observations and evidence of particular teaching behaviors as evidence of teacher effectiveness. Cunningham, Perry, Stanovich & Stanovich (2004), Podhajski, Mather, Nathan, and Sammons (2009), and Spear-Swerling and Chessman (2011) included testing of teacher content knowledge as measured by multiple choices, and Gomez (2009) examined teacher personal literacy practices and knowledge. Knowledge calibration, or having
an accurate understanding of one’s knowledge base was addressed by Cunningham et al. (2004) and Topping and Ferguson (2005). There continues to be a broad range of ideas about what counts in teacher knowledge and expertise. These articles contributed to that conversation.

Camp (2008) selected and observed four highly qualified teachers as they taught reading over the course of five months. She analyzed their practices through classroom observation, questionnaire responses, and debriefing conferences/interviews and found close alignment with the following five performance based competences presented in the 2004 IRA Standards for Reading Professionals: Foundational Knowledge; Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials; Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation; Creating a Literate Environment; and Professional Development. To represent her findings, Camp (2008) presented classroom, field note, and interview examples with the corresponding IRA category.

Cunningham et al. (2004) investigated teachers’ actual and perceived domain specific knowledge in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, and children’s literature. The authors found that teachers overestimated what they know about reading. Interestingly, teacher’s evaluated their knowledge base in each of the areas positively even though their actual knowledge was considerably lower. The teachers’ actual knowledge level and perceived knowledge level were most closely aligned in the area of children’s literature, showing greater knowledge calibration. The authors stated that the idea of knowledge calibration has important implications for teacher educators. If teachers perceived themselves as having considerable knowledge in an area, they may be less open to learning more information about the topic. Conversely, if teachers accurately determined their knowledge base and know they need to learn more, they will be more open to learning. This finding has applicability in both pre-service and in-service teacher education.
Gomez (2009) investigated teachers’ beliefs about their own literacy and how those beliefs impacted instructional practices. Through multiple data courses (surveys, diaries, and interviews) Gomez (2009) learned about teachers’ personal literacy. Teachers varied in the amount they included pleasurable literacy practices into their lives. They also varied in how much they discussed their literate activities for their students. Gomez (2009) quoted Vacca, Vacca, and Gove (1995) when they refereed to three types of knowledge that teachers should possess: professional knowledge, practical knowledge, and personal knowledge. Gomez (2009) advocated for the inclusion of time in professional development sessions for teachers to reflect upon their own personal knowledge and how they might use it in their teaching. Gomez (2009) believed teachers needed to both reveal and model their personal knowledge for their students.

Podhajski, Mather, Nathan, and Sammons (2009) investigated the impact of a 35 hour professional development course in scientifically based reading instruction on both teacher knowledge and student reading achievement outcomes. Podhajski et al. (2009) compared the performance of teachers and students in an experimental group (four first and second grade teachers and their 33 students) to the performance of teachers and students in a control group (three teachers and their 14 students) from a neighboring community with higher socioeconomic status.

Student outcomes were measured by: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE) (Podhajski et.al, 2009). For first grade students, growth was higher for students in the experimental group on measures of letter naming fluency, phoneme segmentation fluency, nonsense word fluency and oral reading.
For both control and experimental groups, teacher knowledge was measured by *The Survey of Teacher Knowledge* (Podhajski et al., 2009). The teacher knowledge survey measured teacher knowledge of language structure “at the sound and word level” (Podhajski et al., 2009, p. 408). Teachers in the experimental group also completed project and course evaluations. Initially, teachers in the experimental group scored lower on the measure of teacher knowledge but by the end of the professional development course, teachers in the experimental group outperformed the teachers in the control group. According to the authors, “an implication from our findings is that effective professional development, which informs teacher knowledge, can have a positive effect on children’s reading performance” (Podhajski et al., 2009, p. 414).

Using a questionnaire and a content knowledge survey, the *Foundations of Reading Test* published by Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, Spear-Swerling and Cheesman (2011) investigated the reading knowledge base of 142 teachers and teacher candidates about various Response to Intervention (RTI) models and the 5 components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension). The 66 multiple choice item knowledge survey assessed content knowledge of specific RTI interventions, assessments, and various instructional models and was formatted to resemble a teacher licensure exam. Thirty-three percent of the items assessed content knowledge and sixty-seven percent involved application where a classroom scenario was presented and the participant had to tell what they would do in the given situation to teach, assess, or implement an RTI intervention (Spear-Swerling & Cheesman, 2011). According to the Spear-Swerling and Cheesman (2011), “The *Foundations of Reading Test* is one of only a few teacher licensure exams focused on pedagogical content knowledge about reading that comprehensively assesses knowledge about the five components of reading specified by the National Reading Panel” (p. 1699).
On the *Foundations of Reading Test*, participants obtained their highest scores on measures of fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, with an average mean percentage score of 63.6. (Spear-Swerling & Cheesman, 2011). On this measure, participants answered items related to compare/contrast, the use of Venn diagrams, modeling think-alouds, and teaching content level vocabulary correctly (Spear-Swerling & Cheesman, 2011). Participant scores on phonics and phonemic awareness scores were in the middle, with an average mean percentage score of 59.5% (Spear-Swerling & Cheesman, 2011). The participants responded to items about the importance of phonemic awareness, using structural analysis to decode, or teaching letters to kindergarteners using multisensory tracing on this subtest (Spear-Swerling & Cheesman, 2011).

The lowest scores were obtained in the area of RTI practices and assessment with an average mean percentage score of 50.7 (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011, p. 1705). RTI and Assessment subtest questions included items about the advantages to RTI approaches, identification of struggling students, and curriculum based management (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011).

The questionnaire contained two parts. The first section on participant background asked questions relating to years of teaching experience, certifications, degrees, professional development in literacy and knowledge of the National Reading Panel Report (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011). The second section assessed participants’ knowledge of instructional models, reading intervention, some commercial reading programs, and specific assessments (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011). Items in this section included: Orton-Gillingham, Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing, Great Leaps, Read Naturally, Peer Assisted Learning Strategies, Questioning the Author, Reciprocal Teaching and STAR model of vocabulary instruction (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011).
The researchers discussed a number of correlations. Teachers who had reported participation in code focused professional development, from programs like Orton-Gillingham, Wilson, or LETRS scored higher in all three knowledge categories than those participants who did not report participation in code emphasis professional development (Spear-Swerling & Cheesman, 2011). Additionally, participants with more years of teaching experience outperformed less experienced teachers on two of the three tests (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011). On the subtests of Fluency, Comprehension, and Vocabulary and Phonemic Awareness and Phonics, certified general education and special education teachers outperformed non-certified teachers (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011). On the subtest of Assessment and Response to Intervention, certified Special Education teachers performed significantly better than either General Education certified teachers or non-certified teachers, with the difference between general education teachers and non-certified teachers not being significantly different (Spear-Swerling & Chessman, 2011). Researchers suggest that PD is needed for teachers to adequately understand RTI models and to implement them effectively.

Topping and Ferguson (2005) examined the literacy practices of five highly effective teachers in western Scotland by investigating the following research questions:

(1) What teaching behaviors do effective literacy teachers employ?

(2) Are there differences between effective literacy teachers in this respect?

(3) Are there differences between general literacy and shared reading sessions in this respect?

(4) What teaching behaviors do effective teachers perceive they employ?

(5) Do these perceptions differ from the observed behavior, and if so how? (p. 127)
The teachers were selected by the researchers for the study based on high student achievement outcomes in reading and nomination as expert teachers. To answer the research questions, the authors conducted classroom observations, questionnaires, and interviews.

All teachers included a metacognitive approach to reading instruction in their classrooms. Additionally, the phonics program used in each classroom used both synthetic and analytic approaches. Shared reading was part of whole class instruction and general literacy sessions included the following breakdown of time allocation: 46% of literacy instruction in small group, 23% in whole class instruction, 17.5% with individual students, and 13.5% on non-teaching tasks (Topping & Ferguson, 2005).

Relying on past research on the effectiveness of teachers, the researchers conducted observations with the following categories in mind: transmitting information, interaction with pupils, questioning, non-teaching, and formal assessment (Topping & Ferguson, 2005). As teachers were observed, their behaviors were sorted according to the above categories. Each teacher was observed and video-recorded twice for 1 hour and 20 minutes each session and included both shared reading and general reading instruction (Topping & Ferguson, 2005).

In addition to observations, teachers were interviewed and asked to comment on teaching strategies, professional development, assessment methods and lesson content (Topping & Ferguson, 2005). The interviews were conducted after the observations were complete. Each of the teacher interviews was transcribed. Interview questions and the observational categories were in alignment (Topping & Ferguson, 2005).

Both qualitative and quantitative analysis of interview and observational data took place. With observational data, researchers found commonality among the teaching practices of the five effective teachers. In shared reading, each of the teachers exhibited high levels of interactions.
with students, followed by questioning behavior, transmitting information, and engaging in non-teaching activities. None of the five teachers assessed students in the shared reading settings of their observations. In general literacy teaching, the most frequent observed behavior was again, interacting. This was followed by transmitting information, non-teaching activities, questioning and finally, assessment (Topping & Ferguson, 2005). Topping and Ferguson (2005) note that there was greater teacher variability during general literacy instruction than in shared reading instruction. In comparison with shared reading sessions, there was less questioning behavior from teachers and more transmitting information, engaging in non-teaching tasks and assessment (Topping & Ferguson, 2005). Interaction was high in both instructional settings (Topping & Ferguson, 2005). This study was similar to the study by Camp (2008) that conducted observations of teachers and categorized them according to IRA professional standards.

Interestingly, Topping and Ferguson (2005) found that there was “only partial overlap between the observations and the perceptions” (p. 139). Teachers lacked awareness about their use of specific literacy practices when comparing their actions across setting. Teachers did not report any variation in their behavior from shared reading to general reading settings. Additionally, teachers did not report an awareness of the complexity of their teaching behaviors. This finding is similar to the finding in Cunningham et.al (2004) in which teachers’ perception of their content knowledge in children’s literature, phonics, and phonemic awareness was not aligned with their actual knowledge. Both studies reported on a lack of accurate metacognitive awareness on the part of teachers.

Topping and Ferguson (2005) concluded that, “Teachers should have access to a wide range of opportunities to develop and enhance effective literacy teaching behaviors through observation and interaction in multiple social contexts. However, they should also have access to
opportunities to monitor and reflect upon teaching behaviors they use and do not use, in different contexts” (p. 141). The last recommendation by Topping and Ferguson (2005) was similar to the recommendation by Gomez (2009) who advocated for an allocation of time in professional development sessions for teachers to reflect upon their personal literacy and how they might incorporate that information into teaching their students.

Though this review focuses upon in-service teacher professional development in primary literacy, there were two studies that investigated teachers in their pre-service and in-service environments. Both of the studies discussed below examine the knowledge base of educators during their pre-service and in-service experiences.

In a three year study by Hoffman, Roller, Maloch, Sailors, Duffy, and Beretvas (2005), researchers looked at the impact of teacher preparation programs on teachers in the field. Specifically, the research questions for the study were: (1) “What effects do participation in and completion of an excellent reading teacher education program have on the experiences of teachers as they enter schools?” and (2) “How does teachers’ preparation relate to their teaching practices?” (Hoffman et al., 2005, p. 272). The research design was quasi-experimental. Within the same school, teachers with similar years of experience were compared to one another with the quality of their university preparation being the differing variable.

Both qualitative and quantitative measures were used to answer the research questions. Qualitative data consisted of structured interviews with teachers that were first transcribed and then analyzed to determine themes using a constant comparative method (Hoffman et al., 2005). Quantitative data was collecting using the TEX-IN3 observation instrument “which assesses the classroom literacy environment from a “social practice” perspective” (Hoffman et al., 2005, p. 273). The TEX-IN3 includes a text inventory, text interviews, and a “texts in use” observation
system (Hoffman et al., 2005, p. 273). In using this system, texts in the classroom were inventoried, teachers and select students were interviewed about text use in the classroom, and students and teachers are observed engaging together with texts (Hoffman et al., 2005, p. 274). 38 trained observers conducted three observations on each of the teachers across eight different states (Hoffman et al., 2005). The researchers used descriptive statistics and analysis of variance to determine there was a statistical difference between the commission program graduates and non-commission graduates. Commission programs were the seven universities and one college that, through a competitive application and screening process, were determined to be exemplar institutions in the preparation of teachers in the teaching of reading (Hoffman et al., 2005).

Researchers concluded that having high quality preparation mattered. Teachers from programs considered high quality commissions scored higher in establishing and engaging students in a high quality literacy environment. It also appeared to impact the ease of transition from the pre-service to the in-service experience (Hoffman et al., 2005).

Like Hoffman et al. (2005), Smith (2009) looked at teachers as they moved from their pre-service to their in-service teaching experience. Smith followed five teachers from their university preparation into the field and focused specifically on two teachers who exhibited extremely different practices in how they taught reading. The five participants were elementary education majors who “represented a good cross-section of their teacher preparation program’s student population in terms of commitment, ability, age, and field placement diversity (Smith, 2009, p. 248). The research questions for the study centered on investigating the factors that lead to such different practices. The research questions for the study were:

(1) What are the beliefs pre-service teachers hold about the teaching of reading, and how do they enact these beliefs?
(2) “What key factors in their coursework and field experience enabled or constrained their developing belief system about how to teach reading? (Smith, 2009, p. 248).

To answer the research questions, the researcher collected data via classroom observation (more than 40 hours), interviews (more than 30 hours), and examination of various documents including lesson plans, written assignments, and written feedback from teacher supervisors (Smith, 2009). Smith (2009) quoted Patton (1990) when he described the process of triangulation which included, “comparing and crossing the consistency of information derived at different times and by different means with qualitative methods” (Smith, 2009, p. 249).

In the results and discussion sections, Smith (2009) described and reflected upon the experiences of the two focus participants, Alice and Karen (pseudonyms) and shared information from observations, field notes, and documents to offer a comprehensive look at teaching practices, knowledge, and beliefs. Smith (2009) concluded that the following four factors led to the differences in practices of the two teachers: knowledge base; opportunities to plan, teach and reflect; models; and feedback. Karen, fortunately, had positive experiences in each of these areas, while Alice was not as fortunate. Smith maintained (2009) that “teacher preparation exerts powerful influences on the development of beginning teacher’s reading perspective” (p. 259). Smith (2009) advocated for teacher preparation programs that resemble medical school instead of barber school so that ill prepared teachers are not certified and sent into the teaching force to “make a devastating impact on children’s ability to read and, thus, hurt students’ chances for future academic success” (p. 261).
Strengths of Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs and Expertise Articles

Camp (2008) clearly demonstrated how her observations and conversations with highly qualified teachers connect to the 2004 IRA professional standards by providing clear excerpts for her readers.

Podhajski et al. (2009) included a section on the limitations of the study in which the small sample size of both teachers and students is addressed and a caution about generalization is issued. The researchers also clearly articulated their analysis process including statistical tests used and including thresholds for significance.

Hoffman et al. (2005) described the observation instrument they used in great detail. They also described how observations took place, including the training of the observers. Additionally, to confirm reliability of observations Hoffman et al. (2005) included an external evaluator. The external evaluator and all but five of the observers achieved .80 reliability (Hoffman et al., 2005). The five observers that had not received .80 reliability with the external evaluator received additional training and eventually met the same reliability standard as the other observers. Additionally, the Hoffman et al. (2005) study included a section on limitations in which they shared their difficulties with data collection in the third year of the study due to attrition of participants.

Smith (2009) clearly demonstrated prolonged engagement in the field, triangulation of data sources, and a complex look at the practices of two teachers in the field. He also offered suggestions for high quality teacher education programs during the discussion section of the article.
Weaknesses of Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs, and Expertise Articles

Camp (2008) presented her findings by presenting observational quotes or happenings with categories promoted by IRA. However, it is unclear if any additional analysis took place or if, from the beginning, the author intended on doing observations in order to provide examples of the various IRA categories for reading professionals. The author also did not elaborate on her observation sessions (in terms of duration or frequency) other than to say that they were observations that took place during reading instruction. Camp (2008) also did not specify how the four teachers were chosen for study, other than she knew them when she was their graduate instructor.

In their discussion section, Spear-Swerling and Chessman (2011) stated, “Teachers certainly could teach or intervene effectively without using any published materials or instructional models that we included in our familiarity items” (p. 1715). The authors made this statement, but evaluate teacher knowledge, in part, by familiarity with largely commercial interventions and assessments. Spear-Swerling and Chessman (2011) said, “… the items we included represent a broad sampling of assessments and interventions relevant to various components of reading” (p. 1715). Surprisingly, there was no mention of the Reading Recovery intervention. About Reading Recovery, Allington (2013) stated, “… of the 153 different reading programs reviewed by the WWC [What Works Clearinghouse] only one had ‘strong evidence’ that it improved reading achievement! One! That program was Reading Recovery, a first-grade reading intervention program that features a yearlong intensive professional development component in which teachers learn how 6-year-olds get confused and begin to struggle with reading acquisition” (p. 522). If Spear-Swerling and Chessman (2011) were including a “broad sampling of assessments and interventions” (p. 1715) it seems that Reading Recovery
assessments would be included. The omission of the Reading Recovery intervention and the assessment battery used within Reading Recovery, the Observation of Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, is questionable. The Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement was rated by the Center for Response to Intervention at American Institutes for Research, (www.rti4success.org/resources/tools-charts/screening-tools-chart), as an appropriate screening tool with broad generalizability and strong reliability and validity (Center on Response to Intervention, 2015).

Call for Additional Research

The call for research included in research articles influences future reading research. After reviewing some of the suggestions for research offered by the authors of the articles reviewed for this paper, I will briefly discuss how this dissertation investigating the coaching conversations of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders in training addressed some of the suggested future research topics.

Heineke (2013) called for more research in order to better understand which coaching approaches will help address specific needs and goals. She also recommended a look at successful coaches and how they use language to foster teacher professional development (Heineke, 2013). Hunt et al. (2013) suggested a need for the investigation of the negotiations that coaches make in various districts, schools, and with teachers. McLean et al. (2010) did not make a recommendation for specific research, but they did discuss training needs for literacy coaches and the viability of mandated curriculum viability, both which could be topics of future research. Vanderberg and Stephens (2010) suggested 3 areas for additional research: (1) specific coaching actions and language, (2) research that links coaches’ actions and language to teacher change and student achievement, and (3) research on contexts in which coaches work and the impact of that
context on coaching effectiveness (p. 159). According to Walpole et al. (2010), studies that investigated the work that principals and coaches do together in an effort to support student achievement would be important to provide a rationale for funding coaching positions. Biancarosa et al. (2010) called for more research on different coaching models and in various contexts. Specifically, the authors called for more research to better understand what coaching conditions may facilitate student achievement improvements. Porche et al. (2012) stated the following in their limitations section, “More rigorous investigation of promising exploratory results requires a randomized control trial with a greater number of schools and with access to more exhaustive student- and teacher-level data” (p. 665). Additionally, they reported that more research is needed on the CLLIP training and coaching and the “specific mechanisms of change” related to the model (p. 666).

Hoffman et al. (2005) acknowledged that no single research study can provide all the information necessary to address the multitude of challenges the reading community faces and that more research must be done around teacher preparation. Specifically, Hoffman et al. (2005) called for more longitudinal, qualitative, and for experimental studies that investigate the impact of quality reading preparation and the subsequent impact on teaching practices and student outcomes. This dissertation which focused on the coaching conversations of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders as they experienced their initial training year addressed gaps in the literature as identified by Heineke (2013), Hunt and Handsfield. (2013), Vanderberg and Stephens (2010), Biancarosa et al. (2010), and Hoffman et al. (2005). This qualitative dissertation closely examined the language use of literacy coaches over the course of an entire academic year. Though several aspects of the Reading Recovery intervention have been well researched (student
achievement, teacher professional development) research focusing on the unique coaching exchanges within Reading Recovery has been unexamined.

