Fall 2018

How Does The Language Used In Literacy Coaching Conversations Impact Teacher Self-Efficacy?

Nicole Cahill
Hamline University

Recommended Citation

HOW DOES THE LANGUAGE USED IN LITERACY COACHING

CONVERSATIONS IMPACT TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY?

by

Nicole D. Cahill

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master

of Arts in Literacy Education

Hamline University

Saint Paul, MN

December 2018

Primary Advisor: Maggie Struck

Secondary Advisor: Shannon Roney

Peer Reviewer: Andrea Johnson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

"Words create worlds"
-anonymous

Introduction

This capstone seeks to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? In this chapter, I establish a context for this capstone. I open with an overview of the literacy journey that led me to my question. I then detail my professional journey from collaborative classroom teacher to novice literacy coach. Next, I share the rationale for my question, narrating the way in which my efforts to support teachers as they implement new literacy practices have caused me to reflect on the linguistic moves I make during coaching conversations. Finally, I conclude with an overview of the remaining chapters of the capstone.

A Journey of a Million Words

Words hold power. As a child, the words my father read to me before bed each night lured me into the world of reading. I began voraciously consuming every story I could get my hands on. The words on the pages of the books at my local library demanded my attention, and I willinging obliged. The word "reader" itself began to mold my identity. Teachers and family members labeled me a reader, and I wore that label like a badge of honor. In time, it was my turn to invite students into the world of reading. I was an elementary school teacher, and in a classroom of young, vulnerable minds, my words held power. With a single sentence I could shape a child's sense of self by casting

them into the role of reader. The power of my words, coupled with an already inherent power that exists in a teacher-student relationship, led me to choose my words carefully.

Eventually, my love of words, and my desire to share that love with teachers, propelled me into a new role: literacy coaching. Words became the means of building trust and beginning collaborative learning with teachers. Each word I selected in a coaching conversation was a calculated step in a complex dance. I was in constant fear of saying the wrong words, essentially stepping on the teacher's feet. My words had the power to build connections, or breed distrust. My words could empower a teacher, or cultivate self-doubt. I coach with the goal of developing relationships of trust and fostering teachers' belief in themselves and their practice. My conviction in the value and power of words in building trust and, consequently, teacher efficacy, has led me to ask the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy?

Collaborative Conversations

In the first years of my teaching career I began developing collaboration skills that would become the foundation of my coaching career. For five years I taught in an inclusive multi-age classroom in Wisconsin, where I served students with a wide range of strengths, abilities, and needs. I began collaborating with the special education teacher, Jackie (all names in this capstone are pseudonyms in order to protect identities), who was servicing several students in my class. We worked together to plan lessons that would reach all of our students, each of us bringing a different skill set to these planning sessions. These collaborative conversations were affirming and rejuvenating for me. I

would share an idea for a lesson, then Jackie would share an idea for differentiating the

lesson, and then we would continue to fine tune and build on each other's ideas until we

had a plan we believed would meet all of our students' needs. The final product was

better than anything either of us could have created individually. This level of

collaboration benefited our

students while simultaneously enhancing my own self-efficacy as a reading teacher. It

was inspiring to work with someone whose values and beliefs around students so closely

aligned with mine. There is a kind of magic that bonds two people together when they

work so passionately for the needs of students. My work with Jackie sparked a flame in

me that has fueled me to seek collaborative partnerships ever since.

Evolving Leadership

At the same time that I was engaged in rewarding collaborative work, I was

beginning to assume leadership roles in my school. During my fourth year of teaching

our instructional coach retired. My principal asked me to consider applying for the role. I

was surprised. "Reader" and "teacher" were part of my sense of self, but "coach" had

never crossed my mind. I could not imagine myself in that role. I was not ready to leave

the classroom, and I was at a point in my career where I knew just enough to know how

very little I actually knew. While I turned down the role of coach, I did agree to become a

lab classroom for a new comprehensive literacy model the district was test piloting. The

principal hired a teacher from another school to step into the role of literacy coach, and I

would be working closely with that coach to implement the new literacy model in my

classroom. Although I did not realize it at the time, this was an important stop on my journey to becoming a literacy coach.

The impact of feedback. Prior to my work with the new coach, I received little constructive feedback. I had been told on many occasions that I was "a good teacher" and that I should continue to "do a good job." This praise certainly felt nice, but it gave me very little information as to how I could continue to grow as a teacher. This all changed when I became a lab classroom and started working with the coach. She entered my classroom, surveyed my classroom library, and told me how it was set up all wrong. I was shocked; I had never received such blunt feedback, and we had only just met. Because others had defined me as a "good teacher," I had bought into a good/bad dichotomy that shaped my teaching identity. In her position of power, this coach's words mattered. Clearly, her words impacted me, as I still remember them today and the shame I felt in that moment. While her constructive feedback pushed me to reconsider my own black and white notions of "good teacher/bad teacher," it also taught me the value of building relationships of trust in order to create a context for feedback.

The Power of Partnerships

A desire to return to my roots and be near my family led me to move to Minnesota prior to my sixth year of teaching. I accepted a teaching position in a diverse school within a first-ring suburb. Though brief, my time spent in this district marks a period of intense professional growth. I was blessed with high quality professional development through the district's partnership with Teacher's College, a role model literacy coach, and an ideal teammate. The literacy coach, June, operated at a level I

continue to aspire to reach. June often came into my classroom, leaving notes with feedback. I saved every sticky note and every email she ever wrote me. It was not her position of power that made her words mean so much to me, instead, it was the level of respect and trust I had for her. In our coaching conversations she was authentic, supportive, and responsive. June did not label me as a "good" or "bad" teacher, instead she acknowledged areas of success, and invited me to reflect on next steps for growth. Her words inspired both a growth mindset about my teaching and a belief in my own abilities as a reading teacher.

My partnership with Jackie in my previous district left me craving to be part of a collaborative team in my new school. I knew that I did my best work when sharing ideas with other passionate teachers. I was gifted with such an opportunity in my second year in the district. I became part of a team with Brooke, a committed educator who shared a similar passion for collaboration. I looked forward to our planning sessions. We took our learning from Teachers College and worked together to make it our own. We found joy in sharing and building on each other's ideas. We took risks, tried new approaches, and were not afraid to push each other's thinking. My admiration and respect for Brooke inspired me to be my best self when we collaborated. Not only did I flourish professionally from our conversations, our students benefited as well. We served them with a quality of instruction that I believe is only possible when two motivated teachers come together. Through my professional development opportunities with Teacher's College, my coaching from June, and my collaboration with Brooke, I grew more professionally in my two years at that district than I had in all my years teaching prior.

A Call to Coaching

Some people see the role of coaching as a calling. My invitation to coaching quite literally came in the form of a call. A principal I had previously worked with called me to say that her new district was hiring literacy coaches and she had thought of me as a potential candidate for the position. I had never pictured myself taking on the job of a literacy coach, yet I could not ignore the fact that this was the second time a person I respected asked me to consider the role. I wondered if they saw something in me that I could not yet see. In a moment of risk-taking I applied for the position. During the first interview I was asked what qualities a coach should have. In responding with the words "reflective," "passionate," and "collaborative" I realized I was describing some of my better qualities. This was the first moment I saw myself as a possible literacy coach. The interview process was rigorous, and by the end of it, not only could I see myself as a literacy coach, I was also desperate for the chance to take on the challenge. The final call came, and I was offered the role of a literacy coach. With equal parts elation and trepidation, I accepted the job.