**Conclusion**

Yoon et al. (2007) stated, “Although calls for high quality professional development are perennial, there remains a shortage of such programs – characterized by coherence, active learning, sufficient duration, collective participation, a focus on content knowledge, and a reform rather than a traditional approach” (p. 1). Many of the empirical studies reviewed in this chapter have embodied the qualities of high quality professional development opportunities for teachers. Coherence, or working toward a unified vision for instruction, was especially evident in the work of Lai et al. (2009), Fisher et al. (2012), Gilrane et al. (2008) and Biancarosa et al. (2010). Each of these studies either developed and implemented or implemented an existing instructional framework or instructional model as part of their professional development initiative. This coherence provided teachers with a structure or framework and provided direction and purpose to the professional development sessions. Active learning that engaged teachers in conversation with one another, with more knowledgeable others and in tasks that impact student achievement were demonstrated in studies by Fisher et al (2012), Biancarosa et al. (2010), Lai et al. (2009) and Gilrane et al. (2008). Additionally, the 13 studies that involved literacy coaching increased the communication between teacher and coach by simply establishing coaching sessions. An abundance of the studies focused on projects that were of sufficient duration. Year-long studies included the work of Garet et al. (2008) and Al Otaiba et al. (2008). The study by Pomerantz Pierce (2013) took place over the course of two years. Studies that were 3 or more years in duration were Vanderberg and Stephens (2010), Biancarosa et al. (2010), Porche et al. (2012), Fisher et al. (2012), Hoffman et al. (2005), and Smith (2009). The notion of collective
participation with involvement from universities, coaches, teachers, administrators and administrators was demonstrated by Fisher et al. (2012), Pomerantz and Pierce (2013), Lai et al. (2009), Vanderberg and Stephens (2010), and Gilrane et al. (2008). Reform models versus traditional approaches to professional development were most evident in the work of Lai et al. (2009), Fisher et al. (2012).

Yoon et al. (2007) asked “How does teacher professional development affect student achievement? The connection seems intuitive. But demonstrating it is difficult” (p. iii). Quite a few of these studies attempted to demonstrate the connection by exploring not only teacher professional development, but the impact it had on student achievement. Biancarosa et al. (2010), Garet et al. (2008), Fisher et al. (2012), Lai et al. (2009), Scanlon et al. (2008), and Gilrane et al (2008) all linked their professional development work to student outcomes. Though the 29 studies included in this review of the literature had significant differences in terms of the content addressed, the methods used, and the type of professional development implemented, there were similar threads throughout that addressed the concerns of Yoon et al. (2007).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I provided a review of the literature on professional development in primary literacy. I opened the chapter by providing a description of my literature review search process. In detail, I outlined each of the articles reviewed within the categories of Professional Development in Literacy Coaching, Specific Literacy Interventions, and Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs, and Expertise. In addition, strengths and weaknesses of the articles within each category were discussed. The chapter included calls for additional research on the topic of professional development in primary literacy and a brief discussion of how this dissertation addresses some of
those research gaps. A conclusion section was included to provide some discussion of themes across the articles.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

Chapter Organization

In this chapter, I will outline the substantive and methodological theories that guided my research. I will also describe the methods I used to conduct the study. Marie Clay’s Literacy Processing Theory and Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory will be discussed in the substantive theory section and the methodology section will provide a discussion of discursive psychology, the discursive action model, and conversation analysis. In the methods section of this chapter, I explain how I went about studying the discourse of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders who were engaged in coaching conversations. I will describe the steps I took to obtain Instructional Review Board approval, gain access to the research site, select participants, collect data, and analyze data. A discussion of trustworthiness and an explanation of how findings are displayed for studies viewed through the lens of Discursive Psychology will also be part of Chapter Three. To conclude this chapter, I will provide a chapter summary.

Substantive Theories

In qualitative research, the researcher is the “instrument” of research. My research topic, my approach to research, and my observational lens have all been colored by my experiences. I chose to study coaching conversations within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training because I was a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader who was coached by university trainers and who coached Reading Recovery teachers. Marie Clay’s Literacy Processing Theory guided my interactions with both students and teachers. Receiving Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training was a transformative experience for me. As I went through training, my beliefs about learning for both children and adults were changed. These two substantive theories, Clay’s Literacy Processing Theory and Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory, are deeply
influential in my life and therefore in my perspective as a researcher. It is important for readers to have an understanding of these substantive theories and how they connect to my choice of discourse analysis as my methodology. In the next section, I will discuss these two theories before offering a rationale for discourse analysis as my methodological choice.

**Clay’s Literacy Processing Theory**

Clay (2005) defined the “reading of continuous text as a message–getting, problem-solving activity which increases in power and flexibility the more it is practiced” (p. 103-104). According to Clay (2005), the ultimate aim for learners is to create a self-extending literacy system that enables students to learn from engagement in the acts of reading and writing. Her theory of reading maintains that there are multiple sources of information in texts and that young readers must learn to use information from the various sources available in text: meaning, visual information, sounds, and structure or grammar (Clay, 2005). With time, practice, and quality instruction, readers learn to “check” those information sources against one another in order to independently make and/or confirm a response.

Clay’s one-to-one literacy tutoring intervention, Reading Recovery, is shaped by her literacy processing theory (Doyle, 2013). Clay designed Reading Recovery with the majority of the instructional time being spent in text reading and writing, with only a few minutes devoted daily to tasks in isolation. Each day, during the 30 minute Reading Recovery lesson, the student reads many authentic texts that have been constructed with predictable and natural language patterns. The texts chosen for each child are based on specific teacher observation and on-going assessment. Additionally, the learner uses his own oral language structures to compose and transcribe original sentences. Only momentary detours to work on letter identification or word learning are integrated within the design of the intervention. According to Clay (2005), “a theory
of reading continuous text cannot arise from a theory of word reading. It involves problem solving and integration of behaviors not studied in the theory about analyzing words” (p. 19).

Clay (2005) asserted that most, if not all students could become literate with responsive instruction. If students did not achieve appropriate literacy levels, she held teachers responsible, stating, “… there is only one position to take in this case. The lesson series has not been appropriately adapted to the child’s needs, whatever they were” (Clay, 2005, p. 180). She maintained that accelerated student learning and progress would be outcomes of clearly selected examples, skills, or procedures by the teacher (Clay, 2005). Clay (2005) stated that teachers could foster the development of independent student problem solving in part, by “accepting the child’s initiatives …, accepting partially correct responses …, praising the way a child worked towards the solution…, whether it was reached or not…, and prompting constructive activity” (p. 39-40). Clay (2005) provided instructional prompts for teachers in her guidebooks. These prompts were designed for use by teachers to initiate student problem solving actions and initiations such as rereading, making multiple attempts, integrating a neglected piece of information, or self-correction. Clay (2005) cautioned, “Prompts are not just talk. How you prompt depends upon where this child is at this point of this text, and what else needs to be integrated into his reading processing. The prompt should send the child in search of a response in his network of responses. Too much prompting interferes with the development of independent solving” (p. 39).

Transformative Learning Theory

Transformative Learning Theory describes the process by which adults alter their previously held views and assumptions and come to think for themselves. Transformative learning involves moving beyond accepting and acting upon taken for granted assumptions and
instead coming to a new and more inclusive understanding. These taken for granted assumptions might be those that are held due to culture, family routines and traditions, religion, or life experience. These assumptions may remain taken for granted until a learner has an experience that does not “fit” with current beliefs, practices, or ways of being. According to Mezirow (2003), “Transformative learning is learning that transforms problematic frames of reference – sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets) – to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (p. 58). Mezirow (2003) maintains that transformative learning is an exclusively adult form of metacognitive reasoning involving critical reflection upon the methods, logic, and justification of reasons as well as focusing upon the consequences of a reason and its appropriateness.

According to Taylor (2007), transformative learning theory is “the most researched and discussed theory in the field of adult education” (p. 173). It is used often as a theoretical framework in dissertations, is the focus of an annual international conference and an adult education journal, and is featured in a number of peer-reviewed journal publications (Taylor, 2007). Key concepts of Transformative Learning Theory including, but not limited to, meaning schemes, meaning perspectives, frames of reference, habits of mind, epochal vs. incremental learning and domains of learning as well as formation of the theory will be explored in the next section.

Mezirow’s creation of Transformative Learning Theory grew from his study of women who were reentering school or the workforce after a significant time away. In this longitudinal, qualitative study, Mezirow wanted to examine the factors that contributed to or inhibited women’s progress as they reentered the worlds of work or school. The study involved an original phase, conducted in 1975, where 83 women who were reentering college were investigated.
Additionally, Mezirow conducted a national telephone survey and sent a mail inquiry in which he received 846 responses (Kitchenham, 2008). From his results, Mezirow maintained that participants had personally transformed. As part of the study, Mezirow formulated ten distinct phases that were descriptive of the experience of personal transformation. Mezirow maintained that not all 10 phases had to be experienced by a participant for a transformative learning experience to take place. Each of the phases is listed below:

Phase 1: A disorienting dilemma
Phase 2: A self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame
Phase 3: A critical assessment of epistemic, sociocultural, or psychic assumptions
Phase 4: Recognition that one’s discontent and the process of transformation are shared and that others have negotiated a similar change
Phase 5: Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions
Phase 6: Planning of a course of action
Phase 7: Acquisition of knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plans
Phase 8: Provisional trying of new roles
Phase 9: Building of competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships
Phase 10: A reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s perspective (Mezirow, 1991).

In 1991, Mezirow added an additional phase to the original 10 phases between phases 8 and 9. This phase stressed the importance of changing established relationships and building new ones.

**Domains of learning.** Mezirow (2000) credits the work of Habermas with his understanding of “two major domains of learning”: instrumental and communicative learning (p.
Instrumental learning is concerned with manipulating and controlling the environment as in problem solving situations that enhance performance (Mezirow, 2000). Within this learning domain, problem solving is concerned with hypothetical-deductive logic that involves hypothesis testing and analysis of the consequences. Empirical testing is used to validate an assertion and arrive at “truth”. The goal in instrumental learning is to accomplish a task, improve performance, or develop a skill.

Communicative learning is centered on making meaning of what someone communicates to you. This domain of learning includes feelings, intentions, moral issues, and values (Mezirow, 2000). Communicative learning involves thinking about not only what is being communicated, but what is behind the communication. Communicative learning involves reflection upon the intentions and truthfulness of statements made. Communicative learning includes analyzing the authenticity of the speaker. For example, if an individual communicates information about the education system and what changes need to be made, the credentials or background of the person making the claims needs to be understood to determine whether the individual is qualified to make such recommendations. In communicative learning, true understanding involves assessment of a claim in connection with authenticity, sincerity, or appropriateness rather than ‘truth’ (Mezirow, 2003). Within communicative learning, the inquiry frame is metaphorical – abductive which relies on analogy and prior understanding leading and building future understanding (Mezirow, 2000, p. 9). Through discourse, claims are justified and understood. Communicative competence is not about performance or ‘truth’, it “refers to the ability of the learner to negotiate his or her own purposes, values, feelings, and meanings rather than to simply act on those of others” (Mezirow, 2000).
Habermas suggested a third domain of learning, emancipatory learning which involves self-reflection and self-knowledge (Kitchenham, 2008). Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory, sees this domain as the transformation process (Mezirow, 2000).

Frame of reference. According to Mezirow (2000), a frame of reference is “the structure of assumptions and expectations through which we filter sense impressions” (p. 17). In his early work, Mezirow referred to frames of reference as meaning perspectives (Mezirow, 1990). Frames of reference result from our experiences and the way we analyze those experiences. Frames of reference are unintentionally learned constructs that we develop as a result of connection to significant others; parents, teachers, or other primary caregivers. Mezirow (1990) states, “the more intense the emotional context of learning and the more it is reinforced, the more deeply embedded and intractable to change are the habits of expectation that constitute our meaning perspectives” (p. 3-4). These frames of reference are closely connected to our values and our sense of self. Individuals strongly defend their frames of references when they are challenged by others with differing viewpoints. Mezirow (2000) considers a dependable frame of reference as one “that is more inclusive, differentiating, permeable (open to other viewpoints), critically reflective of assumptions, emotionally capable of change, and integrative of experience” (p. 19).

Frames of reference include two components, habits of mind and points of view (Mezirow, 2000). “A habit of mind is set of assumptions – broad, generalized, orienting predispositions that act as a filter for interpreting the meaning of experience” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 17). There are various types of habits of mind – aesthetic (values and judgments about beauty), psychological (emotional responses, self-concept, personality etc.), philosophical (religion, world view), epistemic (how one learns, sensory preferences), moral-ethical (norms, conscience),
and sociolinguistic (customs, language, socialization) (Mezirow, 2000). Some examples of habits of mind include: introverted or extroverted orientations, thinking intuitively or analytically, or an inclination to work alone or with others.

A point of view is an expressed habit of mind that is comprised of groups of meaning schemes (Mezirow, 2000). Meaning schemes exist outside of conscience awareness and are “sets of immediate specific expectations, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and judgments – that tacitly direct and shape a specific interpretation and determine how we judge, typify objects, and attribute causality” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 18). Meaning schemes impact what we see and how we see it. Meaning schemes lead us to automatized reactions that are not subjected to thought or reflection.

For Mezirow (2000), learning happens as frames of reference are elaborated, or new frames of reference are learned or points of view or habits of mind are transformed. This transformative learning is a result of reflection upon these meaning structures and base assumptions.

**Critical reflection.** Critical reflection or critical self-reflection is an essential element of Transformative Learning Theory. In order for reflection to take place, individuals have an experience, or disorienting dilemma, that doesn’t fit with their assumptions (Mezirow, 1991, 2000, 2009). This dilemma may be prompted by literature, art, or a discussion. Old ways of being in the world no longer make sense and this disorienting dilemma triggers reflection in order for the individual to make sense of this novel experience. Mezirow explains that this transformation may be triggered by a single event or a series of events. He states, “Transformations in a habit of mind may be epochal, a sudden, dramatic, reorienting insight, or incremental, involving a progressive series of transformations in related points of view that culminate in a transformation in habit of mind” (Mezirow, 1991, p. 21). Mezirow (1995)
contrasted straightforward reflection or “intentional assessment” of one’s actions with critical reflection which involves the nature and consequences of actions and also the “related circumstances of their origin” (p. 44). Mezirow sees this type of reflection as a uniquely adult capability which involves the assessment of beliefs, values, and feelings as well as assumptions.

In 1991, Mezirow introduced three types of reflection (content, process, and premise) to his Transformative Learning Theory. The first two types of reflection, content and process, relate to reflection around and possible transformation of meaning schemes. Content reflection involves thinking about what was done within an activity and process reflection involves reflection upon the cause of an action. Only premise reflection could lead to a meaning perspective, or frame of reference, transformation. Premise reflection forces a learner to look more deeply at her world view and her value system. Kitchenham (2008) explains, “learners can transform an individual meaning scheme by examining previous actions (content reflection or learning within meaning schemes) or where the actions and their related factors originated (process reflection or learning new meaning schemes), but when they consider a more global view, the reflection is much deeper, more complex, and involves transforming a series of meaning schemes (premise reflection or learning through meaning transformation” (p. 114-115).

Mezirow also discussed critical reflection of assumptions which included the ideas of subjective and objective reframing. Objective reframing is either a “narrative critical reflection of assumptions” in which the learner is thinking about her assumptions in the moment, for example, when solving a problem (Kitchenham, 2008, p. 117). In contrast, subjective reframing is “critical self-reflection on, rather than of, assumptions” (Kitchenham, 2008, p. 117) and has various forms: narrative, systemic, therapeutic, and epistemic. Narrative subjective reframing is thinking through something communicated to a learner by another, consider the problem as it is
applied to oneself and then coming to a resolution. Systemic subjective reframing is looking at
taken for granted cultural influences and realizing it isn’t relevant to the learning process.
Therapeutic subjective reframing is thinking through feelings. Epistemic subjective reframing is
thinking about the causes, nature, and consequences of one’s frame of reference (Kitchenham, 2008).

**Discourse.** Discourse is another key element of Transformative Learning Theory. In the
case of Transformative Learning Theory, discourse is defined as, “specialized use of dialogue
devoted to searching for a common understanding and assessment of the justification of an
interpretation or belief” (Mezirow, 2000). Discourse enables better understanding of an
experience. Mezirow explains that active dialogue can take place in partnerships including
reader/author or viewer/artist or in groups (Mezirow, 2000). When groups participate in
discourse, they can work toward reaching consensus and a best judgment by making and
weighing claims made with evidence. Mezirow (2000) discusses the importance of including
various viewpoint that challenge the “prevailing norms” of the dominant culture, be it class,
gender, or race. He says “Agreement based on the unchallenged norms of a culture will be
obviously less informed and dependable than those based on a wider range of experience”
(Mezirow, 2000, p. 12).

**Conditions for discourse.** In order for discourse to be effective, Mezirow (2000, 2003,
2009) proposes a number of conditions that should be in place:

1. Participants should have complete information
2. Participants should be free from coercion
3. There should be an atmosphere of openness and a respect for various perspectives
4. Participants need to weigh evidence thoughtfully
5. Assumptions should be critically and thoughtfully analyzed

6. All participants have equal access to various discursive roles

7. Participants are seeking to arrive at a best judgment based available information

Mezirow (2000) acknowledges that these conditions are unattainable principles that can never be fully realized in practice. Mezirow (2000) refers to Bellah (1985) and calls the conditions “democratic habits of the heart” which include openness, inviting diverse perspectives, and respect (p. 14). Additionally, Mezirow sees engagement in this type of reflective discourse as an adult learning capability. To participate effectively, adults need to be mature, secure, and be emotionally intelligent. Mezirow stresses that participants have to be free to participate openly in discourse and that transformative learning cannot occur when individuals are forced into it.

**Relationships.** Relationships with trusted others are critical in transformative learning experiences (Taylor, 2007). “It is through trustful relationships that allow individuals to have questioning discussions, share information openly and achieve mutual and consensual understanding” (Taylor, 2007, p. 179). Mezirow (1995) supports the fostering of thoughtful reasoning and equal participation among members within learning communities in order to cultivate individual growth and development and to positively impact society.

Various studies have addressed the complex nature of relationships that are supportive of transformative learning experiences. Eisen (2001) studied peer learning relationships among higher education faculty and found peer relationships to be influential in transformative learning. She found the following seven qualities to be important: voluntary participation, authenticity, shared goals, partner selection, trust, nonhierarchical status, and non-evaluative feedback. According to Servage (2008) transformative growth can be enhanced by the relationships within
a supportive learning environment. Brookfield (1995) notes that all individuals have blind spots and need the insights and reflections of others to help identify those blind spots.

**Connecting Mezirow’s transformative learning theory and Clay’s reading recovery.** In this next section, I will outline the similarities between Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory and Clay’s Reading Recovery Professional Development model. For both approaches there is a shared vision around: (1) justifying decisions; (2) instrumental and communicative learning; (3) the role of adult education; and (4) community and intensity.

**Justifying decisions.** Mezirow (2003) discusses the importance of reasoning and providing arguments that support beliefs and decisions to act in particular ways. In each Reading Recovery training session that involves behind the glass teaching or in coaching sessions between Reading Recovery professionals, teachers are asked to provide rationales for their teaching decisions. Prior to the teaching of the lesson, the teacher is asked to describe her student and outline her thinking for the inclusion of particular texts, letter work, and writing goals. During the lesson, teachers who are observing behind the glass offer comments, reflections, and beliefs about what they are noticing. Teachers challenge one another to articulate the why of their beliefs. For example, if a comment is made that the student has a difficult time with fluent reading, the teacher who made the comment is asked to provide evidence, or reasons, for her thinking. A similar process takes place within coaching sessions. This may involve observing the student while he or she is reading, and highlighting each occurrence of dysfluent reading as a means of justifying the observation that fluent reading is an issue for the student. After the lesson, the teacher who taught the child, shares her reflections of the lesson with the group, or the coach who observed the teaching. The teacher may be asked about a particular text choice or teaching decision throughout the lesson, and she is expected to justify her decisions with
concrete reasons for her actions. She is pushed to articulate her views and to justify her decisions. Mezirow (2003) states, "Beliefs are justified when they are based on good reasons. The process of reasoning may involve such tacit knowledge as aptitudes, skills, and competencies" (p. 58).

**Instrumental and communicative learning.** Mezirow (2003) reflects upon and differentiates between Habermas' concepts of instrumental and communicative learning. Both have a role in Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training. Reading Recovery Teachers learn the specific procedures of teaching within the Reading Recovery framework. This type of learning fits with the concept of instrumental learning. Reading Recovery Teachers and Teacher Leaders in training learn the particular structure of the lesson framework: rereading of familiar text, taking of a running record, letter and word work, constructing a sentence, using Elkonin (1973) boxes to help a child hear and record sounds in words, the construction of the cut up story, and the introduction of a new text. This instrumental learning involves taking on the specific steps required of the reading intervention. As teachers in training are becoming familiar with these procedural aspects of teaching children within the Reading Recovery context, they engage in dialogue with colleagues, or communicative learning. As they watch lessons of their colleagues, they are challenged to consider the "why" of decisions made behind the glass. Teachers observing live lessons communicate with one another to reach consensus around what is happening and why. They cite evidence to support their ideas and push others to do the same. Through communicative learning, they come to not only understand the teaching of the particular lesson in front of them, but use the glass and the conversation with others as a way to connect back to and reflect upon their own teaching of Reading Recovery children. Additionally, they use
the concrete examples provided within though the live lessons to reflect back on reading theory and ideas articulated in the core Reading Recovery texts.

*The role of adult education.* Mezirow (2003) sees the role of adult education as assisting in the development of dispositions, skills, and insights essential for practice. Within Reading Recovery Teacher and Teacher Leader training, those in training hone their teaching skills by working with students every day, completing a case study assignment on a student, and keeping daily lesson records and reflecting upon them. In addition, they teach behind the glass for their colleagues and engage in discussion around their teaching decisions with both colleagues and coaches. This discussion helps in the development of teaching dispositions that honor risk taking, reflective thinking, and efficient decision making and potentially lead to greater insight around effective teaching for their Reading Recovery students.

Garvett (2004) studied higher education faculty as they took on a dialogic approach to teaching. Though the participants shifted in their thinking and talking about the approach that articulated awareness was not enough to transfer to actual change in their practice, and thus, transform their teaching. According to Garvett (2004), faculty members needed explicit guidance (or instrumental instruction) to shift their teaching to include dialogic teaching practices.

Throughout Reading Recovery training, teachers engage in conversation around teaching, are provided with instrumental instruction though the guide book (*Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals parts 1 and 2*), additional readings, and one to one coaching with a university trainer. Having support from a Reading Recovery University Trainer as well as Reading Recovery colleagues helps teachers enact new practices and change their teaching. Additionally, opportunities beyond the training year abound. There are annual regional and national
conferences, as well as biannual training retreats, and a website devoted to Reading Recovery implementation to sustain teachers in their transformed learning.

These external structures imposed by the Reading Recovery standards and guidelines may, as Berger (2004) articulates, provide "help to sustain the courage to stand at the edge and work to grow" (p. 347). The Reading Recovery University Trainers function as a "transformative teacher" who helps Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders to reach the edge of their understandings and support them while they become more comfortable being on that edge and as they incorporate new practices in their repertoire of practices. The Reading Recovery professional learning community and the relationships among members (Trainers, Teacher Leaders, and Teachers) contribute to a willingness to stand in that uncomfortable place of taking on new learning and practices.

Eisen (2001) discusses the needs of professionals who need to share their experiences through action and reflection as they work in the context of practice. She discusses the relationships of peers who learn by observing and talking about one another's performances. This type of sharing and reflecting happens both formally and informally in the Reading Recovery settings. Teachers who work side by side hear one another teach, know each other's students, and engage in informal conversations about them. Additionally, teachers attend classes and interact more formally around teaching lessons and readings provided by core text and the Reading Recovery guide book. Eisen (2001) states, "Indeed, formative, reciprocal feedback between peers is invaluable for all kinds of professionals because it emphasizes development rather than evaluation" (p. 32). Eisen (2001) explains that rational discourse and relational knowing help learners confirm new ideas and cope with the discomfort that change inevitably brings.
Reading Recovery teachers meet regularly over a long period of time. The Reading Recovery Standards and Guidelines require teachers to attend monthly on-going professional development meetings throughout their employment as a Reading Recovery Teacher. The teachers come to know each other well and feel safe in the community they develop. In teaching sessions, they share their challenges and success with students, and over time, become comfortable challenging one another in their thoughts, beliefs, and actions. In Reading Recovery training, there is ongoing opportunity for both dialogue and feedback in one to one settings and in group settings. Castelli (2011) contends that this is critical to the transformative learning process.

Community and intensity. D'Amato and Krasny (2011) discuss transformative learning experiences of participants who are engaged in environmental education settings. The participants reported experiencing transformation and point to the following elements as linked to their changes: extended time in nature, separation from "normal life", and the community built among participants, and the challenge and intensity of the new learning. These elements are similar to elements that are in place for Reading Recovery training. Optimally, those in Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training will relocate for the year of training and live in residence at the University training site. This was my experience and is the preferred experience for those in training, though exceptions are sometimes made. Even if relocation is not a possibility, the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader spends a considerable amount of time in the training setting. This relocation, or extended time in the training setting, allows for an immersion in the Reading Recovery sites and separation from everyday life responsibilities. Because those in training are separated from their families, and engaged in various training activities together, experiences are shared and relationships develop. Lastly, every Reading Recovery Teacher Leader I have met
has mentioned the intensity and challenge of their training experience. This difficulty tends to connect participants as well. Each of the factors outlined by the participants in the environmental education experience is shared by those engaged in Reading Recovery teacher leader training. D'Amato and Krasny (2011) state, "The process of leaving home, immersing in a different environment, and returning home provide further evidence of how participants experienced a disorienting dilemma accompanied by self-reflection, and may also have been a catalyst for personal growth. The isolation of participants from their usual relationships also provided opportunities for trying out new behaviors, which enabled personal growth" (p. 245).

Marie Clay designed her Reading Recovery intervention to include these experiences for both Reading Recovery teachers and teacher leaders. University trainers work with teacher leaders to enhance their instrumental learning capacities in relation to reading instruction for children, and work with adults who teach reading to children. They build relationships with incoming teacher leaders and model the critical discourse necessary for reflection and transformative learning experiences. Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders take academic course work which includes information on cognitive coaching. Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders, in turn, and after their training year, then take on this role and provide these critical opportunities for the teachers they work with.

This brief discussion of Transformative Learning Theory and Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training has served to highlight the many points of intersection between the two. Because both Transformative Learning Theory and Clay’s Reading Recovery professional development model place a high value on discourse, discourse analysis seemed a natural methodological choice for a study examining the coaching conversations that take place within the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training year.
Methodological Theory

In this section of Chapter 3, I will describe my methodological approach. I will give an overview of discursive psychology and its key characteristics (Potter, 2012), describe the Discursive Action Model, which I used in analysis, and discuss the aspects of conversation analysis that I attended to in my analysis process. I will provide a rationale for my methodological choice of discourse analysis, and specifically discursive psychology. I will also detail the methods I used in this study.

Overview of discursive psychology. Discursive Psychology (DP) is a version of psychology that frames psychological concepts as discursive practices (Potter, 2012). DP is concerned with events in everyday life and the social interactions between people that take place in both natural and institutional settings. Talk, in DP, is a primary means for human understanding, action, and intersubjectivity (Potter, 2012).

DP focuses upon what is made visible through interaction, and not with what might reside internally for individuals. The focus in DP is on talk as action and not on cognitive constructs. In DP language is examined for the action it performs within interactions, and not as a representation of an internal mental construct, thought, or feeling. Within DP, reality is treated as a social construction and truth is that which is produced through language. This truth is understood to be just one of many representations of truth. Talk and text are ‘reality’ and are the major units of study within the field of discursive psychology. Edwards (2006) explains, “DP rejects the assumption that discourse is the product or expression of thoughts or intentional states lying behind or beneath it. Instead, mental states, knowledge, thoughts, feelings, and the nature of the external world, figure as talk’s topics, assumptions, and concerns” (Edwards, 2006, p. 41).
Discourse within Discursive Psychology has four characteristics (Potter, 2012). They will be described below.

**Discourse as action oriented.** First, discourse is action-oriented, meaning that the talk within an interaction is always doing something. Therefore discourse can be studied for what action it performs. Within this frame, discourse is not treated as a reflection of an internal cognitive state.

**Discourse is situated.** Second, discourse is situated sequentially, institutionally, and rhetorically (Potter, 2012). Sequentially, action (discourse) takes place within the back and forth of conversational exchanges. What takes place in a given moment is connected to what occurred in the previous moment and sets the stage for what happens in the next moment. The study of this turn-by-turn organizational structure has been the work of conversational analysis (Schegloff, 1992, 2007). Institutionally, discourse is bound by its setting. Within specific institutions, for example, a courtroom, various identities are assumed (judges, defendant, plaintiff, attorney). Acceptability of certain language actions are constrained by the various identities. For example, it would be perfectly acceptable for a judge to shout “order in the court” during court proceedings but that same phrase would be considered unacceptable if it were shouted by a courtroom defendant. Talk is situated rhetorically. A major theme in discursive psychology is the use of rhetorical devices to manage situations (Potter, 2012). Some of these rhetorical devices include, but are not limited to systematic vagueness, extreme case formulation, and three part lists (Edwards & Potter, 1992).

**Discourse is constructed and constructive.** Discourse builds particular versions of events or understandings. Knowledge is created through talk and interaction and that interaction constructs reality. For example, within Reading Recovery coaching conversations, there is talk
around what it means for a student to be a successful reader. These understandings of the characteristics of successful readers shared within conversation then becomes part of the instructional goals of a Reading Recovery teacher.

**Psychological constructs are produced through discourse.** Potter (2012) states, “Discursive psychologists are focused on the way what counts as psychological is a central concern of participants” (p. 13). The description offered by a participant around psychological constructs like depression might be of interest to an analyst.

Potter (2012) characterizes analysis within discursive psychology as both crucial and time consuming (p. 24). He explains that discursive psychological analysis involves a systematic sifting through the data to find significant passages. Potter (2012) maintains that this process is and inclusive one and has as its central aim gathering examples that are both representative and varied (p. 25). Potter (2012) views the process of analysis as attempting to determine what is happening and how particular “practices are unfolding” (p. 25). Edwards (2006) explained, The key to analysis is to locate psychological and other issues in participants’ own practices of accountability. Whatever people say is always action-oriented, specific to its occasion, performative on and for its occasion, selected from an indefinite range of options, and always indexically tied to particulars. (p. 46)

**Rationale for discursive psychology.** I decided to study coaching conversations with Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training from the lens of discursive psychology for a number of reasons. One, discourse is of great importance in both Transformative Learning Theory and Reading Recovery. Two, much of the teaching and learning within the RR professional development model occurs as professionals are talking, particularly about their teaching decisions and their students. Three, Reading Recovery has been widely studied through a
cognitive lens. Approaching Reading Recovery through a novel lens provides the opportunity for new insights and new understandings. Four, as a RRTL, I had a number of experiences in which the RRT I was working with espoused a particular set of beliefs about teaching that did not align with her teaching practices. While working with her and before I had even heard of discursive psychology, I used the tools of discursive psychology and conversation analysis (audio recordings and transcripts) to examine with her, through a coaching session, her language and teaching decisions and her student’s subsequent responses. I see this study as a way to sharpen my focus on discursive happenings rather than cognitive explanations. Lastly, by investigating coaching conversations from a discursive psychology lens I can study the interactions that occur and how a teacher might work up a description of a student or explain a particular teaching decision.

The Discursive Action Model

The Discursive Action Model (DAM) was developed by Potter and Wetherall (1987) and Edwards and Potter (1992). This conceptual model focuses on how individuals use language for a variety of functions such as supporting their version of events, managing stake or interest, and managing accountability (Edwards and Potter, 1992). In the following section, I will explain each aspect of the Discursive Action Model. Following the explanation, I will provide an example of discourse taken from a rape trial and will offer an analysis of the extract using features of the DAM.

The DAM is comprised of the three overarching concepts of action, fact and interest, and accountability (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Each of these concepts will be explained in the following section.
**Action.** Within DAM, importance is placed on what language is doing within interaction and not on what mental state is being represented through language (Edwards & Potter, 1992). DAM is concerned with how remembered accounts and attributions are reported and how these reports are influenced by the contexts in which they occur.

**Fact and interest.** DAM views reports as being determined by the interest and stake of those doing the reporting, and sees much “factual’ reporting being accomplished through the utilization of various discursive devices. Additionally, DAM sees talk as being organized rhetorically and constructed in particular ways to minimize other versions of reports. Individuals utilize a number of rhetorical devices for fact construction. Among them are category entitlements, vivid description, narrative, systematic vagueness, empiricist accounting, rhetoric of argument, extreme case formulations, consensus and corroboration, and lists and contrasts (Edwards & Potter, 1992).

**Accountability.** DAM focuses on notions of accountability. As individuals explain events they are accounting for their behaviors through their talk. DAM is concerned with how versions of events are constructed to establish “footing”, or the credibility of a report (Edwards & Potter, 1993, p. 7). Edwards and Potter (1992) see footing as having an important role in accountability. They state, “Footing highlights the basis upon which an account is offered: does it come from direct experience and involvement, or is it a report based upon the testimony of a reliable witness, or is it a disinterested passing on of possibly contentious information, and so on?” (p. 168).

The example below is from a rape trial (Drew, 1992, p. 489). The defense attorney (A) is questioning the witness in the case (W), the alleged rape victim. Although a more detailed
version of the account is transcribed in Drew (1992), for the purposes of this explanation, I chose to provide only the verbatim words spoken within the exchange.

1  A: And you went to a you went to a bar in [city name] is that correct?
2  W: It’s a club.
3  A: It’s where girls and fellas meet isn’t it?
4  W: People go there.
5  A: An during that evening didn’t Mister [name] come over to sit with you
6  W: Sat at our table.

Within this interaction social actions are being performed. Both participants are offering versions of this event. The attorney is attempting to establish an intention, an intimacy, and a connection between the Mister mentioned in the passage and the witness. At every turn, the witness resists his version or characterization and provides a more detached and neutral version of her own. First, the attorney uses the word “bar” to describe the venue where the interaction in question took place (Line 1). The witness responds by not accepting the word bar and choosing the more neutral word “club” (Line 2). Then, the attorney attaches a motive for the frequenting of a “bar” when he says “it’s where girls and fellas meet” (Line 3). Again, the witness responds more neutrally with “people go there” (Line 4). Lastly, the attorney implies an intimacy between the Mister [name] and the witness when he characterizes their interaction by saying “come over to sit with you” (Line 5). The witness responds with “sat at our table”, again a more neutral and less intimate version that eliminates the key word “with” (Line 6).

Factual accounts are being presented in the two very different versions of events. Word choice is important in this extract, as both participants choose their words from a number of alternatives. For example, mention of the word “bar” might bring to mind the drinking of
alcohol. The attorney could have mentioned the specific name of the venue or used the word club himself. Instead of using the terms men and women or boys and girls, the attorney chose the words girls and fellas. Word choice constructs very different versions of events.

This entire exchange is related to a central question of the responsibility or accountability of the witness in the events that transpired. The attorney is constructing a version where the witness went to a bar to meet fellas and invited Mister [name] to her table. This version implies a different level of investment and responsibility than the version presented by the witness. Her construction involves going to a club where people go and Mister [name] sat at her table. There is more neutrality, less intimacy, and less accountability in her report. When I analyzed my data on coaching conversations within RRTL training, I attended to these notions of Action, Fact and Interest, and Accountability. Additionally, I analyzed my data with respect to features of conversation analysis.

**Conversation Analysis**

Conversation analysis (CA), the study of “naturally occurring talk-in-interaction” is widely employed in studies utilizing a discursive psychology perspective (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 12). Put broadly, conversation analysis is the study of talk within interactions. In a more narrow sense, CA is a specific form of analysis that began with the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (tenHave, 2007). According to Hutchby and Wooffit (2008), “The objective of CA is to uncover the often tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction” (p. 12). Additionally, Hutchby and Wooffit (2008) offer the following propositions which form the methodological basis of conversation analysis: (1) Talk is highly
organized; (2) Talk production is methodic; (3) Naturally occurring data should be the focus of analysis; and (4) Analysis should be approached openly without prior theoretical determinations.

Gail Jefferson developed a system for transcription that allowed for the documenting of talk-in-interaction in great detail. Jeffersonian transcription allows an analyst to construct a visual representation not only of what was said within talk-in interaction (the actual words spoken), but how it was said. Jeffersonian transcription attends to micro aspects of conversation such as pausing, overlapping speech, emphasis, intonation, rate of speech, and laughter (Jefferson, 2004). These micro aspects of speech carry a great deal of meaning. For example, pauses within conversations may be a signal of trouble or difficulty within a conversation (tenHave, 2007). Overlapping talk may also signal difficulties, or it may simply occur as participants in a conversation are negotiating turns of talk (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, 1974). Repair in conversation, when an utterance is offered and then changed by either the speaker of the utterance or another conversational participants, may also be a sign or a problem (tenHave, 2007). Laughter can also display emotion, demonstrate agreement with others, or show resistance (Glenn, 2003). Participants may also laugh as part of their speech in order to make their speech unintelligible (Jefferson, 2004). Using the conventions of Conversation Analysis and citing the CA research about the meaning of various speech actions will lend credibility to my analysis as I use the Discursive Action Model to highlight how participants manage fact construction, stake and interest, and accountability. Appendix C contains a chart of standard conventions used in Jeffersonian transcription (Jefferson, 2004).

In an effort to demonstrate the detail that Jeffersonian transcription (Jefferson, 2004) provides, I am including an extract and partial explanation from a conversation I (teacher) had with a student (student) as he is reading during his Reading Recovery intervention lesson. This
extract was not part of this study and is used only to demonstrate the features of Jeffersonian transcription. In this extract I was particularly interested in his use of the phrase “Let’s see”:

1. **Student**: Curly can (. ) eat a plum.
2. Curly can (. ) see (. ) a no (. ) an apple.
3. > I got that a right good! <
4. → Curly can eat (0.5) .hhh Hum, let’s see (0.3) an apple.
5. Curly can see a pumpkin. Curly, no, Can Curly eat (. ) a (. ) pumpkin.
6. NO!
7. **Teacher**: Why can't Curly eat that pumpkin?
8. **Student**: Cause he too full =
9. **Teacher**: He's wa::y too full!
10. **Student**: Ugh huh
11. **Teacher**: You know what, S__=
12. **Student**: What
13. **Teacher**: I like (. ) how you were really thinking right here= 
14. **Student**: = Hmmhumm
15. **Teacher**: You were not sure and you were really thinking= 
16. **Student**: = hmmhumm
17. **Teacher**: And did you work it out by yourself?

Immediately prior to the use of “Let’s see”, the student had made a mistake in his reading, substituting “a” for “an” (Line 2). He then self-corrected his reading mistake by reading “an” (Line 2). When he meets the same word “an” again, he pauses and says “Let’s see” and pauses again before he correctly reads, ‘an apple’ (Line 4). After the student completes the
reading of the text, we engage in a brief discussion. In the interaction, I praise him for “thinking”, and prompt him to think about working the problem out on his own (Lines 15 and 17).

From this extract and with the assistance of the chart of standard conventions within Jeffersonian transcription (Jefferson, 2004), it is possible to see, and in a sense, hear the conversation that took place between the student and I. The pauses, intonation, elongation of particular sounds, and emphasis on particular words are all made available to the reader through this type of detailed and time consuming transcription.

Methods

The purpose of this study was to understand the nature of the discourse of literacy coaching sessions within the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training year. Coaching conversations were audio recorded from August to April of the training year. There were 11 conversations. In the section below, I outline the instructional review board procedures (IRB) that were followed as well as provide a description of the participants and setting of the study.

Institutional Review Board Procedures

According to Potter (2012), the first step in conducting discursive research involves gaining access and consent. I went through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville to obtain permission to conduct a larger research study of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders Engaging in Professional Development. The approval letter included a copy of the informed consent that my participants signed. Appendix A contains my IRB Approval.

As stated in my IRB Form B, I have maintained the confidentiality of my participants by assigning them pseudonyms. All data, including audio files, transcriptions of audio files, and
lesson artifacts, were stored in password protected files on my computer. My researcher notebook, which contained handwritten notes, reminders, reflections, and thoughts about my research process, was always with me, and participants were never mentioned by name in my researcher notebook. Consent forms, which the participants signed, are stored in a secure file drawer on the University of Tennessee, Knoxville campus.

Participants and Setting

After IRB approval, I sought access to a regional Reading Recovery training site. I was granted permission to conduct the study by the Executive Director of Reading Recovery at a regional Reading Recovery University site in the southeastern part of the United States. In addition to this gatekeepers’ permission, an experienced RRTL employed by the university training site, and the two Reading Recovery teacher leaders in training agreed to participate in the study. The in training teacher leader participants signed consent forms prior to the collection of any data.

Research participants. In this study, there were four research participants: Sally, Jodie, Catie and Jill.

Sally, the executive director of Reading Recovery at the regional university site was the trainer of the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders. She provided instruction though clinical classes and coached the in-training Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders as they worked with both Reading Recovery students and Reading Recovery teachers.

Jodie, was another participant in the research study who worked with the Executive Director of Reading Recovery as she conducted clinical classes. She was an experienced RRTL who was employed by the university training center. On occasion, Jodie coached the in-training
Reading Recovery teacher leaders as they worked with Reading Recovery students and Reading Recovery teachers.