Implementing a Balanced Literacy Model

The year before I was hired, the district invited an outside consultant to review their literacy practices. One of the consultant's recommendations was the hiring of literacy coaches. This is where my job came from. In years prior, the district had used a basal reading program and had one coach for all eight elementary schools to support it. The district was now moving away from that basal reading program and replacing it with a balanced literacy model. It was my job as part of the coaching team to support the

implementation of balanced literacy. I was assigned to work at two schools: Victoria

Elementary and Silver Lane Elementary (the names of educational institutions in this

capstone have been replaced with pseudonyms for the sake of privacy). For most of the

teachers it would be their first time working with a literacy coach, and, in many cases,

their first time using a balanced literacy approach.

The role of a coach was a mystery to me once I became one. I knew the

system-wide work I was hired to do, yet was not sure exactly how this work looked on a

day-to-day basis. Uncertainty and anxiety spread over me, as I looked at my blank

calendar for the first week of school. I decided that informally visiting classrooms to take

the pulse of current literacy practices would be an ideal place to start. What I observed

was in juxtaposition to my experiences and training around balanced literacy. I witnessed

students all reading the same story out of identical hardcover basal readers, regardless of

reading levels or student interests. I discovered students sitting through forty minute

whole class lessons, followed by a worksheet to prove their learning. Small groups for

individualized instruction were few and far between, and when they did happen students

engaged in round robin reading of isolated passages. These assigned texts, lengthy whole

class lessons, and worksheets left little room for independent reading, student

self-selected texts, and differentiated instruction- all hallmarks of a balanced literacy

approach. It became evident that I had significant work to do in supporting the

implementation of a balanced literacy model.

Rationale

Under the direction of my supervisor, and with the guidance of the principals at both of my sites, I began my coaching work by identifying a few focus teams to coach. One team in particular, my fourth grade team at Silver Lane Elementary, embraced my support and the new literacy practices with open arms. I drew on my passion for collaboration to work closely with the team. We planned units and lessons together, they invited me into their classrooms to model specific components of balanced literacy, and we even took a field trip to my old district to see a balanced literacy approach in action. As I walked through their classrooms during literacy time, the individual teachers appeared to be applying their learning. It felt like my first signs of success as a literacy coach.

My celebration was short lived. Several months into the school year, I walked down the fourth grade hallway, casually stopped by Erica's room one afternoon, and unwittingly walked into the most significant learning moment of my coaching career to date. Erica happened to be analyzing the results of a recent standardized district assessment her students had just completed. She took one look at me, then back at the test scores, and burst into an uncontrollable sob. She said she felt exhausted. She worked incredibly hard to implement the new balanced literacy model, and yet her scores had dropped. Erica went on to say that she had failed me, and further, was worried that she was not teaching her students enough. She expressed frustration in not being able to do everything perfectly.   Erica was ready to go back to the old way of teaching literacy. While she did believe her students loved reading more as a result of the new model, she shared that she did not think anyone in the district cared about that aspect of reading, and

it certainly was not measured on the test. This moment is seared into my memory as one of the most painful in coaching. It was hard for me to see a teacher I cared so much about experience such a deep level of self-doubt. I felt like she had listened to my suggestions, trusted me, tried to do everything I said, and then became devastated when it did not transfer to test scores.

Reflection. After recovering from the emotional drain of that interaction, I took time to reflect later that day. Everything seemed to be going so well with that team's implementation of balanced literacy and Erica specifically stood out to me as a teacher that had embraced the new model. I saw her as a future leader in our school that could help me guide other teachers towards a balanced literacy approach. Yet, the results of a single standardized test had caused her to doubt herself and this new model. Especially concerning to me was her claim that she had "failed me." That single phrase revealed the underlying mistake I had made. I realized that in our coaching conversations, I was making it about me and what I wanted. This revelation caught me off guard.

As a classroom teacher I was careful to create opportunities for students to take ownership over their learning and work. Through the words I choose I created a culture where students were not just completing an assignment because I told them to, but instead for themselves because of the learning and growth it would afford them. As a coach, I seemed to be doing just the opposite. I had unintentionally selected words during coaching conversations that centered on what I wanted literacy to look like. To my dismay, it dawned on me that the reason the fourth grade team had been so eager to implement the new model had more to do with their desire to "do things right" than their

passion for a new approach to literacy. In misinterpreting their motivations, I got busy telling them what to do, patting them on the back for doing a "good job," and skipping over the part where I helped them develop a sense of purpose, ownership, and self-efficacy.

I am forever grateful for this emotional and difficult moment in coaching. It led me to reflect on and question my approach to supporting teachers. It became my mission to create a sense of self-efficacy in teachers in a way that would empower them to own their balanced literacy practices. My next step was figuring out how, exactly, to accomplish this.

The importance of building self-efficacy in teachers continues to weigh on me in my coaching role. As I enter my third year in the role and in this district, system changes require an even higher level of teacher self-efficacy. When I was first hired, both schools ability grouped for reading. They used the results of a standardized test to place students in high, medium, and low reading classes. This model of homogeneous grouping allowed teachers to target a narrow range of reading abilities. The teachers working with the high students became very knowledgeable and experienced in teaching students reading beyond grade level, and the same was true for each teacher in relation to the level of their reading group.

When I was hired I had some concerns about the equity of this model. I was not alone in these concerns, and eventually both of my schools moved to a heterogeneous model of grouping for literacy instruction. This year is the first year for teachers at Silver Lane Elementary, and the second year for teachers at Victoria Elementary. From an

equity standpoint, this is exciting. From a teacher efficacy standpoint, this is challenging. Many teachers have expressed anxiety that they will not be able to meet the variety of needs in their classroom. Teachers that were previously able to focus on meeting the needs of one level of readers must now learn how to meet the needs of a diverse range of abilities, all while working on learning and implementing a balanced literacy model. For this reason, I am motivated to learn how the language and words I use in coaching conversations can foster self-efficacy in teachers around meeting a wide range of needs in their classroom.

Conclusion

The impact of words in shaping my own world is undeniable. The words of stories read to me as a child thrust me, head first and wholeheartedly, into the world of reading. My love for those words inspired me to pursue a career in the field of literacy and ultimately share that love with others through the role of literacy coach. Throughout my career, I have found that I thrive professionally when engaging in collaborative conversations with colleagues. I have experienced the power that words can have during collaborative partnerships in constructing and molding a person's identity and sense of self. My desire to choose empowering words when coaching teachers has motivated me to research the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy?

The remainder of this capstone is dedicated to answering this question. Chapter two examines the scholarly research in relation to this question through a literature review. Chapter three details the methods for conducting research in pursuit of an answer

to this question. Chapter four presents the results of the research, along with an analysis

and interpretation of the findings. Chapter five reflects on the implications and limitations

of the research conducted.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

"A dialogue is a conversation about a better future. Every dialogue can be a hopeful interaction, proof that we believe a better future is possible."
-Jim Knight

Introduction

In chapter one I delineated my journey from reader, to teacher, to literacy coach, and detailed the role words played in shaping my identity and experience each step of the way. I discussed the partnerships and conversations that taught me the impact collaboration and dialogue can have on self-efficacy. I named my struggle to choose words that would both develop bonds of trust and empower teachers as they strove to implement new literacy practices in a classroom with a wide range of student needs and abilities. My desire to choose words that inspire and affirm teachers in ways that lead to learning and growth has caused me to consider the relationship between coaching conversations, language, and self-efficacy.

In this literature review I synthesize the work and research of scholars in order to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? The first section of this chapter explores the concept of self-efficacy. Next, the second section of this chapter focuses on the components of an effective coaching conversation. The third section of this chapter then considers the language used in coaching conversations. The fourth section integrates key concepts from the previous sections in order to study the intersection of self-efficacy, coaching

conversation, and language. The final section concludes with a summary of the chapter, and provides a preview of chapter three.