Catie and Jill were in-training Reading Recovery teacher leaders. Both were formerly trained Reading Recovery teachers who were moving into the roles of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders within their school systems. One of the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders in training, Catie, was a Reading Recovery teacher the year prior to training and, after her training year, will be the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader for a school system that had been contracting with a neighboring district for the services of its Reading Recovery Teacher Leader. The other Reading Recovery teacher leader in training, Jill, was trained in Reading Recovery ten years prior to the RRTL training year, but has not worked in Reading Recovery in seven years. Jill was most recently a third grade teacher and also had experience as a primary literacy coach. After the RRTL training year, Jill will take over Reading Recovery Teacher Leader responsibilities at a “vintage” Reading Recovery site for a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader who is retiring.

Research Setting. Literacy coaching sessions were audio recorded in a variety of elementary school settings that were affiliated with the regional Reading Recovery University training center. As in-training Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders were working at these affiliated sites in the field, coaching conversations were audio-recorded.

Data collection and Management

From August 11 to April 1 of one school year, I collected data for this study. While my data collection focused only on coaching conversations within the training year, I was present in many aspects of the training – clinical classes, theory classes, conferences, and regional professional development sessions, and therefore embedded in my research site. Data sources for this study included (1) audio recordings of coaching sessions, (2) transcripts of audio recorded
coaching sessions, and (3) artifacts from coaching sessions. For a list of all the coaching sessions including the dates of each session, participants, and length of coaching sessions, see Appendix B. I also kept a researcher notebook throughout the process. My researcher notebook contained handwritten notes, reminders, reflections, and thoughts about my research process and was always in my possession. Additionally, when analysis of the transcripts and audio files began, I wrote reflections about what I was noticing in the data. All of the collected data, except the researcher journal, was stored in electronic form on a password protected laptop. The data was also stored in ATLAS.ti™, a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software program (Muhr, 2004). In the section below, I will describe each of the data sources in greater detail and how I used qualitative computer software to manage the data.

**Audio recordings.** My goal was to capture, via audio recordings, the coaching conversations that took place during the literacy coaching sessions throughout the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training year. There were 11 coaching conversations.

There were three types of coaching opportunities for the in-training teacher leaders throughout the training year. I will describe each in the section below.

Type 1: Sally or Jodie observed in-training Reading Recovery teacher leaders as they taught Reading Recovery children. After the teaching session, the coach reflected with and offered feedback to the in-training Reading Recovery teacher leaders. Coaching sessions of this type occurred 7 total times throughout the course of the training year, 3 times for Catie and 4 times for Jill.

Type 2: Sally and Jodie observed in-training RRTLs as they taught RRTs during professional development sessions. After these sessions, Sally and Jodie reflected with and
coached the in-training RRTLs. This type of coaching session took place 2 times during the training year.

Type 3: The in-training RRTLs coached one another throughout the training year. This coaching took place after the teaching of children. There were 2 audio recordings of this type of interaction. One in which Catie coached Jill, and one in which Jill coached Catie. Throughout the academic school year, each of these coaching conversations was audio-recorded. Each of the research participants had hand held audio recorders. If I was present for the coaching session, I recorded the session. If I was not present, the participants recorded the conversations and shared them with me so that I could upload the audio recordings. A chart of each coaching sessions, the participants, the length of each session, and the recorder of the coaching even is provided in Appendix C.

Transcripts. Each of the coaching sessions described above were recorded and transcribed. I chose to do the transcription myself rather than pay a transcriptionist because doing the transcription myself allowed me to be immersed in the data and become familiar with the session content. The initial transcription was a verbatim transcript in which I typed the actual words spoken by the participants (Rapley, 2007).

I consider the act of transcription to be a form of data analysis in that there were many decisions I made as a researcher as I transcribed my data (Hammersley, 2010; Ochs, 1979). The transcripts were a representation of the coaching conversations on the audio recordings (Hammersley, 2010). I constructed these transcripts in a very deliberate way, making decisions about what to include and what to exclude.

Documents. Sometimes, during the literacy coaching sessions, documents were shared or referenced. The documents included completed lesson plans, student assessment information
(including running records, writing vocabulary charts, book level graphs etc.). I collected each of the items shared during literacy coaching sessions. These items were important for me to have, as they sometimes provided an explanation for an occurrence in the audio recording. For example, there was one segment of conversation in which the participants were discussing how many words a student could write. It was helpful to have the student’s writing vocabulary assessment chart as I could better follow the conversation the participants were having. These data were not analyzed but were used to understand the references within the coaching conversations.

**Researcher notebook.** According to Piantanida and Garman (2009), “At the heart of interpretive inquiry is a researcher’s capacity for encountering, listening, understanding, and thus “experiencing” the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 59). I kept a researcher notebook as I conducted this research. My researcher notebook was a small black notebook that I used to write notes to myself during this dissertation process. I used my journal to record various ideas, wonderings, and questions. It included a log of my research activities including a list of the coaching session and my analysis activities. In the notebook I reviewed my accomplishments on any given day and made plans for days to come. During the analysis phase of my dissertation, I typed reflections concerning what I was noticing in the data. These reflections were typed and were stored on my password protected computer. Keeping a researcher’s notebook also allowed me to be transparent about my analysis decisions. The notebook was always in my possession. I never used participant names or names of specific locations.

**Using qualitative software to manage data.** ATLAS.ti,™ is one of many CAQDAS (Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software) packages. It offers many affordances to researchers. According to Davidson and diGregorio (2011), these packages allow researchers the
following: “(1) A convenient digital location in which to organize all materials related to one study; (2) A suite of linked digital tools that could be applied to those materials, including the ability to store and organize data as well as fragment, juxtapose, interpret, and recompose that same material; (3) Easy portability; and (4) A remarkable new form of transparency that allowed the researcher, and others, the opportunity to view and reflect upon the materials” (p. 627). When coaching sessions took place, the participants would record the conversations. I uploaded the audio files onto my computer and used Inqscribe to transcribe the audio recordings. I saved the transcripts as word documents in a folder on my computer. When I completed all verbatim transcripts, the audio files and verbatim transcripts were both uploaded into ATLAS.ti™ where they were synced and available for analysis. Lesson artifacts were scanned, emailed, and stored in files on my computer. They were also uploaded into my ATLAS.ti™ “hermeneutic units” served as my data archive which held audio recordings, transcripts, lesson artifacts, and analysis reflections. Additionally, I used ATLAS.ti™ to capture quotes, annotate, and code my data. Within the data analysis section, I will offer greater details about how ATLAS.ti™ supported my analysis process.

**Data Analysis**

In the following section, I will describe my data analysis process. My data analysis was guided by the Discursive Action Model (DAM), Conversation Analysis (CA), and attention to my research question which I discussed earlier in this chapter. My analysis occurred in 6 phases: (1) repeated listening to audio recordings; (2) verbatim transcription of audio recordings; (3) open noticing and annotation; (4) memoing and coding of transcripts within ATLAS ti. with attention to the DAM, CA and my research question; (5) selecting extracts to highlight; and (6) sharing data and claims with others. After I describe my analysis actions in each of the phases, I
will discuss trustworthiness within my study, and outline how studies within Discursive Psychology display findings.

**Phase One: Repeated Listening**

After coaching sessions were recorded on the audio recorders, I listened to the sessions repeatedly as I took walks, as I rode the train to work, and as I drove from my research site to my home (approximately 3 hours away). This repeated listening made me familiar with and comfortable with my data. Later, as I began transcribing the data I had listened to repeatedly, I found that the repeated listening actually supported the transcription process as I had become familiar with my participants manner of speaking. This familiarity allowed me to anticipate as I typed their words. Additionally, by listening repeatedly to the interaction, I developed, as Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) describe, a “conversation analytic mentality” which involves a way of being rather than applying “… a static and prescriptive set of instructions which analysts bring to bear on the data” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008, p. 89).

**Phase Two: Verbatim Transcription**

The second phase of my analysis also included repeated listening, but added the step of transcription. I began this phase by uploading an audio recording into Inqscribe, computer transcription software that allows for ease in transcription, synchronization of audio files with transcripts, and storage of both audio recordings and transcripts (Paulus et. al, 2014). I chose to do the transcription of the audio recordings myself rather than hire a transcriptionist so that I could become familiar with my data. According to Rapley (2007):

the actual process of making detailed transcripts enables you to become familiar with what you are observing. You have to listen/watch the recording again and again (and again …). Through this process you begin to notice the interesting and subtle ways that
people interact. These are the taken-for-granted features of people’s talk and interaction that without recordings you would routinely fail to notice, fail to remember, or be unable to record in sufficient detail… (p. 50).

During this phase, I transcribed only the words that were spoken between participants within the coaching sessions. I defined coaching sessions as the conversations that took place before a teaching session and after a teaching session. The actual Reading Recovery teaching session (between the RRTL and her RR student) was also recorded, but not transcribed. I included non-word elements to my transcripts such as “huh” or “um hum”. These utterances are called continuers because they acknowledge information receipt and encourage the speaker to continue talking (tenHave, 2007). I also noted when laughter was taking place, as laughter is indicative of meaningful interactions and might signify agreement, resistance, or emotion (Glenn, 2003) or disguising of speech (Jefferson, 2004). I did not attend to prosodic features of talk such as intonation, pitch, or pace until later in my transcription process after I had selected extracts for deep analysis. As I transcribed, I did not include punctuation or capitalization. Also, I did not include speaker tags (names or initials). I wanted to capture the back and forth conversation without the insertion of names or initials to label speakers. A change in speaker was noted on my transcript by a space.

The transcription process was lengthy, with each 15 minutes of audio recorded data equaling roughly an hour of time in transcription. Also, the greater the number of participants in a coaching session, the more time transcription took. The coaching sessions on 1.29 and 4.1, which both included more participants, took longer to transcribe - approximately an hour and a half for each 15 minutes of audio recorded data. I estimate the total time spent in transcription to be approximately 30 hours.
During this phase, I referenced documents that were used or mentioned in the coaching sessions. These documents included student assessment data (reading/writing vocabulary charts and running records) and teacher lesson records. Having these documents in hand as I transcribed helped me to understand comments made during coaching sessions.

**Phase Three: Noticing and Annotating**

The third phase of my analysis also included repeated listening of the audio recordings. In this phase, on printed copies of the transcripts, I made notes of what was interesting to me in the data as I replayed the audio recording and read the corresponding transcript and considered my research question.

During this phase, I chose to work on printed copies of the transcript rather than digital copies because I comprehend printed text better than digital text. In the many courses I took throughout my graduate career, I noticed a distinct difference in my understanding of and engagement with material when it was digital versus when it was printed. Because I was still becoming familiar with my data, and beginning to engage in in-depth analysis of the material, I wanted to set up optimum conditions to enhance my understanding. In this phase of my analysis I engaged in “unmotivated looking” in which “no particular, pre-selected topics or phenomena are being searched for” (Psathas, 1990, p. 3). As I listened and read, I circled particular interactions, wrote comments in the margins, and asked questions of myself and the data. I listened to each audio recording and read each corresponding transcript chronologically, beginning with the September 8th transcript and ending with the April 1st transcript.

After I made handwritten notes on the printed transcripts, I wrote reflections. These reflections were written/typed in a stream of consciousness manner with me attempting to capture my insights, connections, or possible links between coaching conversations. These
reflections on each of the transcripts were also uploaded into ATLAS.ti™ and were considered part of my analysis.

**Phase Four: Analyzing Data According to Features of DAM, CA, and Research Question**

The open noting and annotating phase of analysis allowed me to see connections between coaching conversations, identify several interesting interactions, and become very familiar with my data. In this next phase of analysis, I wanted to explore those data again, this time noting connections to my research question, features of the DAM, and aspects of CA that I described earlier in the methodology section of this chapter. I uploaded my transcripts and audio recordings into ATLAS.ti™ for further analysis and named this first hermeneutic unit “data analysis”. As I listened to the audio recordings I read the transcript for the corresponding coaching conversation. I would pause the audio and stop reading when I noticed a feature of the DAM or CA or something else that was of interest. I used the quotation, coding, and memoing features of ATLAS ti. to select particular passages, label them in some way, and note my thinking about the passage. I processed each transcript in this manner chronologically. Through this analysis, I noted 136 different codes, 535 instances of coding, and wrote 81 memos. At this point in my analysis, a number of topics were standing out to me: (1) the use of three part lists in fact construction; (2) the role of laughter in difficult conversations, (3) the emphasis on teacher accountability as responsibility to students, and (4) how teachers were questioned.

The last two categories were most interesting to me, related to one another, and addressed my specific research question. I noticed that coaches often used questions as a means to elicit coachee responsibility taking. I also saw instances where coachees would engage in talk about responsibility and accountability without being question or prompted by the coach. I decided to open another hermeneutic project on ATLAS.ti™, and analyze the data again, this time only
looking at and thinking about questioning. As I coded, I looked at the types of questions coaches asked and made note of the various types: open or closed questions; rhetorical questions; questions with specific answers; or real questions in which the coach did not know the answer etc. I also highlighted specific extracts in which questions or alternatives to questions were used with more or less success in terms of their ability to elicit talk of problem solving or responsibility taking on the part of the teacher.

**Phase Five: Selection of Extracts**

In this phase of analysis, I reread through all my transcripts, reflections, codes, quotes, and memos in both ATLAS.ti™ hermeneutic units to decide which extracts I wanted to highlight in my findings chapter. I paid particular attention to my memos, to the codes I had used most frequently, to the interactions I found most meaningful, and to the sections of talk that were most tied to my research question of uncovering what was happening within the discourse of coaching conversations. I decided to select passages that related to questioning techniques and alternatives to questioning techniques used by coaches to elicit teacher accountability as responsibility taking.

I select passages that I wanted to highlight and transcribed them further using a modified form of Jeffersonian transcription, “the standard system used in discursive psychology and conversation analysis” (Potter, 2012, p. 20). In my modified version of Jeffersonian transcription, I attend to pauses, overlap of talk, volume of talk, and rising and falling intonation, rate of speech, and laughter in speech, in an effort to capture as much information as possible about how the talk occurred (Jefferson, 2004).

**Phase six: Sharing of analysis and findings**. Though this phase is listed separately as phase six it actually happened recursively throughout my analysis process. Through my data
analysis process, I was very fortunate to be able to share my data and learn from members of the Discourse Analysis Research Team (DART) who were all affiliated with the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. All of the members of DART that participated in data sessions had experience with discourse analysis, and many had experience with discursive psychology.

During phase three of my analysis process I met twice with members of the DART team. I shared printed transcripts and an audio recorded coaching conversation with them. At both meetings, I shared a portion of a coaching interaction that felt “atypical” or deviant as compared to the other coaching conversations (Potter, 2012). I asked the DART participants to engage with the data in an “unmotivated” way; that is “no claims of exhaustiveness or conclusiveness are made with regard to the observational or interpretive possibilities contained in the segment …Observation and interpretation can thereby remain faithful to the original details of setting and interaction” (Psathas, 1990, p. 15). This open sharing about my data with the DART team proved invaluable. First, I was able to listen to reflections and comments from others about data I had become very familiar with. Some of my ideas about what I was noticing and found interesting were affirmed. Second, it was helpful to listen to comments from researchers who were completely unfamiliar with my context. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008), “… it is absolutely necessary that conversation analysts are either members of or have a sound understanding of, the culture from which their data have been drawn” (p. 106). As a member of the Reading Recovery community I had no difficulty making sense of the context, however, my membership in the community somewhat inhibited my “unmotivated looking”. Comments from my DART teammates help me focus my looking away from the familiar aspects of the Reading Recovery intervention, and on the minute and interesting exchanges within Reading Recovery conversations pertaining to my research question.
Between phases four and five of my analysis process, I met with members of the DART team again. This was a critical time in my analysis, as I had settled on a finding addressing my research question and was considering the extracts to select to illustrate my finding. In both meetings, DART members were able to listen to audio recordings and read transcripts as I shared my analysis with them. In both cases, fellow researchers affirmed my analysis and added more to the analysis with their comments and questions. I met on one more occasion with a DART team member after I had settled upon my extracts to represent my finding (phase five). In this meeting, my colleague was able to affirm my findings and agree with my organization of my extracts into three distinct categories of ways in which teacher accountability as responsibility taking were managed. Each time I met with DART members, they signed a confidentiality pledge. This pledge is available in Appendix D.

**Trustworthiness**

I took a number of steps to establish trustworthiness in my analysis.

First, I established an audit trail of my analytical decisions with my use of qualitative data management software. All of my artifacts, transcripts, and audio recordings as well as my memos and codes complete with timestamps provide a trail of the decisions I made as a researcher. Second, I was engaged in my research site for an entire year, spending a great deal of time with all of my research participants, building trust, and learning the context of my research (Creswell, 2013; Glesne, 2011; Merriam, 2009). This prolonged engagement lends credibility to my claims. Third, I was transparent with my data and with my findings as I shared with my research colleagues on the DART. The details of my data sharing and peer debriefing within the DART was outlined in my analysis process above (Creswell, 2013; Glesne, 2011). Fourth, in Chapter 1 I detailed my personal beliefs and assumptions which have undoubtedly influenced my
study (Creswell, 2013; Glesne, 2011; Merriam, 2009). Lastly, the manner in which I will present my claims add to their trustworthiness as my reader will be able to decide for herself if she agrees with my assertions. In the section below, I will explain how my claims will be presented in Chapter 4.

**Presenting and Warranting Claims**

Studies that adhere to a discursive psychological orientation often present findings in the form of extracts from the audio recorded and transcribed conversations (Stokoe, Hepburn, & Antaki, 2012; Attenborough & Stokoe, 2012; Lester & Paulus, 2012; Lewis & Miller, 2011). The extracts are presented to demonstrate a feature of the analytical framework used for analysis. An explanation of the extract, a warrant for the claim, accompanies the extract. Passages that are particularly noteworthy, interesting, or demonstrative of a discourse feature the researcher wishes to highlight are often subjected to Jeffersonian transcription, a method of transcription that includes attention to pauses, intonation, and overlaps in speech as well as the verbatim words spoken (Jefferson, 2004).

In studies utilizing a DP framework, findings are presented in this way in an effort to “mind the interpretative gap” (Edwards, 2012, p. 428). According to Edwards (2012), “The interpretative gap is the distance between the object under scrutiny and, via method, data processing, and inferences, what you eventually want to say about it. In any particular study, the ‘object’ is what it is supposedly a study of, such as social attitudes, childhood memories, or how people make apologies – that is to say, the criterion for external validity” (p. 428). Edwards (2012) maintains that in DP, the “interpretive gap” is narrower than in experimental social psychology because the interpretation is grounded in the actual text (talk) and can be immediately accessed by the reader, who doesn’t need any special interpretive training to see the
connection between the segment of “data” and the interpretive claims made about data. By presenting findings in this way, readers are able to validate claims made by the researcher. The presentation of the data in this way is a strength of the discursive psychology lens.

Potter (2012) sees the process of validation as closely related to analysis. He highlights the four themes of participants’ orientations, deviant cases, coherence, and readers’ evaluation, as being critical in helping to determine the appropriateness of an analysis. Each of these themes will be discussed below. An example of how each theme is relevant to my study will be offered.

**Participants’ Orientation**

Discourse analysts are interested in how participants orient to specific conversational exchanges. A turn of talk grows out of the talk that preceded it, and lays the foundation for the talk that comes after it (Potter, 2012; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Heritage, 1984). For example, a RRUT might question a RRTL about a teaching decision during a literacy coaching visit. If the researcher claims the question was taken up as a challenge by examining the statement of the RRLT in the transcript, the reader can see how a participant oriented to the comment. If there is agreement between the claim of the researcher and the reader’s understanding of how the participant oriented to the statement, then the claim can be seen as validated and therefore credible.

**Deviant Cases**

Potter (2012) sees deviant cases as being “analytically and theoretically informative” (p. 37). The deviant cases can bolster a generalization or dispute it. For example, there were particular extracts within the coaching conversations that appeared to be outliers. Those deviant cases were closely examined by myself as the researcher and also the DART. The consideration
of deviant cases enhanced my analysis and helped shape the three categories within my major finding.

**Coherence**

Coherence speaks to how well the findings of a particular study connect to the wider findings within the field. In Chapter Five, I will provide a discussion of how other studies connect to the findings of this study. If my findings are similar to what exists in the literature, they will be viewed as confirmation. Dissimilar findings might be viewed more cautiously or might suggest future direction for research.

**Readers’ Evaluation**

In discursive psychology studies, readers are able to make their own interpretations of the data because the data are presented through extracts and explanations. A reader requires no special skills or training to read a conversational exchange and see how the exchanges connect to the analyst’s interpretations. According to Potter (2012), “Sacks’ (1992) ideal was to put the reader as far as possible into the same position as the researcher with respect to the materials” (p. 38). In Chapter Four, I will provide the extracts and explanations so that readers have the opportunity to agree or disagree with my claims.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, I have outlined both the substantive and methodological theories that guided my research. A description of Marie Clay’s Literacy Processing Theory and Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory were provided. Discursive Psychology, the Discursive Action Model, and Conversation Analysis were also discussed. In the methods section of this chapter, I explained how I went about studying the discourse of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders who were engaged in coaching conversations. I described the steps I took to obtain Instructional
Review Board approval, gain access to the research site, select participants, and collect data and in great detail, I described the steps I took to analyze the data I collected. A discussion of trustworthiness and how claims are presented and substantiated within studies employing a DP frame was also included in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the language within coaching conversations during the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader (RRTL) training year and to specifically address the research question *What is the nature of literacy coaching conversations within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training?* Using the Discursive Action Model (DAM) and Conversation Analysis (CA), I analyzed the discourse from eleven coaching sessions throughout a RRTL training year in an effort to address the research question.

**Chapter Organization**

In this chapter, I will first describe the overall finding, and then provide extracts and explanations of those extracts of coaching conversations that fall into the following three categories: (1) Accountable talk clear questioning and comments; (2) Lack of accountable talk and the use of why questions; and (3) Some accountable talk and the use of why questions. After each category of extracts, I will provide a brief discussion of the extracts within the category before moving onto the next category of extracts. I will conclude the chapter with a summary.

**Overall Finding**

Through in-depth analysis as I listened to audio recordings and read transcriptions, I found that the discourse of coaching conversations within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training focused upon teacher decision making which included teacher responsibility taking. This responsibility taking was often, though not always, in response to a coach’s questions or comments. In my initial coding and annotating of my data analysis hermeneutic unit, there were 136 different codes and 525 instances of coding. The categories of questioning (30 codes, 109 instances), accountability (16 codes, 87 instances), and ‘other’ (17 codes, 120 instances) accounted for almost half of the codes and more than half of the coding instances as they
comprised 63 of the codes and 316 of the coding instances. The ‘other’ category contained codes that connected to accountability but weren’t specifically labeled that way. The ‘other’ category included but was not limited to the following codes: *directive, narrative, new thought, referring to experts, soft suggestions*, and *summarizing* what we are working on. Of the remaining codes within this data analysis hermeneutic unit, many focused upon conversation analysis features often related to fact and interest within discursive psychology studies such as; “extreme case formulations”, “systematic vagueness”, and “lists” (Edwards and Potter, 1992, p. 162-163). Some of the other codes were related to my research process (*recorder talk, references to look up, research question, and structure of Chapter 4*). A list of the codes from my data analysis hermeneutic unit is available in Appendix E.

Within the overall finding of teacher decision making, I found that coaches often probed for rationales for decisions and that coachees offered accounts of decision making and rationales in response to questions posed or comments made by a coach and sometimes spontaneously, without being prompted by questions or comments. Specifically, I found instances where the teacher being coached engaged in accountable talk or responsibility taking, through clear questioning or comments by the coach to highlight teaching actions. I also found instances where ‘why’ questions were posed by the coach and did not facilitate teacher accountability, and instead elicited hedging, blame, and defensive justifications. Lastly, I found instances where ‘why’ questions were somewhat productive in engaging teachers in some accountable talk and responsibility taking. In each of these instances, the ‘why’ question was mitigated by another factor. Together, these findings, illustrate how responsibility taking did (or did not) take place in literacy coaching sessions (Table 2).
Extracts and Explanations

I use the term accountable talk to mean responsibility taking on the part of the teacher. This responsibility taking can take many forms and might include comments about specific teaching actions taken or teacher reported thoughts about student behavior as a result of teacher decision making. As is typical of studies with a discursive psychology (DP) framework, extracts will be presented with the use of Jeffersonian transcription to highlight particular aspects of speech such as emphasis, volume, elongation of sounds, rate, and pauses (Jefferson, 2004). A list of Jeffersonian transcription conventions is available in Appendix C.

Table 2: Categories of Coaching Conversations Focused on Teacher Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Coaching Conversation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountable talk through clear questioning and comments</td>
<td>Teachers display responsibility for their teaching actions as they have coaching conversations with the coach. Of note in these extracts is the lack of why questions used by the coaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accountable talk and the use of why questions</td>
<td>Teachers had great difficulty engaging in conversations around teacher decision making, and thus, responsibility taking. In each instance why questions were used to elicit conversation around teacher decision making, however, the why question did not facilitate the desired action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some accountable talk and the use of why questions</td>
<td>Why questions were posed by the coach and facilitated some responsibility taking and accounting on the part of the teacher. In each instance, the why questions are mitigated by another factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before each extract is presented, I will offer minimal but necessary contextual information for readers that may be unfamiliar with Reading Recovery procedures and language. I will also make a claim about what is happening within the talk. After each extract is presented, I will offer a line by line analysis of the language of the coaching conversation, highlighting the accountable talk of the teacher, discursive resources employed by the participants, and applicability to Reading Recovery. After the three extracts presented in each category are analyzed, I will share some reflections about all three extracts within that category before moving to the next section of categorical extracts.

**Accountable Talk through Clear Questioning and Comments**

In this first group of extracts, the teachers display responsibility for their teaching actions as they have coaching conversations with the coach. Of note in these extracts is the high degree of responsibility taking on the part of the teacher and the various techniques used the coach as she engages in these conversations. In Reading Recovery, effective teaching decisions are highly valued. If coaching conversations are a means of improving teacher decision making through allowing teachers to talk through their decisions and take responsibility for their decisions, this type of interaction appears to be effective. Of note in these extracts is the lack of why questions used by the coaches.

In this first extract, the coach, Sally, and the teacher, Catie, are discussing the actions Catie took to insure that the student wouldn’t incorrectly build the word ‘can’ as she worked with magnetic letters. Within Reading Recovery, magnetic letters are used so that students have opportunities to construct words letter by letter. This task for the child involves correct letter orientation (Ex. the letter ‘b’ has the stick on the left side and not the right side as in ‘d’), sequencing (the word is constructed with the initial letter first, the middle letter next, and the
final letter last), and direction (the word is constructed left to right, following the constraints of printed English). In this extract, Sally asks a series of very direct questions that require Catie to articulate multiple teaching actions she engaged in.

Extract 1 (Accountable talk, no why questions)

1 Sally: can you think (.) what you did that helped (.) <make sure> she couldn’t go wrong?
2
3 Catie: (.1) I mean (.) I gave her one to look at
4 Sally: yeh
5 Catie: and (..) she possibly would have turned that c backwards I don’t know if you saw her at first and then she flipped it really quickly
6 Sally: yes yeh so that was helpful (..) you did something else that I think was very helpful at the moment (..) in terms of controlling (..) hopefully her getting it (.).
7 correcty?
8 Catie: um (.) just showing her we always go this way? [or]
9 Sally: [yeh yeh] what about
10 how she got the letters (.) to make it?
11 Catie: handed them to her one at a time yeh
12 Sally: so she really had no choice but to put them in the [right]
13 Catie: [right]
14 Sally: sequence and she put them in the right direction
15 Catie: right
16 Sally: because of the model so that was good

In Line 1, Sally is asking Catie to think about specific actions she took to help the student
correctly construct the word ‘can’ with magnetic letters. Sally uses the question words of “can you” and “what”. She also signals that the teaching was effective by saying “make sure she couldn’t go wrong” (Lines 1 and 2). After a brief pause Catie uses a discursive marker (“I mean”) that indicates expansion of previous talk (Schiffrin, 1987), Catie offers one action she took (Line 3). In Line 4, Sally offers “yeh” which in this case serves as a continuer (Schegloff, 1982). Catie’s continuation of her turn of talk in Lines 5 and 6 serve as confirmation of “yeh” as a continuer. In this turn of talk, Catie highlights the action of the student in response to her teaching action. In Line 7, Sally agrees that the teaching action taken by Catie was “helpful”. She then prompts Catie for another example of teaching that helped the child in “getting it correctly” (Lines 8 and 9). Catie pauses slightly before, with rising intonation that is common when asking a question, she offers another example of her teaching that contributed to the student’s success (Line 10). According to Schriffin (1987), the rising intonation from a speaker is a solicitation for recognition from the hearer. Sally provides that recognition on Line 11 and there is some overlapping speech. Overlapping speech can occur when one speaker is ending a turn and another is beginning a turn (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) and shows participants attention to the turn by turn nature of talk (Jefferson, 1986). In this case, the overlap seems to indicate the receipt of the information from the coach, Sally, while Catie says “or” which might mean she is going to offer another teaching decision. Just after the overlapping talk, Sally asks a specific question about an action Catie took (Lines 11 and 12). In Line 13, Catie responds by providing the specifics of the action. The rest of Catie’s turns (Lines 15 and 17) are agreements with the summary Sally offers (Lines 14 and 16). Sally ends the exchange with a compliment (Line 18).
In this first extract, Catie, the teacher, articulates specific teaching moves she made through the direct questioning and confirmations of the coach, Sally. In naming her specific teaching actions, Catie takes responsibility for her teaching decisions.

The next extract (Extract 2) is an exchange between Sally, the coach, and Jill, the teacher. It focuses on a teaching decision Jill made in a part of the Reading Recovery lesson framework called the cut-up-story. In the cut-up-story, the student assembles a sentence he has constructed (in his writing book) and the teacher has written on a sentence strip and cut into word units. This extract shows the coach asking questions, providing information by highlighting contrasts, and the teacher coming to a new understanding about what she could have done in her teaching to be more effective with her student:

Extract 2 (Accountable talk, no why questions)

1 Sally: when you work with him (.1) say on the introduction you made a decision
2 (.1) or on the cut up story you made a decision (.1) what did you (.1) so he’d made the
3 cut up story and then you said <show me the>
4 Jill: um hum
5 Sally: so what (.1) how is that helping him?
6 Jill: well I’m trying to help him find those words that he knows fast ((3 finger
7 snaps))
8 Sally: but that isn’t what he needs to do (.1) what does he need to be able to do?
9 When he sees it he needs to be able to
10 Jill: say it (.1) fast=
11 Sally: = right but that’s (.1) when you say show me he’s not being asked to do that
12 Jill: ok so what do I do?
13 Sally: cause you’re saying show me so he just has to show you where it is it’s
14 actually going from that visual information to producing the sound information
15 that’s hard for him isn’t it?
16 Jill: right >oh so<
17 Sally: and when you write them
18 Jill: so if I so I should point to it and say what’s this?
19 Sally: yes
20 Jill: what’s this? what’s this?
21 Sally: yeh
22 Jill: ok ok good

In her first turn of talk in Lines 1-3, Sally seems to be concerned with the decisions the teacher made. She uses the phrase “you made a decision” twice. She is setting up the teaching scene by saying “so he’d made the cut up story and then you said show me the”. After an acknowledgement from Jill that she received the information “um hum” (Line 4), Sally continues by asking “what”, pausing, and then continuing with a “how” question (Line 5). In Line 6, Jill offers her rationale. She begins her turn of talk with “well” which is often used to initiate a turn (Schriffin, 1987) or in some cases to delay a dispreferred response (Heritage, 1984; Pomerantz, 1994). Sally uses the word “but” in her response setting up a disagreement or contrast from what Jill offered (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Schriffin, 1987) (Line 7). She continues by asking a question and then rephrases that question by leaving an opening for Jill to supply the answer (Line 9). In Line 10, Jill supplies the answer “say it fast”. After confirming her response in Line 11, Sally sets up a contrast beginning with the word “but”. She highlights the fact that when Jill says “show me” the student is not being required to “say it fast” which is what Jill has said (in
the previous turn) she wants the student to do. In Line 12, Jill accepts Sally’s comment with “ok” and then asks Sally what she should do. With this question, Jill seems genuinely at a loss for the action she should take. Interestingly, Sally does not take up the question that Jill poses. She continues with her previous turn of talk and again sets up a contrast between what the teacher is actually doing, saying “show me” and what the student is finding difficult “going from that visual information to producing the sound information”. Sally ends this turn of talk with the rising intonation of a question and the words “isn’t it”, perhaps in an effort to bring Jill into the next turn. In Line 16, Jill responds with “right oh so”. Her use of the word “oh” is significant in that it displays a shift in Jill’s understanding. According to Heritage (1984), the producing of “oh” indicates “that its producer has undergone some kind of change in his or her locally current state of knowledge, information, orientation, or awareness” (p. 299). In Line 17, Sally begins to talk about the teacher writing words. Jill’s comments in Line 18 seem more connected to her previous turn of talk (“right oh so”) than to Sally’s turn in Line 17. In Line 18, Jill begins with “so if I” and then self-repairs and begins again. In this turn of talk, she offers a teaching action she “should” take (“point to it and say what’s this”). The initial construction (“so if I”) seems to set up a question phrase while the latter (“so I should”) is a more decisive statement. There is rising intonation at the end of this turn of talk which could be related to Jill asking Sally for confirmation of her offering of the teaching decision she “should” take or the question she could ask of the student (“what’s this?”). Sally response of “yes” in Line 19 indicates that she received Jill’s question as a prompt for confirmation of her decision about what she “should” do. In Line 20, Jill continues with what she should do – ask the student “what’s this? what’s this?” In Line 21, Sally agrees and in Line 22, Jill acknowledges her understanding with “ok” “ok” and says “good”. She may use the word “good” here because she, within this conversational exchange,
determined what she should do to support her student’s learning. In this extract, the coach, Sally, questioned the teacher, Jill, and also set up a two contrasts between what Jill was doing in her teaching action and what she desired to achieve for her student. It is also significant that Sally did not address a direct question that Jill asked and that within the next two turns of talk Jill decided upon the action she needed to take. As in the previous extract, no why questions were asked.

In the last extract in this section, Catie, the teacher, and Sally, the coach, are discussing a student, Amanda (pseudonym), who is about to exit the Reading Recovery program reading on grade level (which is between text level 14 and 20 depending upon the time of the school year). This extract shows the teacher being able to talk about her teaching actions without being questioned by the coach. Additionally, it appears that the teacher, and not the coach, is directing the interaction:

Extract 3: *(Accountable talk, no why questions)*

1 **Catie**: ok this is Amanda
2 **Sally**: and she is ABOUT TO GO
3 **Catie**: well (.1) I hope so (. ) um (. ) she (. ) she was in some 14s (. ) and then I felt like I just needed >to slow it down a little bit< because (. ) she was not really (. ) something we talked about in class made me heh he
4 **Sally**: heh heh
5 **Catie**: think about it one day um she was using her finger to do the whole you know whatever
6 **Sally**: blocking it off or
7 **Catie**: yes um but it was really slo::w she was still looking at me::: and it was
almost like >every single time I < had to say <what can you do to help yourself>

like baby her through this

Sally: yeh

Catie: and I though(.) this is not(.) what we want(.) um I want her to know what
to do

Sally: do it

Catie: to do it(.) and to know if she’s right or wrong and needs to change it(.)

and move on and so I thought ok >I’m going to make it a little easier < to do that

so(.) I’m still questioning even today’s um she =

Sally: = whether it’s still too hard

Catie: yeh to do the work yes I am still questioning it(.) she did this one

The extract begins with Catie introducing her student, Amanda, to the coach (Line 1). Sally responds by connecting to Catie’s statement by the use of “and” and in a loud voice offers “about to go” (Line 2). With this statement, Sally is referring to Amanda exiting the Reading Recovery program successfully by reading on grade level. In her response, Catie does some hedging (“well”, “I hope so”, “um”) and pausing. Her use of “well” at the beginning of the turn is setting up a contrast, or dispreferred response, to the earlier statement made by Sally (Pomerantz, 1994). Sally’s comment related to Amanda being ready to leave the Reading Recovery program might be in contrast to Catie’s assessment, as evidenced by Catie’s hesitations and hedging. In Line 3, Catie refers to the type of text the child was reading (“she was in some 14s” – meaning Level 14 text). In response to how the child was reading the text, Catie comments (Lines 3 and 4) on the action she felt she needed to take as a teacher “I felt like I just needed to slow it down a little bit”. This comment is one of responsibility taking, and it occurs without a question or prompt
from the coach around decision making. In Line 5, Catie mentions the influence of “something we talked about in class”. The mentioning of this connection to the formal graduate classes she is engaged in may be in an effort to support her earlier teaching decision (of needing to “slow it down a bit”) and add credibility to her decision. As Edwards and Potter (1992) discuss, building consensus and collaboration is a way of “warranting the factuality of a version” (p. 163). Catie’s turn of talk in Line 5 ends with her voice trailing off in laughter. For Catie, the laughter may be attached to her vulnerability around her teaching decision being linked to new information she gleaned in class. According to Glenn (2003), when a first speaker offers “laughables” it may be in a self-deprecating way and may indicate a speaker’s ability to laugh at oneself (p. 104). In Line 6, Sally takes up the invitation to laugh from Catie and laughs as well. Glenn (2003) notes that laughter is sometimes an indication of agreement. In Line 7, Catie highlights an action the child took – “using her finger to do the whole…” (Line 7 and 8). Sally seems to be offering another descriptor of the same child action in Line 9. Sacks (1992) notes this type of feature, when a description from one individual elicits another description or extension of a report. This interaction demonstrates the joint nature of this conversation in which understanding is being built by both participants. The teacher, Catie, is leading the interaction, and the coach, Sally is contributing. In Lines 10-12, Catie highlights two problematic student actions (“really slow” and “looking at me”) and the decisions she made in response to the problematic action (“I had to say what can you do to help yourself” and “baby her through this”). In response to Catie’s comments, Sally offers “yeh” which serves as an invitation for Catie to continue (Schegloff, 1982). In Line 14, Catie does continue by commenting on her thoughts and what she wants the child to do. Interestingly, she uses the pronoun “we” in this comment, saying “this is not what we want”. Catie seems to be speaking of the Reading Recovery “we”, as the type of student
dependency she describes is not what Reading Recovery teaching values or endorses. Catie then demonstrates responsibility taking by offering what she wants the child to “know”. In her turn of talk on Line 16, Sally adds to Catie’s comments about what the child needs to do by saying “do it”. In Line 17, Catie begins her turn of talk by repeating what Sally has just stated. This interaction between Catie and Sally on Lines 14-17 display more joint construction and agreement around teacher decision making and goals for student action. In Line 17, Catie continues her list of actions she wants the student to take “to know if she is right or wrong”, “needs to change it” and “move on”. In Line 18, she offers her thoughts around her decision making and takes responsibility by deciding to “make it a little easier”. She also reports that she is still “questioning” her teaching (Line 19). In Line 20, Sally asks a clarifying question about what Catie is questioning (“whether it’s still too hard”) and Catie, in Line 21, takes it up as a question and answers affirmatively that she is still questioning if it is too hard for the student to “do the work”.

In this first group of three extracts, the teachers displayed accountability as responsibility taking. In the first two extracts in this group (Extract 1 and Extract 2) the coach asked very direct questions that allowed the teachers to comment on specific teaching actions they took. In the last extract in this group (Extract 3), the coach asked no direct questions, and appeared to be following the lead of the teacher who guided the interactions. Of significance in Extract 2 was the ignoring of a direct question for an answer by the teacher to the coach. The coach did not address the question and instead provided contrasting information between what the teacher was doing and what the student was struggling with. In the next turn of talk the teacher decided on an action to take and the coach affirmed her action. In Extract 3, the teacher led the interaction, highlighted student action, and discussed her teaching decisions. The coach’s contribution was
minimal, with her turns of talk serving to continue the teacher’s talk, add description, or clarify a comment.

**Lack of Accountable Talk and the Use of Why Questions**

In the following section, I will present three extracts of talk within coaching conversations in which the teachers had great difficulty engaging in conversations around teacher decision making, and thus, responsibility taking. In each instance why questions were used to elicit conversation around teacher decision making, however, the why question did not facilitate the desired action. These next three examples stand in stark contrast to the examples presented in the first section in which no why questions were asked and teachers were able to take responsibility for their teaching decisions.

In the extract that follows, Catie has just finished a lesson with her Reading Recovery student. The coach, Sally, observed the lesson and is engaging in a post lesson conversation with Catie. Catie has a great deal of difficulty taking responsibility for her action (providing the child with Skittles after the lesson). The coach uses two why questions in this extract:

**Extract 4: (Lack of accountable talk, why question)**

1  **Sally:** ok (.) so tell me about the Skittles
2  **Catie:** tell you about the Skittles?
3  **Sally:** ummm
4  **Catie:** um well (.) honestly > another Reading Recovery teacher brought them < and (.)um (.) > the other kids of course < have picked up on ↑that and so::: I
5  normally if I do > a candy treat < I will only do it on (.). like a um Frida::y after
6  they’ve read or >they have like a little reading log < if they’ve read at [ho::me]
7  **Sally:**
8  **Sally:** [apart from
the fact that they are going to lose their teeth

Catie: ahh. heh.