Self-Efficacy

This first section focuses on self-efficacy with the aim of better understanding the concept in order to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? It commences with an exploration of models of self-efficacy and their evolution over time. The section then outlines the benefits of high self-efficacy in teachers. Next, the section presents an alternative perspective regarding the negative consequence of high self-efficacy in teachers. From there, the section proceeds to discuss the sources of self-efficacy, along with the factors that impact it. Then, the section narrows in on the impact of coaching on both self-efficacy and implementation of literacy practices. The section concludes with a consideration of the relationship between self-efficacy and educational reform.

Models of Self-Efficacy

Conceptions of self-efficacy have evolved over time. Current understandings of self-efficacy are rooted in the work of psychologist Albert Bandura (1977), which expands to all disciplines. Bandura introduced the notion that individuals develop beliefs about their own capacity to perform a task at a desired level (1977, 1997). He was particularly interested in self-efficacy as a cognitive process, wherein individuals receive input from external sources and then develop a self-assessment of their own level of competence based on that input. In this model, self-efficacy can be understood as a means

for acquiring and retaining new behavior patterns. Bandura (1977) postulated that an individual encounters one of four sources of efficacy: verbal persuasion, vicarious experiences, mastery experiences, and physiological and affective states. These four sources will be defined and explored in detail later in this chapter. After an individual encounters one of the sources, consequent cognitive processing either positively or negatively impacts the individual's sense of efficacy. The resulting level of efficacy then determines whether or not the individual engages in the task in future situations.

The prevailing model. Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy (1998) built on the work of Bandura to develop a new conception of self-efficacy. They posit two components of self-efficacy: self-perceptions of teaching competence and consideration of the teaching task and context. This conceptualization accepts Bandura's view that individuals construct efficacy through self-assessments of one's capacity to perform a specific task at a desired level, and adds to it the notion that when deciding whether to take on a task an individual considers their own perceived abilities given the task and context. In short, an individual evaluates their own capabilities with regards to the specific task while accounting for the particular context and constraints that make the task difficult. Tschannen-Moran et al. elucidate: "It is in making explicit the judgement of personal competence *in light of* an analysis of task and situation that our model improves upon previous models" (p.233). In adding to Bandura's model of self-efficacy Tschannen-Moran et al. introduced a new understanding of self-efficacy that has influenced the field of education for almost two decades.

An alternative model. Recently, researchers have begun to challenge the dominant model of teacher efficacy put forth by Tschannen-Moran et al.. Wheatley (2002) and Wyatt (2016) question models that favor high levels of efficacy and problematize efficacy doubts. While Wyatt agrees with Tschannen-Moran et al.'s interpretation of self-efficacy as a cognitive process, and their understanding of the multidimensional nature of self-efficacy as both an analysis of the teaching task and an assessment of personal competence, he asserts that the flaw in their model is a missing component between the input from sources of self efficacy information and cognitive processing of that information. In other words, receiving input from sources of self-efficacy does not automatically lead to cognitive processing of that information. Wyatt asserts that the missing component is reflection. In Wyatt's model of self-efficacy, an individual receives input on self-efficacy, then engages in reflection, which in turn leads to cognitive processing. Without reflection the sources of input may not impact self-efficacy.

Wyatt bases his model heavily on the work of Wheatley (2002) who argues against the traditional view that higher levels of self-efficacy are ideal. Instead, Wheatley asserts that doubts in self-efficacy are necessary for teachers to learn and grow, as these doubts create a disequilibrium that has the potential to motivate teachers to reflect on and change their practice for the better. Wyatt (2016) concurs, and argues that reflection is essential for growth in teacher self-efficacy. In this assertion, Wyatt introduces a model that embraces self-doubt and reflection as crucial in developing self-efficacy.

Common components of self-efficacy conceptualizations. Despite differing conceptions of self-efficacy, there are several elements common across all models. Researchers agree that self-efficacy refers to a perceived competence rather than an actual level of competence (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). This is to say that an individual's level of self-efficacy does not necessarily accurately reflect their capacity. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) describe self-efficacy as a future-oriented belief, since the individual is imagining the level of proficiency they will demonstrate in a given situation. As such, the actual level of competence they show in that situation may or may not align with their perceived and predicted competence for it. Wheatley (2005) insists that levels of teacher efficacy must not confused with levels of teacher effectiveness. Because self-efficacy is based on an individual's perceptions, self-efficacy levels may be overestimated, underestimated, or may accurately reflect their effectiveness. In general, research has revealed that teachers tend to overestimate their effectiveness (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011).

The specificity of efficacy. Researchers also agree that self-efficacy is not an overarching concept. Instead, self-efficacy is context specific, task specific, (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), situation specific (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011) and specific to subject matter (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). This means that teachers may have a high level of efficacy in one subject, such as reading, and not another, such as math. A teacher may even have efficacy for a specific task within one subject and not another. For example, a teacher that experiences efficacy for teaching

comprehension in a whole group format in literacy may demonstrate low efficacy in teaching comprehension in a small guided reading group.

Types of self-efficacy. Additionally, researchers concur that there are different types of self-efficacy. The different types of efficacy include, but are not limited to: general teacher efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher self-efficacy in literacy instruction. General teacher efficacy is a teacher's beliefs about the ability of teachers in general to impact student outcomes (Wheatley, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Teacher self-efficacy, also referred to as personal teaching efficacy, is more specific to the individual teacher, reflecting their belief in their own ability to impact student outcomes (Wheatley, 2000; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Teacher self-efficacy in literacy instruction is even more specific, referring to a teacher's belief in their ability to impact student outcomes in the subject of literacy instruction.

While these different types of efficacy are related, they are not interchangeable. General self-efficacy beliefs tend to be more stable. These beliefs are more dynamic in early learning; however, they typically become more fixed and resistant to change once established (Bandura, 1997). Consequently, most career teachers have high general self-efficacy beliefs. Along the same lines, novice teachers with doubts in general teaching efficacy typically raise their level of efficacy within the first few years or leave the profession (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Wheatley, 2002), whereas novice teachers with higher general teacher efficacy are more likely to stay in the field (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1982 as cited in Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In short, general self-efficacy beliefs become solidified within the first years of teaching and tend

to remain fixed. On the other hand, teacher self-efficacy beliefs are more fluid and dynamic (Wyatt, 2016). A teacher may demonstrate high general self-efficacy on the whole, while their teaching self-efficacy beliefs in a given subject or technique may fluctuate.

Benefits of High Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy continues to be a salient topic in the field of education due to the numerous benefits associated with high levels of efficacy. Self-efficacy has advantages for teachers and their students. In his seminal research on self-efficacy Bandura (1977) provided a compelling reason for emphasis on efficacy. He asserted that a person's beliefs in their own abilities is more powerful than their actual abilities for a given task in terms of that person's level of motivation, persistence, resilience, and actions. He revealed that an individual's belief in their own self-efficacy determines the amount of effort they will put forth and how long they are willing to persist when they encounter obstacles and difficult experiences. The higher the level of efficacy, the more effort invested. Furthermore, self-efficacy impacts the level of a teacher's resilience when they face failure and how much stress they experience in a demanding situation (Bandura, 1997). Teachers with higher self-efficacy also select more challenging tasks and show more commitment towards their goals (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008 as cited in Burić & Macuka, 2017).

Persistence and resilience. The reason for a higher level of persistence and resilience in teachers with higher self-efficacy is connected to their perceptions. People with higher self-efficacy see environmental demands as less threatening and more

challenging, whereas individuals with lower self-efficacy see themselves as less capable of dealing with environmental demands (Jerusalem and Schwarzer, 1992 as cited in Burić & Macuka 2017). In summation, a teacher with high self-efficacy invests more effort, demonstrates more resilience, takes on more challenges, and exhibits more commitment to their work than a teacher with lower efficacy, because they view themselves as more capable of handling environmental challenges.