Sally: what? I mean why: Skittles? Why are you doing it?

Catie: well normally > it’s a sticker<

Sally: even a [sticker]

Catie: [but if she] (.). just it’s it’s a if if >you come in here and work hard <

Sally: but what should be the reward? (.). can (.1) you see (.). you’re creating extrinsic motivation? it’s like pizzas for accelerated reader (.). instead of intrinsic motivation

Catie: ye::h: I think part of it’s just something (.).

Sally: habit? =

Catie: = we’ve always done (.). yeh

Sally: so > that would be good to try and eliminate

Catie: ok

Sally: it is tricky when you are in a room with other people

Catie: ye::h ↑

Sally: but (.). I mean it it just kind of (.). gets confused with what it’s about (.1) um and it >might be something you want to think about and read about> um (.1) the role of things that (.). in terms of children’s (.1) learning

Catie: ok

Sally: um (.). cause it’s not > necessarily terribly helpful< and [ in fact it takes away from their achievement]

Catie: [ it’s probably more a habit than anything]
32 Sally: and satisfaction from that
33 Catie: um hum
34 Sally: into (.) you know kind of paying me for doing it
35 Catie: um hum
36 Sally: um so
37 Catie: never really thought about > it to be honest with you like that<
38 Sally: someth (h) ing to th (h) ink a (h) bout =
39 Catie: = ok =
40 Sally: = something to think about > just the motivation of < ok let’s think also
41 about you were asking about the you know the issues with the um kind of
42 sequencing and trying to do something about that so how did you think that went?

The extract opens with Sally issuing a command (Line1). She wants specific information about a specific portion of the just-observed 30 minute Reading Recovery lesson (Line 1). Catie takes up this command as a surprise, as the information being requested is not immediately connected to teaching within Reading Recovery or reading processing (Line 2). Her surprise is displayed in her repeating of the command (“tell you about the Skittles?”) and a questioning inflection (Line 2). After the coach essentially passes on her turn of talk with the use of the continuer “umm” (Schegloff, 1992) in Line 3, Catie begins an explanation in Line 4. She opens with “um well” which seems to serve to buy her some time as she formulates her response. Catie emphasizes the word “honestly” next which might be being used in this instance to bolster the truth, the factual reporting, of the account that follows (Potter & Edwards, 1992). Catie reports that another teacher brought the Skittles. This serves to minimize her responsibility and increase
the responsibility of the other teacher. Catie then mentions the other “kids” (presumably other Reading Recovery students) who have “picked up on” the Skittles (Line 5). This mention of the children also serves to distance Catie from the Skittles distribution. The attention drawn to “another Reading Recovery teacher” and “the other kids” may be viewed as a shift in “footing” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008).

Catie uses the first person pronoun “I” to begin to describe what she “normally” does in situations when she distributes candy (Line 5). This is the first instance of her acceptance of personal responsibility. It is tempered by the word “normally” which serves to cast the Skittles distribution as an anomaly, an atypical occurrence. Catie explains further by offering the conditions under which she gives a “candy treat” (“if it is Friday” and “if the child has read at home and it is noted on the reading log”) (Lines 6 and 7). Sally responds with humor and with an extreme case formulation (Potter & Edwards, 1992) by saying “apart from the fact that they are going to lose their teeth” (Lines 8 and 9). This statement serves as a contrast to the account that Catie provided and to highlight another possible consequence to the candy distribution. Catie offers a forced laugh in response to the humor of the comment Sally made (Line 10). In the next line, Sally opens with the question word “what” and then continues with “I mean” in an effort to repair and begin again (Line 11). She then asks for an accounting by asking two “why” questions in succession. Catie responds by offering the word “normally” to build up the Skittles giving as unusual, and then offering what is typically provided; a sticker (Line 12). This response does not directly address the questions in the previous line and instead changes the focus. Sally does not accept the change of focus and instead equates the Skittles to the sticker by the use of the word “even” (Line 13). There is some overlapping speech here between the two participants. In the line that follows (Line 14) Catie seems to be setting up a contrast with the use of the word “but”
and then a minimization with the use of the word “just”. She also repeats words, “it’s” and “if”, in a stammering response, signally trouble within the interaction (Jefferson, 1988). She ends her turn of talk with a justification for the giving of the treat. In the next turn from Sally, the word “but” sets up a contrast between what is to come to what has just been said (Line 15) (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Schriffin, 1987). After the “but” Sally poses a direct question but there is not space for the teacher to respond before another question is asked, making the question a rhetorical one. In this line Sally uses the words “you” and “you’re” to indicate the responsibility and accountability of the teacher. The beginning of the word extrinsic is emphasized. The example of “pizzas for accelerated reader” serves as a definition of the term extrinsic and is also a shared reference. Sally offers a contrast by using the word “instead”. The beginning of the word intrinsic is also emphasized. Catie indicates that she has heard what Sally has offered with a drawn out “yeh” (Line 18). She uses the word “just” again as a minimization (Wooffitt, 1992). The general term “something”, in its vagueness, also reinforces the minimization. In the next turns (Lines 19 and 20) there is latching, where utterances closely follow one another, and there is an agreement for the first time within the conversation (Jefferson, 2004). Sally offers the word “habit” to describe the treat providing practice and Catie offers a phrase meaning the same thing; “we’ve always done”. Additionally, she uses the word “we’ve” which is inclusive of others around her and again minimizes her personal responsibility (Line 20). She also uses the word “always” which is representative of the well-established treat giving practice.

After this place of agreement, there is a shift in the conversation and Sally begins to soften her comments. First, she suggests that Catie should “try” to eliminate the practice (Line 21) and Catie agrees (Line 22). Sally softens by acknowledging how difficult eliminating the practice might be because of the presence of other people (Line 23). Catie is agreeing with what
is being stated in her next two turns (Lines 24 and 28). In her turns (Lines 25, 26, 27 and 29) Sally continues to soften in her interaction with words like “I mean” and “just” and “kind of”. She suggests further reading and thought and offers a justification for her statements about extrinsic motivation and how it relates to student achievement. There is overlapping speech at this point, with Catie again discussing the routine practice of treat giving and using the word Sally used in an earlier exchange – “habit” (Line 31). Toward the end of the extract, Catie reports that she had never thought about it (meaning extrinsic and intrinsic motivation) (Line 37) and Sally ends this portion of the coaching conversation by encouraging Catie to think about the topic (Lines 38 and 40). She transitions from this topic to the next by offering a joint opportunity to (“let’s”) think about a topic (“sequencing”) that Catie had brought up in the pre-conference (Line 40-42). This extract included “why” questioning on the part of the coach, and minimal responsibility taking on the part of the teacher. Instead of taking responsibility, the teacher blamed others, minimized her responsibility, and hedged her response.

In the next extract, Jill is being coached by Sally. This coaching conversation took place immediately after Sally had observed Jill teaching. The conversation focuses upon the student’s ability to use the printed text (the visual information) and the teacher’s expectations around the use of visual information. In this extract, the coach poses a why question. The teacher hedges, makes self–deprecating remarks, stammers, and in one section of talk, is incomprehensible:

Extract 5: (Lack of accountable talk, why question)

1 Jill: ggggg which I confused her about um (.) so she’s not wanting to have to
2 look (.) but she’s learning to look (.) um on her way to looking and an I am having
3 to
4 Sally: so when you talk about that what are you
Jill: beyond first letter? Or just

Sally: why would you think she’d be looking beyond first letter at this point?

She’s only on level five I mean if she’s using first letter (. ) you’re lucky

Jill: well ugh (. ) I guess (. ) when I think about that (. ) I’m thinking when she comes to a word she doesn’t know (. )

Sally: um hum

Jill: that’s my issue as a teacher (. ) that’s on the teacher part of this um (. ) I’m unsure what to say (. ) um because > my prompting is not solid < um however (. )

I’ve read about (. ) if I want her to start looking >because she just can’t make it up < she wants to do that > she wants to just make it up< um (. ) then I’m saying well what could it be (. ) um what would make sense but it has to not not what could it be and then if she looks at the picture and says butterfly well um what would you expect to see there for butterfly? Buh buh b well is that a b? that’s what I am going towards so I am having her look at the first letter

Sally: so you’re using that to check rather than try to get her to

Jill: right I’m not doing any get your mouth ready °any of that°

Sally: ya so I’ve (. ) that’s ok

Jill: ok

This extract opens with the teacher taking responsibility for confusing the child. She is explaining that the child is not wanting to learn to look at print but that she is having to learn. She begins the sentence “I am having to” and is interrupted by the coach (Line 4). The coach begins to ask a question (Line 4) and stops and the teacher offers “beyond first letter” as a means of picking up the question and beginning to extend with “or just”. The coach, Sally, offers a why
question related to the comment of the teacher around use of first letter. With the qualifiers “at this point”, “only” and “you’re lucky” she displays the unlikeliness of the student looking beyond the first letter (Lines 6 and 7). The question of “why would you think she’d be looking beyond first letter” is therefore essentially answered by these qualifiers and leaves little room for a response from the teacher. Jill’s response in the next turn (Lines 8 and 9) include a great deal of hedging and suggest trouble in the talk as she begins to formulate her description (“well”, “ugh”, “I guess”) (Jefferson, 1988). The term “I guess” also reveals her uncertainty and lack of commitment in her response. The next two phrases appear to be buying time as the teacher is formulating a response. After Sally offers a continuers (Line 10), Jill begins to take some responsibility, in a self-deprecatng way, by talking about what is the “teacher part” and saying that her prompting is not solid (Lines 11 and 12). However, she is also offering justifications and minimizing responsibility with comments like “I’m unsure what to say” which is similar to “I don’t know” and then focusing on the child’s behavior (“she wants to just make it up”) (Lines 12 and 14). This focusing on the child’s behavior is a way to diminish her responsibility and increase the student’s responsibility. Beginning on Line 15, Jill offers a scenario that is difficult to follow. Sally summarizes the scenario and it is taken up as a question by Jill (Lines 19 and 20). Jill answers the question by saying “right” and then offers a statement about what she is not doing (Line 20). This practice that Jill mentions that she is not doing is somewhat taboo in Reading Recovery and often discussed within the Reading Recovery community as ineffective. With this statement, Jill is distancing herself from what has been deemed inappropriate inside the Reading Recovery context; there is a shift in “footing” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 146). The interaction ends with agreement between the participants (Line 21 and Line 22). In this extract, the why question from the coach elicits little responsibility taking on the part of the teacher.
In the next extract, the coach is debriefing the leading of a behind-the-glass teaching session. In this session, both RRTLs in training conducted the Reading Recovery Teacher training class of an experienced RRTL while the coach, Sally observed. While the entire conversation included 5 participants, this isolated extract only includes three participants: Jill, Sally, and the experienced RRTL who was not part of this study. In this extract, the coach poses a *why* question to Jill about a question she asked of the group of Reading Recovery teachers as they observed a live Reading Recovery lesson. Though the *why* question from the coach is couched in a series of compliments and serves to highlight an action she views as productive from the RRTL, Jill. Jill takes up the *why* question as a negative and is unable to engage in a high level of responsibility taking:

**Extract 6: (Lack of accountable talk, why question)**

1. **Sally:** well and you did a very nice job there (.) the sad thing was the teacher
2. who’d asked that question (.) who’d said that (.) um was actually > doing a side
3. bar conversation with the person beside them at that point < but you did say how
4. did you get in there < without doing that > (.) and that’s very nice so we don’t
5. need to build all these rules in and so you were following up and taking that
6. further um (.1) and here’s another you had a nice opening here she’s asking him
7. where to cut what do you think (.) and so we get was it where he clapped? Could
8. have clapped again (.) and my question to you is why did you ask that?
9. **Jill:** (.1) why did I ask?
10. **Sally:** why did she get him to tell him where to cut it?
11. **Jill:** well I wanted to th I wanted them to think about (.) a getting the kid to take
12. ownership of that like (.) I’VE NEVER DONE THAT where do you think I
should cut this? What are the w

Sally: so that I mean > I thought it was a useful thing to be asking <

Jill: what are the pros and cons of that? I just =

Sally: =why is she doing that (. ) what are the pros and cons of doing that (. ) why

( .) It wasn’t where he clapped it so does that matter? um if he wants

TL: ((a RRTL who was not part of the study is speaking))

Sally: not at that point

TL: ((a RRTL who was not part of the study is speaking))

Sally: you know would that have been (. ) someone said could he have clapped it

again um does he need to clap it or does he just need to say it? He’s saying cos
tume so that’s what I’d want to cut (. ) so I’ll cut it for you that way (. ) say it again

cos tume yep I’m cutting it like that you know but what’s good is you brought it

up (. ) what’s not so good is it kind of just went nowhere

Jill: well that’s because °I don’t understand it myself I guess (. ) I don’t know °

Sally: so you might say that > I’ve never done that < I mean you don’t have to

have done it (.1) um I thought the discussion was splendid

This extract opens with Sally offering compliments around the conversation that had taken place with several Reading Recovery teachers in the RRTL led professional development session. Sally offered two questions and one comment made by the teachers before asking a why question of one of the RRTLs, Jill (Line 8). Jill’s response, after a pause, is a question back to Sally, restating the question that was asked (Line 9). This questioning back may serve to buy Jill some time as she formulates her response to Sally. In Line 10, Sally asks another question in reply. There is a repair in Jill’s reply, signaling trouble within the interaction (Jefferson, 1988).
She distances herself from the action the teacher in the discussion took by saying “I’ve never done that” in a loud tone of voice. This can be viewed as a shift in footing (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). She specifies what she had never done by offering the language the teacher used, “where do you think I should cut this?” (Lines 12 and 13). Her last phrase of talk of this turn also contains a repair (Line 13). When Sally speaks in the next turn, she does some repair as well, with the use of “so” and “I mean” (Line 14). Her repair may be in response to Jill taking up her why question in a negative way. With an accelerated delivery, she praises the usefulness of the question Jill had posed in the session (Line 14). In her next turn (Line 15), Jill seems to be continuing to respond to the question Sally posed earlier (Line 10). Sally contributes a number of questions to the conversation, one that was just offered by Jill in line 15 (Lines 16 and 17). At this point a RRTL who was present in the session but not a participant in the study joins the conversation. Her comments were not transcribed, therefore making it difficult to discuss comments that were offered and next turn proof of the comments because that information is unavailable (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Sally is responding to the RRTL who was not part of the study (Lines 21 -25). This sets up the comment made by Jill in Line 26. Jill offers an explanation around the action taken by the teacher behind the glass and her subsequent question about the cut up story and the teacher’s decision to ask the child where to cut it. Jill offers “I don’t understand it myself”, and “I guess” and “I don’t know” which all three serve to distance her from responsibility (Line 26). Sally responds using the word “might” which offers Jill a possibility in how she could have handled that conversation behind the glass. She ends her turn of talk (Lines 27 and 28) with a compliment around the discussion of the lesson. Within this extract, it is interesting to see a why question intended to highlight a positive teaching decision
taken up as a “negative”. The RRTL was not able to take responsibility for her actions and instead distanced herself from her teaching decision.

In each of these extracts, why questions are posed by the coach, Sally. In each extract, the teachers have a difficult time taking responsibility for the questioned actions – the giving of Skittles, thinking that the RR student would be looking beyond first letter when trying to problem solve an unknown word, and asking a question about the cut up story in the professional development session. Instead of engaging in responsibility taking or accountable talk, the teachers hedge their responses with comments like “well” and “I guess”. There is also considerable pausing in their responses which indicates hesitation and uncertainty. In two of the extracts, a form of the question is tossed back to the coach perhaps to buy time in formulating a response to the question posed. It is interesting to note that in Extract 6, the coach used a why question around a teaching decision she felt was positive and the coachee took up the why question in a negative way. In each of these extracts, the why questions posed by the RRUT did not facilitate responsibility taking on the part of the RRTLs. Why questions, which are highly valued in Reading Recovery, may not be eliciting the desired action in that it appears that responsibility taking may decrease in the presence of why questions.

Some Accountable Talk and the Use of Why Questions

In each of the next three extracts, why questions are posed within the coaching conversation. In contrast to the first three extracts (1, 2, and 3), in which teachers took a great deal of responsibility and commented on their teaching decisions, there appears to be less, though some, responsibility taking on the part of the teacher. And, in contrast to the last three extracts (4, 5, and 6), why questions are asked and do not appear to have the same distancing impact on the teachers. In each of the extracts, the why questions are mitigated by another factor.
In the following extract, Sally, the coach, and Jill, the teacher, are discussing Jill’s decision to leave some of the student’s reading errors unaddressed:

Extract 7: (Some accountable talk, why question)

1  Jill: um there were some things I needed to not correct all the time
2  Sally: yes I noticed that and I was just going to say so that was one of the things
3       you very nearly with the school bus bus on Little Things you were about to say
4       something and then you decided to leave it
5  Jill: um hum
6  Sally: so
7  Jill: and the shop and store
8  Sally: and shop and store (.) so talk through the rationale
9  Jill:    [ok]
10  Sally: [why]
11  Jill: so on a word like that ° on those words° it’s not important that they get it like
12       absolutely correct=
13  Sally: = not at the moment
14  Jill: I mean honestly they both make sense
15  Sally: right they make sense (.) he didn’t read it as two words did he? He read
16  school bus under bus
17  Jill: um hum um hum

This extract opens with Jill making a statement about her teaching, a statement of responsibility, and what she needed to do (or not do in this case) (Line1). In her turn of talk, Sally agrees with Jill and provides a specific example of her teaching that represents Jill’s
statement in Line 1 (Line 2). In her statement, Sally uses the term “you” three times – “you very nearly … “, “you were about to…”, and “you decided to…”. She is recounting and highlighting Jill’s specific teaching actions, and thus her responsibility. Jill indicates she has heard Sally’s statements about her actions by saying “um hum”, which serves as a receipt marker (Sacks, 1992) and Jill offers a related example in Line 7. In her response in Line 8, Sally takes up the example Jill provided (“shop and store”), instead of the earlier one she provided (“school bus” and “bus”), and directs her to “talk through the rationale” (Line 8). This directive “talk through the rationale” is asking for an account of Jill’s actions around the “shop and store” example. There is some overlapping talk on Lines 9 and 10 with Jill agreeing to provide the rationale (Line 9) and Sally defining “talk through the rationale” by stating “why” (Line 10). Asking why is another way to ask for an account (Sacks, 1992). This overlapping talk is significant in that it may disguise the why that was offered by the coach. Jill begins her accounting for her decision on Lines 11 and 12. She begins with “so” which works to transition the conversation from one speaker to another and to take responsibility for her turn of talk (Schriffin, 1987). There is no hesitation or hedging in her response and she asserts a conditional truth by saying “on those words it’s not important that they get it like absolutely correct”. In Line 13, Sally’s comment “not at the moment” latches to Jill’s earlier comment (Line 12) of “absolutely correct” which also speaks to the conditional aspect of the assertion. In Reading Recovery, there is respect for student development over time. Early in the lesson series, students are not expected to correctly process all of the printed text accurately. However, as they progress through the lesson series and become better readers, their accuracy in the use of the printed text will improve. This interaction between the coach and teacher shows a place of agreement about student’s literacy processing, and a shared understanding of student’s change and growth over time. Jill continues her
accounting in Line 14 by offering a second reason why she left the “shop and store” error unattended to. In Line 14 she chooses the word “honestly” which might serve to bolster the legitimacy of her “fact”, that both words “make sense”. Sally confirms Jill’s second reason and then returned to her first example (Line 15). Jill offers the receipt marker of “um hum um hum” indicating that she heard the information in Line 17 (Sacks, 1992). In this extract, the teacher was able to “talk through the rationale” of her decision making around the “shop and store” example. There did not appear to be trouble or discomfort in the talk as Jill discussed her decision making. Perhaps the comment “talk through the rationale” and the overlapping talk when the “why” was issued allowed the teacher to engage in some talk around her decisions.

In the next extract, Sally and Catie are engaging in a pre-coaching conversation in which they are discussing text selection for a student who is having difficulty learning to attend to the visual information in text. They are looking at various texts as they have a conversation:

Extract 8: *(Some accountable talk, why questions)*

1 Sally: so why do you think this (. ) what was it in this kind of text that made her

2 actually have to read it?

3 Catie: definite and she did have problems with dinosaur and birthday but (. ) um

4 it’s not repetitive (. ) it’s not [your]

5 Sally: [it’s] using the same structures (. ) but it’s not [quite]

6 Catie: [um

7 hum]

8 Sally: identical is it?

9 Catie: can’t really anticipate

10 Sally: and it’s not like some of these (. ) patterned ones where after you’ve read
the first page =

Catie: = right

Sally: you almost don’t have to look again

Catie: right

Sally: um

Catie: and this one is more patterned and so I’ve kinda of like I kind of tried to stray away from that (.) this one is somewhat but

Sally: heh heh heh I think those are funny ones

Catie: they don’t really have a whole lot of um (.) you know =

Sally: = and isn’t it the switch every two lines?