Mental health and emotions. Self-efficacy also correlates with teacher mental health and emotions. A higher level of self-efficacy is associated with positive emotions. Burić & Macuka (2017) found that teachers with higher self-efficacy in regards to the demands of their job were more engaged in their work. They also discovered that teachers with higher self-efficacy experience more joy, pride, and love towards their students, and less anger, fatigue, and hopelessness than teachers with lower self-efficacy. Similarly, Bandura (1977) revealed that people that view themselves as less efficacious experience more feelings of distress, anxiety, depression, and helplessness. Efficacy levels become significant for a teacher's mental health even in the first years of their job. Novice teachers with higher efficacy report a greater sense of satisfaction, a more positive reaction to teaching, and experience less stress (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Overall, high efficacy is linked to healthy, positive emotions for teachers.

Teacher and student perceptions. Self-efficacy also plays a powerful role in influencing how a teacher perceives and responds to their students. Teachers with higher self-efficacy believe in a child's ability to be successful, and consequently put more time and effort into instruction (Vartuli, 2005 as cited in Shidler, 2009). They also teach a

subject more clearly, use more interesting delivery, and produce more positive outcomes.

Furthermore, teachers with higher efficacy levels are less likely to criticize a student that

gives an incorrect answer and more likely to persist with a failing student

(Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Striving students in particular benefit from a teacher

with high self-efficacy. Educators teaching remedial courses are more likely to rate their

students as increasing in achievement and effort if the teacher has higher levels of

self-efficacy. This is likely a reflection of the teacher's belief in their own ability to be

instructionally effective (Miller, Ramirez, & Murdock, 2017). In short, teachers with

positive self-efficacy believe in their ability to impact student outcomes, while teachers

with negative teacher self-efficacy do not believe they can affect student outcomes, either

because of a lack of capacity or because of contextual factors (Wheatley, 2000).

Teacher's self-efficacy also influences student perceptions. Increased teacher efficacy is

correlated with perceived teacher competence and respect on the part of students (Miller

et al., 2017). Higher self-efficacy results in a more positive perception of students on the

part of teachers, and of teachers by their students. This positive perception may result in

more effort and persistence for both educators and the students they serve.

Instructional benefits. Finally, self-efficacy has instructional benefits. Teachers

demonstrating high self-efficacy are more willing to experiment with, and implement,

new teaching techniques. High efficacy teachers are more open to engaging in

instructional experimentation, including using a variety of materials and approaches,

searching for better ways of teaching, and attempting to implement more progressive and

innovative methods (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Bishop, 1992 as cited in Tschannen-Moran et al.,

1998). One example of this is that high efficacy teachers are more likely to teach using small group instruction (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), a type of instruction that differs from a more traditional whole class lecture approach. Additionally, there exists positive correlations between teacher self-efficacy and both teacher and student ratings of instructional quality (Holzberger et al. 2013 as cited in Miller & Murdock, 2017). Higher levels of instructional quality are a logical consequence of willingness to experiment with new teaching approaches. When a teacher attempts different instructional methods they are more likely to find techniques that meet the unique and varied needs of their students, rather than teaching the way they have always taught regardless of student needs. Teachers and students benefit when teachers exhibit high self-efficacy.

Disputing the Value of High Self-Efficacy

There is debate regarding the value of high self-efficacy. Research has found that teachers tend to overestimate their knowledge and abilities. Bandura (1997) asserts that this overestimation is useful because it can lead to more effort, persistence, and resilience. In turn, he views low efficacy as the enemy, asserting, "insidious self-doubts can easily overrule the best of skills" (p.35). Simply put, Bandura understands low self-efficacy as an obstacle to implementation of a given task or behavior. For example, a teacher that has low efficacy for implementing small groups during their literacy instruction is likely to allow their self-doubt to prevent them from attempting this beneficial literacy practice.

In contrast, Wheatley (2002) asserts that doubts in self-efficacy can be important because they lead to reflection, whereas overestimation in abilities can lead to

complacency. For example, the same teacher that doubts their ability to use small group instruction likely demonstrates a high level of efficacy for their instruction using a whole group approach. This teacher may overestimate their abilities to instruct using this more traditional approach, and become complacent in their literacy practices as a result. In this way, high self-efficacy can be damaging to attempts at change and reform (Wheatley, 2005). Teachers that are overconfident in their effectiveness lack incentive to reflect on their practice or make improvements in their instruction. Over efficacious teachers may be more resistant to change and growth.

Disadvantages of high self-efficacy. Despite the plethora of benefits related to positive teacher self-efficacy outlined in the previous section, researchers have also identified a number of disadvantages to high self-efficacy. Wheatley (2001) identified eight types of harmful teacher self-efficacy, seven of which connect to resistance of reform for more progressive methods, including: efficacy connected to traditional methods, efficacy connected to traditional goals, too-certain efficacy, the overly-optimistic novice, hypothetical future efficacy, pretend teacher efficacy, and efficacy based on independent teacher control.

Self-efficacy in traditional teaching methods. In the case of teacher efficacy connected to traditional methods, the teacher's high efficacy is tied to the use of traditional teaching methods (Wheatley, 2001). These teachers may lack motivation to try a new method because their high self-efficacy is tied to past successes with the old, traditional approach. Reforms, then, threaten their sense of efficacy, and the anticipation of a decrease in efficacy while trying new approaches may prevent them from adopting

new methods. For example, a teacher that has experienced success teaching

comprehension using a more traditional approach of whole class basal reader and an

accompanying workbook with comprehension questions, may be reluctant to teach

comprehension strategies through a reading workshop approach that allows students to

practice the comprehension strategy in authentic texts of their choosing. This reluctance

stems from the uncertainty of not knowing whether they will be successful with the new

method.

      Self-efficacy in traditional goals. Efficacy connected to traditional teaching

methods ties closely with Wheatley's (2001) second variety of harmful high efficacy:

teacher efficacy connected to traditional goals. In this situation, teachers' high efficacy is

connected to their perceived ability to help students attain traditional goals. Traditional

goals are usually easily measured and observed, which can provide a sense of

self-efficacy. More progressive teaching methods are typically more difficult to measure.

Returning to the previous example, the teacher that has all students reading the same text

and completing a workbook page can easily look at each student's completed page to

determine success in the comprehension strategy. Conversely, it is more difficult to

measure a student's use of a comprehension strategy applied to their own text, when each

student is reading a different book and there is no worksheet to complete. This is not to

say there are not ways to measure success in the second example, only that they are

harder to measure. In both teacher efficacy tied to traditional methods and efficacy

connected to traditional goals a teacher's high levels of efficacy may prevent them from

attempting new methods that would challenge their past successes and diminish their perceived efficacy.

Too-certain self-efficacy. A third type of detrimental efficacy is too-certain efficacy (Wheatley, 2001). Teachers with overconfidence in their capacity may not be compelled to try new strategies and implement new learning. These teachers tend to have a fixed-mindset, meaning that they believe ability and intelligence are fixed rather than dynamic (Dweck, 2000). Because of this fixed-mindset these teachers are less willing to take risks and learn from failure. Too-certain efficacy leads these teachers to resist change and the disequilibrium in practices that inevitably accompanies it.

Self-efficacy and the overly-optimistic novice. A fourth type of harmful efficacy according to Wheatley (2001) is the overly-optimistic novice. Over optimism sets the stage for major disillusionment (Ross, 1998 as cited in Wheatley, 2000). Teachers with high levels of efficacy for a new practice may become deflated when their perceived competence does not match their actual ability. This over optimism and consequent disappointment makes it more likely that reforms will be abandoned.

Hypothetical future efficacy. A fifth form of harmful efficacy is hypothetical future efficacy (Wheatley, 2001). In this case, a teacher believes they could have an affect on students, if only certain things would change. The things that would need to change tend to be things beyond the teacher's control. Hypothetical future efficacy results in a teacher that believes in their own capacity, while allowing their context to prevent them from reforming their practices. High levels of self-efficacy have little value when a teacher perceives environmental barriers as limiting their effectiveness.

Pretend teacher efficacy. A sixth type of damaging efficacy is pretend teacher efficacy (Wheatley, 2001). In an effort to appear confident, teachers may hide their uncertainty and failures. The result is that the teacher's need for support and growth is also hidden. Pretend teacher efficacy occurs when too much value is placed on self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy tied to independent teacher control. The seventh adverse form of high self-efficacy is efficacy based on independent teacher control (Wheatley, 2001). Reforms tend to shift from a teacher control centered approach to a more student centered and hands-on approach. Teachers embracing a reform take less credit for student outcomes than those using a traditional approach, because they are giving students more ownership over their own learning. Some teachers may resist reform because they do not want to let go of such a direct sense of efficacy resulting from a teacher controlled approach.

Competitive teacher efficacy. High self-efficacy can also be disadvantageous in the area of teacher collaboration. Wheatley (2001) described a type of efficacy he calls competitive teacher efficacy which prevents, rather than promotes, collaboration. When a teacher is motivated by a desire to be seen as one of the most effective teachers, they are less willing to share ideas and collaborate with others. In fact, Wheatley argues that the concept of teacher efficacy itself does not fit with democratic teaching. Teacher efficacy focuses on an individual teacher's efficacy, whereas democratic teaching focuses on collaborative teaching.

The value of low self-efficacy. Just as high efficacy can be detrimental, low efficacy has the potential to be beneficial. Efficacy doubts can encourage new learning and promote reform. Research reveals that doubts in self-efficacy can increase effort, self-regulation, and achievement when the person believes they are capable of learning (Schunk, 1994 as cited in Wheatley, 2005). When teachers have a growth mindset, uncertainty can create a disequilibrium that fosters reflection, a motivation to learn, and, consequently, change. Furthermore, self-efficacy doubts encourage collaboration, decrease the inclination to return to traditional teaching, prevent dogmatic thinking in reform efforts, and prevent teacher burnout (Wheatley, 2002). The benefits of low self-efficacy stand in direct contrast to the disadvantages of high self-efficacy. Low efficacy levels encourage learning, change, reform, and collaboration.

Sources of Self-Efficacy

Essential to any conversation on self-efficacy is a consideration of the sources of, and impacts on, efficacy. Bandura (1977) identified four sources of efficacy: verbal persuasion, vicarious experience, mastery experience, and physiological states. It is through cognitive processing of these sources that an individual's beliefs about their own efficacy are formed.

Verbal persuasion. Verbal persuasion as a source of efficacy may include words of encouragement, specific feedback, and strategies for overcoming obstacles (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Verbal strategies that enhance teachers skills will only impact efficacy if they are used successfully in a way that results in student learning. Additionally, verbal persuasion is most impactful when used in combination with other

sources of efficacy, such as vicarious or mastery experiences (Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009).

      Vicarious experiences. A vicarious experience involves watching another person perform activities without negative consequences (Bandura, 1977). This observation can lead the observer to believe that they can improve in the task if they intensify their efforts and persist. There exist a number of factors that impact the effectiveness of vicarious experiences. Vicarious experiences are most powerful when the modeler shares knowledge, skills, and strategies for the task through their behavior and by revealing their thinking about the task (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Vicarious experiences also work best when the modeled behavior has clear, rather than ambiguous, outcomes. Additionally, they have a greater impact when the observer identifies with model (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In the field of education, a vicarious experience may involve another teacher or coach modeling a lesson or strategy. When a teacher sees a successful teaching interaction, they are more likely to view the task as manageable (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

      Physiological state. An individual's physiological state is another source of self-efficacy. A person that associates stress with an activity is less likely to develop skills for coping with the stress. In turn, this inability to cope with the stress creates a sense of fear for the activity (Bandura, 1977). A teacher's level of emotional arousal as they anticipate and practice teaching influences their efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

Mastery experiences. The final and most influential source of self-efficacy is mastery experiences. When an individual perceives that they have performed a task successfully it raises their efficacy beliefs. Mastery experiences are past experiences used to predict success in future performances (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Thus, a teacher's perceptions of their past teaching experiences influences the level of efficacy they hold for similar tasks in the future. Mastery experiences provide authentic evidence as to an individual's ability to succeed in a particular context or task.

Mastery experiences reveal the cyclical nature of efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Successful mastery experiences lead a teacher to believe in their effectiveness, which inspires the teacher to put forth more effort and persistence. This increased effort leads to further successful teaching experiences, which in turn serves to enhance that teacher's self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Conversely, repeated failures in teaching experiences leads to lower self-efficacy, which leads to the teacher investing less effort and giving up more readily. This decreased effort then produces less effective experiences, which in turn serve as further proof of lack of competence. In this way, self-efficacy beliefs can become self-fulfilling prophecies (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). Success raises self-efficacy, while repeated failure lowers it (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Failure can be especially detrimental when it occurs early in the learning process. It should be noted, however, that occasional failures that an individual is able to overcome through effort can actually strengthen self-motivation and persistence. Overall, when success is achieved early in the learning process without too many setbacks, mastery experiences fuel a high

level of self-efficacy. Accordingly, professional development of teachers should include mastery experiences that help teachers identify improvement in student learning in order to increase self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Continued success through mastery experiences fuels teacher self-efficacy.

Factors unrelated to self-efficacy. Several noteworthy factors have been found to be unrelated, or minimally related, to teachers' sense of self-efficacy for literacy instruction. One such factor is the number of years teaching, and the attaining a higher degree of education (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). After the initial years of teaching where teachers either improve their teacher self-efficacy or leave the field, there is no correlation between the number of years teaching and the level of efficacy. Additionally, the setting of the school, such as urban, rural, or suburban, and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced meal does not affect teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). Number of years teaching and school demographics do not ultimately influence teacher self-efficacy levels for literacy instruction.

Factors negatively impacting self-efficacy. There exist several factors that diminish self-efficacy. Not surprisingly, excessive role demands, poor morale, lack of recognition, low salary, low status, professional isolation, uncertainty, and alienation all lead to low teacher self-efficacy (Webb and Ashton as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). It seems that when a teacher does not feel respected, validated, or connected their self-efficacy declines.

Factors positively impacting self-efficacy. A number of factors have been identified as increasing self-efficacy. As previously mentioned in the discussion of mastery experiences, past success correlates closely with higher efficacy. Success in implementing a strategy, along with consequent gains in student achievement can lead to an increase in self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). A clear impact on student gains is an important element in influencing efficacy. Teachers need to see increase in student learning before their self-efficacy increases.

Another factor that impacts teacher self-efficacy is mindset. Whether a teacher believes that abilities and strategies are fixed or that abilities and strategies can be learned and improved with training and experience affects a teacher's efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1993 as cited in Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Challenging beliefs about intelligence as fixed rather than dynamic can have positive effects on self-efficacy (Ross 1995 as cited in Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Along with a growth mindset, the freedom to make decisions also affects teacher self-efficacy. A positive correlation exists between the level of freedom a teacher is given to make decision in the classroom and a teacher's sense of self-efficacy (Moore & Esselman 1992 as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). When teachers feel empowered and trusted to make decisions, their efficacy increases.