Catie: yeh

Sally: one page says here is

Catie: here I uggh

Sally: I can

Catie: >here is here are I can eat a blah blah blah blah< so

Sally: here is (.) so it’s really very patterned isn’t it?

Catie: she would just have to =

Sally: = well here’s the change is a (.) I can eat (. ) here is ( . ) so the a’s missing

Catie: um hum and then =

Sally: = I can eat a’s back in there a’s missing (. ) so that’s the switch

Catie: [and there’s one time]

Sally: [is the a]

Catie: is says are instead of is but
Sally: here is a (.) here is my(.) and then it says my(.) so does she know any of those words?

Catie: well

Sally: here I

Catie: yes she could I wouldn’t anticipate that that would be =

Sally: = so does (.) I mean there’s enough there to make her look

Catie: um hum same with this one (.). I mean (.). I feel like 4 level 4 really goes into more of (.) there’s a good story:: (.) there’s but these are starting to hit on it (.). some (.) and I I think she would

Sally: I mean that’s quite a good story

Catie: um hum

This extract begins with Sally posing a question that begins as a ‘why question’ but is then repaired and becomes a ‘what question’ (Line 1). This repair is self-initiated in that it is started and fully implemented by the speaker (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). This key repair makes the question about the text in instead of the teacher’s thoughts. Because the question becomes about the text, instead of the teacher, it may be easier for the teacher to address. In Line 3, Catie responds with “definite” perhaps agreeing with Sally’s comment in Line 1 that the text “made her actually have to read it”. She points out a trouble spot in the text for the child, and then offers a reason that the child successfully read the text (Line 4). There is some overlapping talk between Catie’s last utterance (Line 4) and Sally’s first utterance (Line 5). There is overlapping talk again with Sally’s last utterance (Line 5) and Catie’s first utterance (Line 6). This overlapping is occurring as conversational transitions are taking place. Speakers are attending to the turn–by-turn nature of talk (Jefferson, 1986). The coach and coachee are engaged in a
conversational interaction in which they are building upon one another’s utterances. They are closely attuned to one another and to the task of sorting through the text to consider the qualities that allowed the child to process the text successfully. With her contributions on Lines 5 and 8, Sally is expanding upon Catie’s ideas (Line 4). Sally is valuing the comment that Catie made and is building it up. Catie continues the conversation by offering another reason the text was successfully processed by the child (Line 9). In Lines 10-15, the conversation continues in a similar manner with Sally adding to Catie’s comments from Line 9 with the conjunction “and”, and Catie latching onto Sally’s comments in Line 11. In Lines 16 and 17, Catie talks about the text, but she also talks about her own teaching decision and responsibility. There is laughter from Sally on Line 18 just before she offers “I think those are funny ones”. Catie begins to discuss another feature of the text on Line 19. Sally joins their comments again by latching onto Catie’s last utterance on line 19 and using the conjunction “and” as she poses a question (Line 20). The use of “and” in both instances above seems to be to ease the conversational transitions (Schriffin, 1987). Sally’s use of “and” may also be connected to Catie’s use of “you know” in the line before. “You know” draws attention to shared knowledge (Schriffin, 1987). For the next several turns of talk (Line 21-33) Sally and Catie are looking at text, reading from the text, and constructing an understanding together. There are several places where their talk links (Lines 27 and 28 and Lines 29 and 30). There is a section of overlapping talk (Lines 31 and 32). After Catie’s contribution about the text on Line 33, Sally shifts the conversation back to Catie’s student with a question (Lines 34 and 35). Catie begins a response (Line 36) and Sally continues with the question by naming known words (Line 37). Catie responds affirmatively and is talking about the text (Line 38) when Sally comes in with what seems like a beginning of a question “so does” (Line 39). She pauses and then makes a statement instead (Line 39). In Line 40, Catie
agrees and then offers comments about Level 4 text stories, and her student’s abilities. The extract concludes with a comment of agreement from Sally (Line 43) and an acknowledgement from Catie (Line 44). Throughout the entire extract, there seems to be an ease in the interaction and the working toward a common goal. The coach and the teacher are investigating text features and attempting to answer the initially posed question together. A why question was posed, but adapted, and there was some discussion of teacher decision making.

In the next extract, the two RRTLs in training are working together. Catie has just taught her Reading Recovery student and Jill served as the coach for Catie. This extract takes place as part of the post-conference coaching, and is actually focused on the teaching of the RRTL who just served as the coach in the live teaching session. In this extract, a why question is posed, and the RRTL immediately takes it up and is able to respond without hesitation or seeming discomfort. Perhaps the symmetry in the relationship (Heritage, 1997), where the RRTLs are in the same role, allows for the taking up of the why question in a productive way:

Extract 9: (Some accountable talk, why questions)

1  **Jill**: but I you know when I’m sitting there (.) like in my lessons (.) my really awful lessons on Thursday or whenever it was Tuesday or yesterday it seems like forever ago
2
3  **Catie**: why did you say that?
4
5  **Jill**: ↑because (.1) first of all(h) my basket of 3s were really(h) 4s
6
7  **Catie**: heh heh heh heh
8
9  **Jill**: so three out of the four (.) books =
10  **Catie**: =that could make some things challenging
11
12  **Jill**: were way too hard even though I’d planned for em and I looked through em
(. when I did the first one and I was like oh my gosh this is horrible and my little
girl who is full of vim and vigor and awesomeness went ugh and I’m like ok ok
right there I knew this is not good and oh it wasn’t good and then ° I looked back
it said 4 ° heh so guess what I am going to check all the books heh from now(h)
on(h)

Catie: heh heh heh
Jill: and
Catie: well that was partly not your fault I mean it was your fault
Jill: well it was ugh
Catie: but that I mean was just a miss (. ) whatever

This extract opens with Jill, the coach in this coaching session, sharing with Catie, the
teacher in this coaching session, about her lessons. Jill uses the phrase “you know” which brings
Catie into a shared knowledge experience (Schriffin, 1987). She refers to her lessons as “really
awful” (Line 2). Catie responds and asks a ‘why question’ (Line 4). In her response to the
question, Jill’s pitch is elevated and she emphasizes the word “because” (Line 5). In this
instance, both “Why” (the first part) and “because” (the second part) are an adjacency pair
(Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Jill pauses before offering a reason for why the lesson was awful.
There is some laughter in her response (Line 5). This laughter may serve to soften the discomfort
involved with acknowledging a mistake in teaching (Glenn, 2003). Catie’s turn of talk in
response to Jill’s statement is laughter (Line 6), so she may be joining in the laughter to ease
Jill’s acknowledgement. Jill continues her explanation (Line 7) to which Catie offers a comment
in agreement that sounds somewhat sarcastic in its tone. Having books that are too hard would
make the reading very difficult for a Reading Recovery student and her sarcastic comment is also
minimizing of the difficulty a bad book choice would create. In her turn of talk beginning on Line 9, Jill discusses her planning for the text and her understanding that her book choice was “horrible”. When describing her student, Jill uses a 3 part list, as she describes her student with “vim and vigor and awesomeness” (Jefferson, 1990; Potter & Edwards, 1992). This discursive device denotes completion (Jefferson, 1990) and lends credibility to her fact construction (Potter & Edwards, 1992). Jill takes responsibility for her teaching actions, as she describes the behavior of her student in response to the text choice and her acknowledgement that “it wasn’t good” referencing her book choice and her student’s subsequent reading of the text. In a lower tone, she reports looking on the back of the book to see the level 4. She is laughing as she mentions the action she will take as a result of this experience (Line 13). Catie responds with laughter again (Line 15) and then repairs when discussing the notion of “fault” (Line 17) (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). The use of laughter in both instances may be smoothing over the difficulty of the notion of fault (Glenn, 2003). Catie concludes (Line 17) and Jill agrees (line 18) that the poor reading by the student due to the bad book choice was Jill’s “fault”. In this extract, a why question is used and is taken up by the receiver in a productive way. Jill is able to offer several examples of her teaching decisions and discuss her responsibility in making the reading difficult for the child because of her text selection. The symmetry in the relationship may have contributed to the why question contributing to productive responsibility taking in this extract.

In these three extracts, why questions were posed by the coach and facilitated some responsibility taking and accounting on the part of the teacher. In the seventh and ninth extracts, the why question from the coach came after a teaching issue that the teacher had identified herself. In Extract 7, the why question followed a command of “talk through the rationale” which may have softened the why. Also, the why was issued as the teacher was agreeing with “the talk
through the rationale” statement. Lastly, with Extract 7, the entire interaction was around a positive teaching decision the teacher had made which may have contributed to her ability to take some responsibility for her actions. In Extract 8, the repair of the “why” to “what” significantly changes the nature of the question. Instead of being a question about the teacher’s thinking, it becomes a question about the text. Together, the coach and teacher review books and build an understanding around the question originally posed by the coach. Through the course of their discussion, the teacher does some responsibility taking as she discusses text selection. Though this interaction is between the RRUT and the in-training RRTL, it appears to be more symmetrical as the teacher and coach are working together to build understanding with one another. The last extract in this section, Extract 9, also includes this aspect of symmetry. The two RRTLs in training are having a discussion after Jill has coached Catie. The actual extract from that session focused on Jill’s sharing of her teaching and Catie asking a question in response. The participants are “equal” in terms of their positions and this may have contributed to the “why question” not being off putting or threatening. In this extract there was responsibility taking on the part of the teacher and there was laughter and humor in the interaction.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to address the research question, What is the nature of literacy coaching conversations within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training? In this chapter, I presented the major finding within my study - that coaching conversations in Reading Recovery focus upon teacher decision making. The extracts and explanations I highlighted were from coaching conversations and demonstrate the various ways accountability as responsibility for teaching decisions is elicited. I highlighted three categories of extracts to support my main finding that coaching conversations in Reading Recovery focus upon enhancing teacher decision.
The three categories within the major finding are: (1) Accountable talk through clear questioning and comments; (2) Lack of accountable talk and the use of why questions; and (3) Some accountable talk and the use of why questions.

The first category, *Accountable talk through invitations and clear questioning*, seems to offer diverse examples of coaching approaches that lead to the highest degree of responsibility taking on the part of teachers. The clear questioning of the coach allowed the teacher to articulate her teaching moves, which may make her decision making more visible. The next category, *Lack of accountable talk and the use of why questions*, features the use of why questions by the coach and the hedging, blaming, and distancing responses of the teachers. In each of these extracts, teachers were unable to engage in conversations in which they took responsibility for their teaching decisions. The *why* questions appeared to be taken up as a challenge and the teachers were not able to examine their teaching actions and decisions. The last category, *Some accountable talk and the use of why questions*, includes the use of why questions that are each tempered by another factor in the extract; a conversation with a peer, a *why* question that became a *what* question, and a *why* question that was asked after a request for a teaching rationale. Within this category, teachers were able to take some responsibility for their actions, but not in the same manner as the first category of extracts.

These findings have implications for those engaging in literacy coaching and specifically for the Reading Recovery community. These findings also lead to ideas for future research. In Chapter 5 I will connect my findings to research, discuss implications from these findings, and offer recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This study was designed to examine the discourse of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders as they participated in literacy coaching sessions during the initial training year. Eleven coaching sessions were analyzed through the lenses of Discursive Psychology, the Discursive Action Model, and Conversation Analysis in order to address the research question What is the nature of literacy coaching conversations within Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training?

In Chapters 1-3, I provided background information on teacher professional development and Reading Recovery, a review of the literature on primary professional development in literacy, and an explanation of my methodology and methods. In Chapter 4, I presented my overall finding; that in these data, Reading Recovery coaching conversations focused upon teacher decision making. I also presented extracts and explanations of interactions between teachers and coaches in which: (1) a teacher engaged in responsibility taking and a coach clearly questioned and commented; (2) a teacher did not engage in responsibility taking and a coach asked why questions; and (3) a teacher engaged in some responsibility taking and a coach asked why questions. In this chapter, I will demonstrate connections between my study and other research, provide implications of my findings, and offer suggestions for future research.

Research Connections

In this section, I will make connections from this study to both research reviewed earlier in this dissertation and to research that is now relevant in light of the findings of this study. The following areas of research will be addressed: general teacher professional development; professional development through literacy coaching; specific literacy interventions; teacher knowledge, beliefs, and expertise; conversation analysis; and transformative learning theory. Within those sections, the topics of questioning and teacher decision making will be discussed.
General Teacher Professional Development

The engagement of teachers in high quality professional development is not a new concern. Characteristics of high quality professional development are well established and well researched (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Yoon et al., 2010). Yoon et al. (2010) offer the following characteristics of high quality professional development programs: coherence, active learning, sufficient duration, collective participation, a focus on content knowledge, and a reform rather than a traditional approach. The Reading Recovery professional development model in general, and coaching conversations within Reading Recovery specifically, embody these characteristics. In each of the coaching sessions of this study, the notion of coherence, or working toward a unified vision for instruction was evident. The coaching sessions demonstrated active learning and collective participation in which colleagues were engaged in conversations with one another. The eleven audio recorded coaching conversations took place over the course of an academic year, and were just one aspect of the multi-faceted Reading Recovery professional development model which includes teaching Reading Recovery students daily, leading professional development sessions, taking graduate level course work in reading theory and reading clinical practice. These aspects of the training speak to the sufficient duration of the model and to its emphasis on the development of reading content knowledge for teachers. Lastly, the goal of Reading Recovery is to bring the lowest achieving literacy learners to average or better rates of proficiency by providing teachers with professional development that focuses on enhancing teacher expertise. The goal of bringing the lowest achieving literacy learners to average rates of proficiency is not a goal in traditional reading instruction delivered through special education services or commercial reading programs like Success for All, Wilson Reading, and Reading Mastery. Enhanced teacher expertise is not a
goal of principals who conduct “fidelity checks” and walk through classrooms with clipboards and checklists to ensure that teachers are faithfully abiding to the scope and sequence in reading textbooks and adhering to reading “scripts”. These two overarching goals of Reading Recovery make it a model of reform rather than a traditional approach in both the teaching of children and the professional development of teachers.

**Professional Development through Literacy Coaching**

Many of the studies reviewed in Chapter 2 relate to this study and to Reading Recovery professional development in general. In a study by Pomerantz and Pierce (2013) that looked at comprehension strategy use, the authors found that teachers were able to demonstrate a strategy for their students but were unable to turn the strategy over to the students to practice and use independently. In the present study, coaching sessions within Reading Recovery place great importance on student independence as evidenced by the coaching conversation in Extract 3 when Catie, the teacher, and Sally, the coach, discuss specific actions they expect the student, Amanda (a pseudonym), to demonstrate.

Al Otaiba et al. (2008) contend that conflict often arises in coaching conversations when a teacher’s previous experience differs from new information. This tension appears to be present in Extract 4 when Catie, the teacher, is presented with novel information from Sally, the coach, concerning extrinsic and intrinsic motivation and the impact of offering extrinsic motivators upon student’s achievement and learning.

Porche, Pallante, and Snow (2012) describe coaching visits where feedback, or suggestions for improvement for teachers is provided via emails or memos from coaches. This type of coaching session differs from coaching visits in Reading Recovery in which the coach provides immediate feedback and engages with the teacher both before and after the lesson and
sometimes within the lesson. The immediacy of the feedback provided in Reading Recovery coaching is provided in each of the extracts within this study.

Kent (2005) stressed the importance of collaborative relationships between teachers and literacy coaches. Relationships in Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training develop through the course of the training year and are built between in-training RRTLs and between RRTLs and the RRUT. The ease of interaction which is a hallmark of collaborative relationships can be heard in the audio-recorded interactions where participants make themselves vulnerable to one another. This type of interaction takes place in Extract 9 when Jill, a RRTL in training, talks with Catie, another RRTL in training, about her “awful” lessons.

**Language within literacy coaching.** At the conclusion of their research studies, Heineke (2013), Hunt and Handsfield (2013), and Vanderberg and Stephens (2010) called for more research into the language of literacy coaching. My study directly addressed this need. Within my overall finding, I found extracts of talk that highlighted different questioning techniques used by coaches that fostered (or did not foster) teacher accountability as responsibility taking. Within the Reading Recovery research, I did not find attention devoted to the language of literacy coaching. Clay (1991) mentions RRTLs visiting RRTs to observe them at work or to provide a requested demonstration. She does not comment on the conversations or language of the visits. Lyons (1991) does discuss the questioning patterns of RR teachers and their relationship to RR student responses. She also discusses how teachers build understandings within in-service sessions (Lyons, 1994) but there isn’t a discussion of coaching language within Reading Recovery.

Though I did not find information on questioning techniques within literacy coaching in Reading Recovery, I did find commentary on the use of ‘why’ questions in my own data. Below
is an extract from a coaching interaction on 1.29 in which the RRUT is praising the in-training RRTLs for the use of ‘why’ questions as they led a professional development session:

Extract 10 (Endorsement of why questions)

1  RRUT: um I thought you both tried to take it further which is what you were
2    talking about so I thought there were places and we’ve I’ve got probably some
3    examples here I can share with you where you were trying to take it further um
4    and you both did that you got to some why questions
5  RRTL: oh hallelujah
6  RRUT: yea and that’s important those why questions help them eventually to
7    make better decisions

It is important to note that this exchange took place as part of a debriefing of a professional development session where RRTLs in training and Reading Recovery teachers are discussing teaching decisions made by a teacher on the other side of a one way screen. However, because ‘why’ questions are endorsed in this setting as a means to encourage responsibility taking and decision making, it would be logical for RRTLs to use why questions in coaching sessions with individual teachers. The data from this study suggests that why questions within coaching sessions may inhibit teacher responsibility taking.

In addition, my categories of extracts in my findings have connection to works that focus upon the language of literacy coaching. Costa and Garmston (1994) discuss the use of why questions in coaching conversations and assert that a ‘why’ question “often creates a defensive reaction because it asks for a justification of behavior rather than an inquiry into the decision-making process” (p. 113). They go on to say that ‘why’ questions can be reframed (Costa & Garmston, 1994). In the Appendix of their text, they offer information about the Language of
Coaching: Questioning. The chart outlines various thought processes that teachers may engage in – describing, translating, predicting, sequencing, comparing, inferring, analyzing, evaluating – in both planning and reflective coaching conferences, and questions that coaches might use in response. In nineteen of the twenty presented scenarios, only 1 involves the use of a ‘why’ question. In this example, the ‘why’ question is “What hunches do you have to explain why some students performed as you had hoped while others did not? in response to a teacher wanting to analyze student behavior.

Though not explicitly stated, as in the Costa and Garmston (1994) text, Lyons and Pinnell (2001) seem to discount the use of why questions as well. They present a similar chart about questioning in coaching conversations (Lyons & Pinnell 2001). The chart on Questions to Prompt Analysis of Teaching contains the use of why questions twice in the list of twenty-two questions. In one of the examples, the why question in directly tied to a teacher decision (Did you change your plan at any time in the lesson? Why?) and the other is related to student behavior and action (Why is [action, behavior] important for readers and writers?).

Specific Literacy Interventions

Several of the studies that focused upon specific literacy interventions and were reviewed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation have connections to the findings of my study. Gilrane et al. (2008) outline the following conditions for teacher change and reflection: (1) voice in determining professional development needs; (2) structures to support teaching; (3) availability of support personnel; and (4) access to useful information about student learning. Within the coaching extracts presented in this study, there are several instances in which the teacher established the topic of conversation in the coaching session. The scheduling of coaching sessions themselves provides a structure to support teaching. RRLTs in training not only have
the support of the RRUT through coaching sessions, but also have both clinical and theory
graduate level reading courses taught by the RRUT. Lastly, the conversation between teacher
and coach in Extract 4 though uncomfortable, did provide the teacher with important information
about extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

When designing an intervention to improve student achievement, Lai et al. (2009) included the implementation of professional learning communities where teachers examined the effectiveness of their instruction and fine-tuned their instruction to meet student needs. Reading Recovery professional development takes place within a professional learning community. In coaching session and behind the glass professional development sessions teachers examine the effectiveness of instruction and consider teaching actions which might better serve students. Additionally, these settings within Reading Recovery professional development help Reading Recovery professionals develop a deep understanding of the reading process. Reynolds and Wheldall (2007) acknowledge Reading Recovery teachers’ depth of understanding about the reading process.

Fisher et al. (2012) show change over time when teachers move from the use of published reading materials to using a framework that relies on teacher decision making. In the study, the authors provided intense professional development that relied upon teacher knowledge and expertise. This emphasis led to an increase in student achievement. The authors conclude that professional development should be ongoing and that teachers need the opportunity to talk and develop expertise. In the conclusion of their study, Doubek and Cooper (2007) call for an examination of the complexity of teacher rationale for decision making. Like the conversations in my data within Reading Recovery coaching sessions, both of these studies acknowledge the importance of teacher decision making.
Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs, and Expertise

As in the previous sections on specific literacy interventions and professional development through literacy coaching, this study on the discourse within Reading Recovery coaching sessions has connections to studies that were reviewed previously. Coaching sessions within Reading Recovery provide teachers the opportunity to develop the practical and professional knowledge discussed by Gomez (2009). These sessions do so by providing teachers with the opportunity to monitor teaching actions they use and don’t use (Topping & Ferguson, 2005). Coaching conversations also allow teachers to develop knowledge calibration accuracy in which they become aware of what they don’t know and are, therefore, open to learning (Cunningham and Stanovich, 2004). Podhajski et al. (2009) suggest, and Reading Recovery professional development is in alignment with the assertion that professional development informs teacher knowledge and can positively impact student’s reading achievement. Lastly, elements of the Reading Recovery professional development model, specifically behind the glass teaching sessions and coaching sessions, resemble the medical model approach to teacher development programs that Smith (2009) advocates for.

Teacher decision making. The overall finding of this study, that in these data coaching conversations within Reading Recovery focus upon teacher decision making, aligns with and builds upon existing research in the field on Reading Recovery. According to Pinnell, Fried, and Estice (1991), “Teachers have to learn to be expert decision makers in order to choose appropriate books and to select the most effective and powerful procedures for each child” (p. 22). Teachers develop this expertise—which in the present study manifests as taking responsibility for instructional decisions and their consequences—within the interactive professional development which includes analysis of teaching practices while observing behind
the glass lessons and literacy coaching conversations. Clay (2005) is clear that responsibility for student achievement lies with the teacher. She says, “There is only one position to take in this case [when students do not achieve]. The lesson series has not been appropriately adapted to the child’s needs, whatever they were (Clay, 2005, p. 180). In addition to the specific references discussed above, there is an abundance of studies that speak to the importance of teacher expertise within Reading Recovery professional development (Clay, 1991; Cox & Hopkins, 2006; Lyons, 1991; Lyons, 1994; Lyons, Pinnell, & DeFord, 1993).

In part, Reading Recovery is effective with students because of literacy coaching and professional development sessions that focus on enhanced teacher expertise. The entire focus of the intervention is upon improved outcomes for students and each component of professional development supports that focus. This singular drive and attention is not the same in literacy coaches working in different contexts. The talk in coaching conversations when the goal is curriculum implementation vs. the talk in coaching conversations when the goal is enhanced teacher expertise is quite different. Literacy coaches and districts that employ literacy coaches might look to the Reading Recovery coaching design as a model if improved student outcomes is a goal.

The focus of literacy coaching conversations outside the Reading Recovery context is not as clear. The Literacy Collaborative (LC) coaching model values teacher expertise (Lyons & Pinnell, 2001). It should be noted that the LC model was designed by Gay Sue Pinnell and Carol Lyons, who were instrumental in the implementation of Reading Recovery in the United States. In their text Systems for Change, Lyons and Pinnell (2001) propose five features of an effective coaching conversation: (1) connected to event that recently occurred; (2) is linked to the teacher’s desire to learn about a specific concept or approach; (3) draws upon actions and words
of teachers and students; (4) teacher and coach engage in dialogue; (5) leads to new learning and improved teaching. These features, especially numbers 3 and 5 support the notion of teacher decision making. Biancarosa et al. (2010) studied the implementation of Literacy Collaborative over a three year period and found “at a minimum, the current study does suggest that well-specified and well-supported coaching initiatives can effect positive changes in student learning” (p. 28). Vanderberg and Stephens (2010) determined that teachers changed in a number of ways with the support of a literacy coach. Teachers were encouraged to implement new approaches, to assess students authentically, to learn more about research and theory, and make decisions based on student needs. With these studies, it appears that there are some places of alignment between my study and the research in the field.

There are many studies on literacy coaching that appear to have a different perspective and focus on literacy coaching conversations. L’Allier et al. (2010) offer guiding principles for literacy coaching which are broader than those proposed by Lyons and Pinnell (2001). Heineke (2013) examined the discourse of literacy coaching sessions and concluded that coaching discourse was influenced by contextual factors and that literacy coaches dominate the talk in coaching conversations with teachers. Two studies I reviewed earlier (McLean et al., 2010; Walpole et al., 2010) focused upon the implementation of Reading First by literacy coaches. A study by Garet et al. (2008) looked at the implementation of literacy coaching in addition to professional development and its impact on student achievement, finding that there were no positive changes in student outcomes.

**Conversation Analysis**

Within Conversation Analysis there is some attention to the use of ‘why’ questions as they relate to accountability. Sacks (1992) states:
Now, I’ll consider many times the use of “Why?” What I want to say about it just to begin with, is that what one does with “Why?” is to propose about some action that it is an ‘accountable action’. That is to say, “Why?” is a way of asking for an account. Accounts are most extraordinary. And the use of accounts and the use of requests for accounts are very highly regulated phenomena. (p. 4-5)

This connects to my data in which each highlighted use of ‘why’ led to an accounting of teaching actions. Buttny and Morris (2001) discuss the venues where accounting occurs and suggest they surface as a result of “conditions of uncertainty” or from “practical-moral misalignment with others” (p. 289). They discuss the power of community to observe, evaluate and endorse conduct in relation to the standards of the group. This type of accounting is visible in the interactions within Reading Recovery professionals who have standards of teaching and interacting with children and ask questions of teaching decisions in an effort to get to teaching rationale.

According to Buttny and Morris (2001) the use of ‘why’ and calling for an account can be “face-threatening” (p. 291). More indirect means of asking for an account have been explored. Owen (1993) discusses the use of priming moves, Antaki (1994) suggests stating an observation of an action and opening up room for accounting, and Sacks (1992) discusses the correction-invitation device in which an account is offered so that a correction of the account might be made. More indirect means of accounting were seen in my data, as clear and direct questioning in Extract 1 led to highlighting action the teacher took for the student to build the word ‘can’. In Extract 3 and invitation was issued in which the teacher offered an account of how her child was reading and the decisions the teacher had made in response to the child’s processing. Potter (1996) maintains, “Invitations and accusations occasion different sorts of accounts” (p. 61). This was clear in these data as well. When teachers were asked why questions there was blaming and
minimal responsibility taking (Extracts 4-6). This was in contrast to examples that highlighted clear questioning and no why questions and a great deal of responsibility taking (Extracts 1-3).

**Transformative Learning Theory**

Teacher accountability is a hot topic in education today. Conversation on teacher accountability often centers on test scores or curriculum implementation. High stakes test results for students’ factor into teachers’ evaluations, their ability to acquire tenure, and in some districts, how their pay is determined. Teachers are often asked to faithfully implement a reading curriculum by following a script or scope and sequence in a reading textbook. Although, as Richard Allington reminds us, there are no research studies that demonstrate that faithfulness to any particular reading curriculum yields positive outcomes for student achievement (Allington, 2013).

Within Reading Recovery, teacher accountability is taken up quite differently. Teachers are held accountable for student success and the professional development model places the highest premium on enhancing teacher expertise. In these data, the nature of coaching conversations within Reading Recovery focus upon teacher decision making, not teacher obedience to a script or textbook guidelines. Reading Recovery invests in teachers, and professionals within Reading Recovery work to enhance their expertise, in order to be more responsive to students each day. Coaching sessions, an important aspect of Reading Recovery professional development, include in these data conversations on responsibility taking, and coaches use various approaches to facilitate teacher accountability with more and less success.

The focus of the coaching conversations in this study was on teacher decision making. There were not instances in the data where the teachers spontaneously offered comments about how they had changed through the course of the training. However, I think teachers who undergo
this training, in which they are held accountable for teaching decisions as opposed to following a teaching script, must have to change and transform to survive the training itself.

It follows that when teachers move from environments where allegiance to a reading script is demanded (traditional schools and classrooms), to an environment where teachers are held accountable for effective teaching decisions for students (within Reading Recovery), that a “disorienting dilemma” may result (Mezirow, 1991) and lead to a learning transformation. Both Mezirow (2003) and Clay (2005) speak to the importance of justifying decisions. Mezirow (2003) states, “Beliefs are justified when they are based on good reasons. The process of reasoning may involve such tacit knowledge as aptitudes, skills, and competencies” (p. 58).

In December of 2013, I presented a case study of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders as they engaged in a professional development retreat (Swafford, 2013). Through interviews with Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders, I found that Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders are often solicited by administrators in their school systems to take on other literacy tasks such as providing Guided Reading training to first and second grade teachers, serving on district wide literacy instructional teams, and conducting training on critical friendships with administrators. In light of these data about teacher decision making, perhaps RRTLs are solicited because they are “transformed” learners with valuable “aptitudes, skills, and competencies” (Mezirow, 2003, p. 58) and have moved beyond the mandates of a reading script or textbook scope and sequence to become able to make important decisions even outside the field of Reading Recovery.

Implications

In this study, I found that the discourse of coaching conversations with Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training focuses upon teacher decision making. Literacy coaches often asked questions around decision making and coachees offered accounts of decision making in response
to questions posed and often without being prompted by questions. I found specific instances where the coachee engaged in responsibility taking through invitations or clear questioning by the coach to highlight teaching actions. I also found instances in which why questions were somewhat productive in engaging teachers in some responsibility taking. Additionally, there were instances where why questions did not facilitate teacher accountability, and instead elicited hedging, blame, and defensive justifications. There are implications for both literacy coaches and Reading Recovery professionals as a result of this study. There is a conflict between what is endorsed in Reading Recovery training sessions and what was evident in my data and in the wider research in the field. Within Reading Recovery, why questions are endorsed for their ability to help teachers make better decisions. The data and the research from the field question this assertion. It will be important for Reading Recovery professionals to monitor the effectiveness of why questions in facilitating responsibility taking around teacher decision making. Perhaps the use of why questions is very successful when a group of teachers in a professional development session are discussing the decisions of a teacher who is not present for a conversation. Perhaps why questions work when Reading Recovery colleagues (who are symmetrical in terms of their job responsibilities) are engaged in peer coaching sessions (Extract 9). It will be important for both Reading Recovery professionals and Literacy Coaches in other contexts to look closely at language usage to determine if the language used is having the desired outcome.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

In addition to implications for practitioners in Reading Recovery and Literacy Professional Development, my findings have implications for researchers in that the findings point to aspects of professional development research that have not yet been explored.
Why Questions in Reading Recovery

As discussed above, why questioning is highly endorsed in Reading Recovery professional development. This study provided extracts where the use of why questions to elicit teacher accountability as responsibility taking was more and less successful. I wonder if the Reading Recovery community might benefit from more research around the use of questions and specifically why questions in coaching sessions vs. why questions in professional development sessions. Why questions might be helpful in exploring rationale and teacher decision making if they were presented to a group of teachers who were watching a live lesson unfolding instead of being asked to a specific teacher. An investigation of the discourse of Reading Recovery professional development sessions would be interesting.

Asymmetry

One of the extracts featured in the findings section (Extract 9) presented talk from two in-training teacher leaders as they debriefed a literacy coaching session in which one teacher leader watched the other teach. In this instance, the why question posed was not taken up as a challenge. The teacher leader who responded to the question did not hesitate to respond, hedge her response, or blame others. Instead, she took responsibility for her teaching within the exchange and the exchange with the other teacher leader included laughter and humor. This exchange was very different than exchanges that involved the use of a why question by the Reading Recovery University Trainer. The difference between how the why question was taken up by the receiver of the question made me wonder if the difference in the response had to do with the symmetry of the relationship between the two teacher leaders and the asymmetry of the relationship between the teacher leaders and the university trainer (Heritage, 1997).
Institutional Talk

It would be interesting to examine not only the asymmetry within the institutional talk of Reading Recovery coaching sessions and/or professional development sessions but also the other aspects of institutional talk offered by Heritage (1997). The features proposed by Heritage (1997) are: (1) turn-taking organization; (2) overall structural organization of the interaction; (3) sequence organization; (4) turn design; (5) lexical choice; and (6) epistemological and other forms of asymmetry. Heritage (1997) explains that these aspects of institutional talk are interrelated where each element is part of the other elements. For example, turn design is an aspect of sequence organization and sequence organization is an aspect of the overall structural organization of an interaction etc. Within my study, lexical choice would be interesting to investigate. There were occasions when research participants reflected on the esoteric language use within Reading Recovery. Also, when meeting with DART members, confusion over the internal Reading Recovery language was discussed.

Transformative Learning Theory

When I trained as a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, I found the experience to be transformative. In part, my experiences during that time led me to consider Transformative Learning Theory as a theoretical framework for my dissertation work. I was also influenced by the conversations I had with other Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders in the field who described their transformative learning experiences during Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training. Though my participants did not specifically address their personal and/or professional transformation within coaching sessions, I still think the theory has connection to the experience of Reading Recovery Teacher Leader training. I believe it would be interesting to research aspects of Reading Recovery Training that facilitate teacher transformation and perhaps a
teacher’s ability to accept responsibility for her teaching decisions. Though my study examined very specific coaching interactions, those interactions did not take place in a vacuum. They occurred in a context in which both instrumental and communicative learning play a role (Mezirow, 2000), critical reflection is endorsed (Mezirow, 2000), discourse is valued (Mezirow, 2000), and strong professional relationships are built (Mezirow, 1995).

**Context and Culture**

Though this specific study did not address the context in which these conversational exchanges occurred, as the discourse was being examined as it unfolded in a moment by moment fashion, it would be interesting for future research to attend to context in future research studies. As mentioned previously in this paper, Reading Recovery originated in New Zealand. I wonder if why questions are taken up differently in the country where the intervention originated. If so, that might explain the emphasis and endorsement of why questions as part of the professional development model. Future research might focus upon how why questions are taken up in Reading Recovery coaching conversations and professional development sessions that take place in New Zealand.

**Closing Thoughts**

Hoffman et al. (2005) contends that no single research study can address all of the challenges faced by the reading community. I agree with Hoffman et al. (2005), but believe that different voices and lenses can contribute to the conversation about these challenges. This study closely examined one aspect, literacy coaching, of a professional development model that has proven results in positively impacting the reading proficiency of low achieving first grade readers. Although I have been an “insider” in the Reading Recovery community for more than a decade, through this study my awareness has been heightened around the kinds of questions that
are used to prompt teacher decision making and responsibility within coaching conversations. By narrowing the focus and attending to the nuances of conversation, important information was captured that might lead to improvements in coaching conversations within Reading Recovery and beyond.
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Appendix A: Transcription Symbols

(Jefferson, 2004)

[ ] Brackets indicate overlapping talk and sections of overlap are aligned

↑ Vertical arrows indicate an increase in pitch and are presented prior to pitch elevation

_ Underlining indicates emphasis

UP Uppercase letters denote loud speech

° Degree symbol before and after a selection notes quieter speech

= Latching, or unbroken talk, is indicated by equal signs

(.) Indication of a pause shorter than .2 seconds

(.5) A longer pause with the length in seconds

> < Greater than and less than symbols indicate sped up talk

< > Less than and greater than symbols indicate slowed down talk

? A question mark indicates rising intonation

heh Heh indicates laughter without words

(h) Laughter within a word is noted

me:: Colons note extended sounds
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### Appendix C: Coaching Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total session</th>
<th>Pre-Conf</th>
<th>Post-Conf</th>
<th>Total coaching time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pseudonyms)</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>coaching time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Catie (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:06:33</td>
<td>13:43</td>
<td>20:31</td>
<td>34:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Jill (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:08:46</td>
<td>15:49</td>
<td>22:48</td>
<td>38:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>Catie (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:18:14</td>
<td>10:39</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>33:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jill (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Jill (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:13:07</td>
<td>19:02</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>35:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Jill (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:32:15</td>
<td>7:39</td>
<td>46:46</td>
<td>54:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catie (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>Jill (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:12:12</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jodie (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>Catie (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:18:10</td>
<td>13:07</td>
<td>18:05</td>
<td>31:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jodie (Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Catie (RRTL)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1:06:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jill (RRTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally (RRUT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jodie (ERRTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name (Role)</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time 3</td>
<td>Time 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Catie (Teacher)</td>
<td>23:36</td>
<td>10:13</td>
<td>9:02</td>
<td>19:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sally (Coach)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Jill (Teacher)</td>
<td>1:03:58</td>
<td>8:10</td>
<td>11:34</td>
<td>27:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sally (Coach)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Jill (RRTL)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1:03:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catie (RRTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally (RRUT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jodie (ERRTL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANON RRTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the **recorder** of the coaching conversation is noted in **BOLD** type*
Appendix D: DART Pledge

A Discourse Analysis of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders Engaging in Professional Development

Discourse Analysis Research Team (DART) Member’s Pledge of Confidentiality

As a member of this project’s research team, I understand that I will be listening to recordings and reading transcriptions of coaching interactions. The information in these transcripts has been revealed by research participants who participated in this project on good faith that their interviews would remain strictly confidential. I understand that I have a responsibility to honor this confidentiality agreement. I hereby agree not to share any information in these transcriptions with anyone except the primary researcher of this project, her doctoral chair, or other members of this research team. Any violation of this agreement would constitute a serious breach of ethical standards, and I pledge not to do so.

_________________________  _______________________
Research Team Member       Date
Appendix E: Coding within Data Analysis Hermeneutic Unit

Code-Filter: All

________________________________________

HU: data analysis 6.3.15

File: [C:\Users\Owner\Documents\Dissertation information for ATLAS ti\data analysis 6.3.15.hpr]

Edited by: Journey

Date/Time: 2015-06-12 12:51:36

________________________________________

3 categorical findings and 3 extracts for illustrate them
3 part list
3 part list example
3 part list example 9.8.14 line 0563 beginning
3 part list example 9.8.14 line 0607 ending
3 part list example 9.17 line 0316
3 part list example 10.1 line 1596
3 part list example around strange b formation 9.8 0705
Accountability
Accountability example
Accountability example 11.18.14
Accountable
Accountable together
accountability
another teacher's accountability
anyways
Asymmetry
asymmetry or role of more knowledgable expert
asymmetry?
Building consensus
closed question
closed question debate
Coach asking permission to join in
Coach asks a teacher that coachee doesn't answer
Confusion
continuer - way to keep her talking
contradictions?
conversation that leads to teacher taking responsibility
Deviant case
Difficulty
Directive
Disagreement
Disagreement negotiated
Don't know what this is but i like it
Don't know why ....
Encouragement of challenge
Enormously too much talking
Example of questioning and accountability 2.3
Example of responsibility and accountability 2.3
Expert role
Extreme case formulation
extreme case formulation ?
generative processing disagreement
genuine problem solving and question
hard to lead
Hardest to teach
hedging
Home
hot seat
humor
I win?
inside joke
Interruption
invitation/refusal
joint problem solving
joking
just interesting
Kid accountability
kid language
Laughter
Laughter and humor to deliver uncomfortable info
Lazy?
lexical choice
Lexical choice - all the rr lingo
Mezirow - disorienting dilemma?
narrative
Negative kid behavior teacher action as a result
negative talk about the kid
NEGOTIATION symmetry?
new thinking
New thought
NICE open question to encourage reflection on each other
Not accountable for this
NOT closed questions (don't use them talk)
NOT questioning
NOT takin up!
Open ended question
Open ended question from the coach to the coachee
open question
open questioning
Overall structural organization
positive kid talk
Praise and concern too
praised unsolicited 2.3
Pronoun use "we"
Pronoun use we
pulling kid into
Question
Question from coachee to coach
question from TL to TL
question problem solving wondering
question that's not a question
Question that coach puts back on teacher
Question with an answer
Reason, rationale, excuse?
Recorder talk
References to look up
referring to experts
refusal
relationship
reminded me of "hot seat" in 1.29.14 transcript
repair
Research question
Rhetorical question
shell shocked
Shock of BTG
Skillful coaching move
Skittles
so, what, how questions (NOT WHY)
soft suggestions
Statement to open up conversation
Stating what she should do and not asking a question
Storytelling
Storytelling among TLs
Structural organization of the interaction - Heritage #2 p.164
Structure of Chapter 4
summarizing what we are working on
Survival
symmetry
systematic vagueness
systematic vagueness?
teacher accountability
Teacher language
teacher responsible for kid
tentative
TL to TL coaching
uncomfortable
Who's role?
Why
why and rationale
Why example about clapping in 4.1.15
Why question
WHY question encouragement
Why question example 9.30 line 290 ish
Why questions
Wondering from the coach
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