Research has identified several other factors that predict teachers' sense of efficacy specifically in the area of literacy instruction (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). A teacher's ratings of the quality of their teacher preparation program is connected

to higher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. Participation in quality professional development experiences, and in collaborative book studies with colleagues also correlates to levels of efficacy. External factors such as analysis of teaching task and context, and having resources available to purchase books for classroom use, also influence teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. Finally, the level of school where they teach, be it elementary, middle, or high school also predicts efficacy levels. Higher efficacy beliefs exist for teachers working with younger children (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

Impacts for novice teachers. Impacts on self-efficacy are different for novice and veteran teachers. Because their levels of efficacy are not yet stable, there are several factors that have a stronger influence on the efficacy of novice teachers. One such example is the availability of teaching resources. Having access to resources significantly impacted self-efficacy beliefs for novice, but not experienced, teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Furthermore, novice teachers have fewer mastery experiences, so other sources of self-efficacy become more important in developing their self-efficacy. Verbal persuasion from administrators, colleagues, and the community is more important for novice teachers' self-efficacy than career teachers. New teachers with a greater opportunity for collaboration with other adults indicate higher levels of self-efficacy. Additionally, new teachers who gave higher ratings to the adequacy of support they received at the end of their first year reported higher self-efficacy (Hoy & Spero, 2005). While mastery experiences make the strongest contribution to novice and career teachers' self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007), other efficacy sources

become equally valuable for new teachers that have fewer mastery experiences to draw

on and a more dynamic teacher efficacy level.

The Impact of Coaching on Self-Efficacy

Coaching is *the* crucial component in fostering teacher self-efficacy.

Tschannen‑Moran and McMaster (2009) found that coaching leads to an increase in a

teacher's self-efficacy in their literacy practices. It makes sense that time spent with

another individual knowledgeable in the area of literacy would enhance one's efficacy

beliefs in that area. It is important to note, however, that not all coaching sessions are

equally impactful. Shidler (2009) argued that the correlation between coaching and

self-efficacy is not as simple as the number of hours spent coaching. More important is

the quality and the type of the coaching interaction. Coaching interactions that focus on

specific content and teaching methods, rather than general abilities, prove more effective

in influencing teacher self-efficacy. Shidler contends that this focused coaching must be

supported by modeling of techniques, observing the teacher, and engaging in reflective

conversations. Along the same lines, teachers find coaches less helpful when the

coaching is not focused on specific content, nor followed by modeling of techniques and

instructional practices, and reflection. Focused coaching helps turn ideas from

professional development trainings into classroom practice.

Coaches play an integral role in developing teacher self-efficacy due to their

ability to support cognitive processing of any of the four sources of efficacy.

Tschannen‑Moran and McMaster (2009) assert that the most influential method for

increasing teacher self-efficacy is professional development involving opportunities for

mastery experiences, coupled with coaching support. Teachers benefit most when coaches help them process situations where they experience success implementing new learning in the context of their classroom.

Conversely, vicarious experiences and mastery experiences without coaching support can lead to a decrease in teacher self-efficacy. Watching a coach model a lesson, or having a successful experience with a lesson themselves, may not lead to increased efficacy unless it is followed by cognitive processing with that coach. This negative impact on self-efficacy may result from the teacher developing an understanding of how the task could be implemented successfully, while doubting their own ability to do so at the same level, thereby generating feelings of inadequacy. Tschannen‑Moran and McMaster (2009) postulated that coaching in conjunction with vicarious and mastery experiences provides an opportunity for reflective conversations to overcome the doubts that arise when a teacher views a gap between their practice and the new skill. They elucidate: "The follow-up conversations and assistance received during coaching may have allowed for deeper processing of the information presented and helped bring teachers' skill levels in line with their revised standards of good practice, resulting in strengthened self-efficacy" (p.243). This fits with Wyatt's (2016) assertion that teacher self-efficacy is enhanced through reflection. The value of a coach lies in their ability to engage teachers in reflective conversations that encourage cognitive processing of efficacy sources.

Coaching to overcome self-efficacy doubts. When teachers face self-efficacy doubts a coach can support them in ways that lead to accelerated efficacy. Teachers

typically experience an efficacy dip when attempting to implement a new technique (Hoy & Spero, 2005; Ross, 1994 as cited in Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). This dip has the potential to counteract teacher persistence in implementation. Coaching can help mitigate these doubts, providing teachers with the encouragement, support, and feedback during change process to persevere through this initial dip (Guskey 1986, 1989 as cited by Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Coaching support through self-doubt is especially important for new teachers. Hoy and Spero (2005) assert that coaching support may be a key component in protecting teacher efficacy for novice teachers. Wheatley (2002, 2005) asserts that it is the role of the teacher educator to learn what teachers' doubts are, and prepare teachers to deal with efficacy doubts. I would add that it is also the role of the coach to help teachers see these doubts as opportunities for growth. Wheatley maintains self-efficacy doubts are only beneficial if teachers have some belief that they can learn how to become more effective. Coaches can help cultivate this growth mindset in teachers by examining their doubts and reframing them as opportunities for new learning and change.

Coaching and implementation. The relationship between coaching and efficacy can ultimately lead to implementation of new practices. Literacy coaching is one form of effective, job-embedded professional development (Shidler, 2009). Isolated whole-staff professional development sessions are the first step, not the final step, in supporting application of new teaching methods. Implementation of new instructional strategies increases when there is follow-up coaching (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011) Teachers increase in efficacy and implementation of a new strategy when they engage in

professional development through information, followed by modeling, mastery learning, and coaching (Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009). Coaching along with mastery experiences makes it more likely that instructional strategies introduced to teachers through professional development will be implemented. Implementation of new literacy practices also has the potential to lead to student achievement. For example, in a study conducted by Shidler (2009) there was a positive correlation between the time spent coaching in classroom and student achievement. In the study, the implementation of a new literacy technique supported by coaching resulted in an increase of student letter recognition. These results show that when professional development involves coaching, teachers are more likely to implement new strategies, and, as a result, student achievement increases.

The Relationship Between Educational Reform and Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy and change are deeply intertwined. Implementation of new literacy practices is positively correlated with teacher efficacy (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). There exists a relationship between teacher efficacy and response to reform. Teachers' reaction to change depends on whether they see it as a threat or challenge. Teachers with low self-efficacy are more likely to see change as a threat. This perception of threat leads to either avoidance of new techniques or superficial belief change. Cantrell and Callaway (2008) explain, "Teachers with lower senses of efficacy may be less receptive to change, and it may be more difficult for them to work through the barriers inherent to content literacy implementation" (p.1748). During the change process teachers with lower self-efficacy are concerned about the impact it would have on them, whereas teachers

with higher self-efficacy are concerned with how the changes would impact their students and their school, and how they could refine their practices (McKinney et al. as cited in Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009).

In contrast, teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to see change and reform as a challenge (Gregoire, 2003 as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). They see themselves as having the resources, support, and time necessary to implement the changes in ways that result in more systematic changes (Gregoire, 2003 as cited in (Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009). Self-efficacy levels affect how teachers perceive new learning. Teachers with higher efficacy that are exposed to training are more likely to rate the new method as more important, more congruent with their current teaching practices, and less difficult to implement (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). High efficacy teachers see change as important and possible, whereas low efficacy teachers disengage from reforms (Scribner, 1999 as cited in Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009).

Self-doubt and reform. While willingness to change requires high teacher self-efficacy, consequent changes in instructional practices require a decrease in self-efficacy. Teacher efficacy doubts are necessary for effective education reform, as they can create an impetus for reflection and new insights (Wheatley, 2002). Change requires disequilibrium in teacher's thinking, which often causes uncertainty. This disequilibrium creates a cognitive dissonance that humans have a psychological need to resolve (Wheatley, 2002). The desire to resolve such an internal dissonance can result in motivation for inquiry and new learning. Wheatley (2002) asserts that doubts in self-efficacy can be important because they lead to reflection, whereas overestimation in

abilities can lead to complacency. Complacency lies in direct opposition to reform, as Wheatley (2000) details: "Although efficacy beliefs foster motivation and persistence, they only do so concerning that with which one feels efficacious- which by definition is *not* reformed teaching" (p.23). Cognitive dissonance and doubt, not high self-efficacy, create the foundation for reform.

The self-doubt propelling individual teacher change is temporary. There exists a curvilinear relationship between teacher efficacy and change implementation (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Change is usually accompanied by a decrease in teacher efficacy. Increases in efficacy usually follow changes in teaching practices, rather than leading it (Guskey, 1986 as cited in Wheatley, 2000). Coaches leading reform must find ways to recognize and deal with the loss of efficacy around traditional teaching practices that will occur when teachers experiment with new reforms methods (Wheatley, 2000).

Teachers need to see increase in student learning before their self-efficacy will increase. Efficacy beliefs flourish again once teachers experience success with the initiative and consequent increases in student learning (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009) Teacher efficacy can be developed with extended professional development that causes teachers to challenge their existing beliefs. With the right, meaningful professional learning, initially resistant teachers may change over time (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008).

The different types of self-efficacy become significant in conversation around the value of low self-efficacy in the process of change. Because general self-efficacy remains stable, while teacher self-efficacy is more dynamic, teacher self-efficacy beliefs are more

easily impacted by change and self-doubt (Wyatt, 2016). This has a number of implications. First, it suggests that work at the task specific level will be most impactful. Second, Wyatt infers it may also mean that general self-efficacy beliefs can be protective, as teachers take on a new task and experience a dip in their teaching efficacy, as long as the two tasks are similar (Wyatt, 2016). Providing teachers with strategies and support in one content area may transfer to a more general sense of self-efficacy (Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009). Third, it means that teacher self-efficacy contributes to the development of a more stable and robust general self-efficacy. In other words, work done increasing teacher self-efficacy on a particular task can enhance that individual teacher's general self-efficacy.

Outcome expectancies. A teacher's willingness to invest effort in educational reform is also correlated with their perception of outcome expectancies. Central to understanding Bandura's (1977) definition of self-efficacy is the distinction between efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. An efficacy expectation is the belief that a person holds that they can successfully carry out the behavior needed to perform a specific task (1977). Efficacy expectations indicate an agent means relationship wherein an individual believes they are capable of executing the actions necessary for a task (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In contrast, an outcome expectancy indicates a means-end relationship, as it is a judgement of the likely results of a specific act when the task is performed at the expected level of competence (Bandura 1986 as cited in Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In short, outcome expectancies ascertain whether the action will attain certain outcomes. It is important to note this distinction, because an

individual may have self-efficacy for a given task, yet may not engage in that task if they do not believe it will result in desired results. As such, outcome expectancies can provide incentives or disincentives for engaging in a certain behavior (Bandura, 1977). For example, a teacher may believe they have the capacity to teach using a balanced literacy approach, however, if they do not believe this approach will produce a positive impact on student achievement, they will not use this approach despite a sense of efficacy. Efficacy expectations and outcome expectancies differ, however, both play a role in whether an individual will attempt and implement a particular task.

The impact of outcome expectancies on reform. A teacher's response to outcome expectancies impacts their persistence in implementing reform. Research shows that high implementers, as in teachers that implement new techniques, believe it is the obligation of the teacher to impact student learning regardless of challenges outside of school, such as a difficult home life (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Conversely, low implementers, as in teachers that do not implement new techniques, focus on limitations to student learning and motivation from challenges outside of school. They express the belief that teachers have little power to impact student literacy learning (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Both high and low implementers experience barriers, failures, and discomfort as they attempt to implement new literacy strategies (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). However, high implementers persist through these barriers in ways that then allow them to experience some amount of success with the new strategies (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Low implementers report less success in overcoming barriers while attempting to implement new strategies (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Low implementers

typically view new strategies as an "add on" to the curriculum (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). In summation, high implementers persist in their implementation of new teaching methods, whereas low implementers view outcome expectancies due to environmental challenges as impeding their ability to implement new techniques.

This section investigated the theories regarding self-efficacy through a synthesis of relevant research and literature. It began by examining how notions of self-efficacy have evolved over time, along with the common features across those various models. It then highlighted benefits and disadvantages of high teacher self-efficacy, sources of and impacts on efficacy, the influence of coaching on teacher efficacy, and the relationship between teacher efficacy and reform. The next section will center on coaching conversations.

Coaching Conversations

This section seeks to define the ideal coaching conversation in order develop the context for answering the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? This section begins by describing a traditional model of coaching conversations, and the negative ramifications associated with that model. It then introduces a new model of coaching conversations founded in a dialogical approach. Next this section explores the major components of effective coaching conversations. Finally, this section closes with a consideration of the change that arises from effective coaching conversations.

Traditional Model

Traditional models of coaching conversations position coaches in the role of authority (Armstrong, 2012). In such models, coaches are the holders of knowledge regarding both the content and the process. Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) label this the "tell and sell" method, as the coach acts as an expert telling others what to do in an attempt to convince teachers to change.

A banking model of coaching. This traditional approach to coaching conversations is grounded in what Freire (1970) refers to as the banking method of education. In a banking model of education the teacher views the students as empty containers to be filled with the teacher's knowledge. While Freire's work focuses on the relationship between teachers and students, it can be extrapolated to a coach and teacher situation as well. If coaches can be considered teachers, and the teachers they support considered their students, then this same model can be applied to the coaching conversation. In a banking model of coaching, the conversation becomes an opportunity for the coach to fill the teacher with their knowledge.

The dominant approach. Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) claim that the model of coach-as-expert is really not coaching at all. They detail a leadership continuum with supervising at one end and coaching at the other. When leaders are working in the "supervising zone" of the continuum they give advice, ask loaded questions they already know the answer to, solve people's problems for them, and tell people what to do. Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) advise leaders and coaches to spend no more than five percent of their interactions with teachers in the "supervising zone." In spite of this, this banking model of coaching dominates most coaching conversations (Nowak, 2003;

Heineke, 2010, as cited in Heineke, 2013). In a study of one-on-one coaching interactions

Heineke (2013) found that the majority of the interactions were monopolized by a

directive, or telling, model of coaching. Traditional banking models of coaching prevail

in the field of education.

   The negative consequences of a traditional approach. The traditional model of

coaching conversations is problematic due to the many negative effects it produces. This

type of top-down communication with the coach as the expert telling others what to do

feels easier for leaders, however, it is typically unsuccessful (Knight, 2016). On a

school-wide level it fosters competition among teachers and undermines collaboration

(Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). For individual teachers it threatens motivation, stifles

inspiration, decreases responsibility, subverts relationships, discourages risk-taking,

limits imagination, and decreases results (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

The traditional model also leads to power struggles, disillusionment, and decreased

performance (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). In short, coaches often act

as experts with the goal of producing results efficiently, instead, their approach

undermines their efforts.

   Dehumanization of teachers. Worst of all, a banking model approach to coaching

conversations is dehumanizing (Freire, 1970). Knight (2016) contends, "when we silence

other people . . . we fail to recognize them as fully alive, complete human beings. A

top-down conversation turns others into objects, things- receptacles for our ideas, not

partners" (p.71). Put simply, engaging in a banking model of coaching conversations

objectifies teachers. Such an approach favors the coach's perspective, leaving little room

for alternative points of view (Wall & Palmer, 2015). It disempowers teachers and diminishes their voice (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011).

A banking model of coaching conversations creates what Peter Johnston (2012) refers to as "asymmetrical power relationships" (p.56). Position and identities are relationally constructed. When one person is in a position of power it abates the power of the other person participating in the interaction (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011). In traditional models of coaching conversations the coach gains power as the initiator, the person in control of the conversation, and the "guardian of the space in which meaning is constructed" (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011, p.111). This in turn places the other participants in a passive role, effectively taking away their agency and voice.

A New Model

The negative effects of the traditional model of coach-as-expert has led many scholars in the field to explore alternatives. A new model of coaching conversations has emerged that displaces the coach from their position of authority and recasts them as an equal partner in the collaborative process (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010; Knight, 2016; Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). In this new model, the coach becomes a partner in the teacher's growth journey, supporting and challenging them in the process (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

A humanizing view of teachers. This new model of coaching conversations rejects traditional views of teachers. Teachers are treated as whole and competent, as Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) explicate: "Coaching is a way of listening and speaking to colleagues that assumes a belief that others are whole and capable. Others don't need to

be 'fixed'"(p.9). In contrast to traditional methods, collaborative coaching does not focus on fixing people or problems (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Rather than telling answers or providing solutions, the coach creates the conditions for the teacher to reflect and find their own answers (Wall & Palmer, 2015). Such an approach is founded on the notion that learning and change must come from authentic concerns and questions of the teacher themselves (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009 as cited in Crafton & Kaiser, 2011), rather than top-down initiatives.

Inherent in this approach is the belief that teachers are capable adults who have the resources within to figure things out for themselves (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Engaging in the process of sharing ideas and making decisions together requires the coach to believe that teachers bring a great deal of knowledge and experience to every interaction (Knight, 2011). This lies in direct contrast to a banking model of education, which views the learner as an empty vessel (Freire, 1970). When coaches engage teachers as partners with ideas and experiences, decisions are created jointly and success is collaborative, rather than the result of any one person. (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). The outcome is a balanced, symmetrical power relationship.

A partnership approach to conversations requires coaches let go of the role as the person that must always have the "right" answer (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Coaches are often hired for their knowledge and experience. However, rather than using it to tell teachers what to do, in a collaborative model coaches use it to facilitate conversations that support the development of ideas and decisions in a way that builds the capacity of teachers (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010) This fits with adult learning theory, which asserts that

adult learning should be facilitated rather than directed (Cox, 2006; Knowles, 1950, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Lindeman, 1926 as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Put simply, the role of the coach in a collaborative conversation is that of facilitator.

The benefits of a partnership approach. There are many benefits to a collaborative approach to coaching. Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) explain that it can inspire curiosity, raise levels of self-efficacy, lead to more freedom and increase positivity. Most importantly, a partnership approach to coaching disrupts asymmetrical power relationships (Johnston, 2012). Crafton and Kaiser (2011) describes how the role that the coach invites a teacher to play in a conversation becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy: "When teachers participate as knowledgeable professionals, capable of engaging in reflective and collaborative inquiry, that is who they become" (p.112). Collaborative coaching conversations cast teachers into active roles. As a result, coaches become the instruments for inspiration and humanization of teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

Dialogical Conversations

New models of collaborative coaching conversations go by many different names. Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) call it "evocative coaching," as these conversations have the power to unleash, or evoke, a teacher's full potential (p.8). Knight (2016) refers to such conversations as "better conversations" (p.2). Regardless of the label, these models share many common components, most significantly of which is their foundation in Freire's (1970) notion of dialogue.

Dialogue involves an honest exchange of ideas between two people (Wall & Palmer, 2015). It is "the flow of meaning between two human beings as they interact" (Armstrong, 2012, p.33). Freire (1970) describes it as a "mutually humanizing form of communication (p.cite)." As mentioned previously, this humanization only becomes possible when all members of the conversation have an equal voice. Because of its collaborative nature, dialogue has the ability to equalize power between groups in ways that can transform education. Wall and Palmer (2015) explicate, "When coaches work dialogically with teachers, they form a partnership where power is equally shared between both of them and all ideas are honored" (p.639). It can be energizing and empowering for teachers to be regarded as equals and invited to share their ideas and solutions to problems (Wall and Palmer, 2015).

Dialogue is a shared process of making meaning (Knight, 2016). The aim of a dialogue is to engage in a learning conversation wherein each person understands, listens to, and is shaped by the other person's thoughts (Knight, 2016) This means the coach must set aside the desire to push their own point of view (Knight, 2011). Dialogic conversations allow for multiple interpretations and perspectives, and the construction of meaning from those perspectives (Johnston, 2012). Armstrong (2012) describes the constructive nature of coaching through dialogue: "Coaching is a meaning making activity . . . the purpose is to explore the ways that the coachee constructs meaning about any given situation. As this exploration occurs, meaning is re-authored and solutions to dilemmas or problems emerge." (Armstrong, 2012, p.33). In a dialogue, meaning is co-constructed by both the coach and the teacher.

The structure of a dialogical discourse. Dialogical conversations are characterized by a back and forth structure, where all participants are actively engaged in making meaning together (Knight, 2016). This lies in contrast to a traditional conversation which follows a sequence of question and answer, where the "expert" poses most of the questions, and sometimes also evaluates responses (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011). Armstrong (2012) describes dialogue in opposition to monologue, the latter involving a coach "talking at" teachers, the former involving a coach "talking with" teachers. A dialogical conversation involves more discussion and exploration than traditional coach-as-expert conversations (Heineke, 2013). The key to a dialogical conversation is the equality that exists among all participants. There must be shared ownership over all parts of the process, otherwise the participant's role will become more narrow which will diminish the quality of collaboration and the knowledge they create (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011).

The role of the coach in a dialogical conversation. In a dialogical conversation the coach becomes a co-collaborator, engaging teachers in the meaning-making process through authentic discussion and turn taking (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011). The task of the coach in such a dialogue is to empower teachers, reconnect them with their passions, and push them to develop their own plans for higher levels of professional mastery (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). To accomplish this, the coach must center the conversation on the teacher (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). They must surface the best of the teacher, encourage the teacher to share their perspectives, and draw out the teacher's expertise (Knight, 2016;Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

Coaches must engage teachers as decision makers and support them in coming up with their own ideas (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010; Knight, 2016). Such an approach requires coaches to be humble, curious, and a strong advocate for teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). It requires that the coach be open to not knowing, and to taking risks (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Most of all, to engage in true dialogue, a coach must be fully present, and metacognitive (Armstrong, 2012). They must constantly reflect on their own role during the interactions, and be reflexive and responsive with the goal of maintaining the space of dialogue, so that learning can take place (Armstrong, 2012). Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) acknowledge that such an approach to coaching is not easy, they reveal: "It is, in fact, counterintuitive to the typical way we think about leadership happening. Instead of being the problem solver and idea generator, the leader becomes the keeper of the vision and the one who helps *others* succeed (p.87). Thus, the role of a coach in a dialogical conversation subverts traditional coaching and leadership roles.

Components of Effective Coaching Conversations

In addition to fostering the conditions for dialogue, there are a number of essential components all coaching conversations must have in order to produce learning and change. These components are supported by a dialogical model of conversations.

Building trust. Trust is an essential component of effective coaching conversations. Learning cannot take place until a foundation of trust has been established (Knight, 2016). Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) elucidate: "Without a solid foundation of trust and respect, no coaching alliance can generate a productive and

fulfilling change process" (p.35). Trust is the first step in the change process. People want to know what an individual's intentions are towards them, and whether that person has what it takes to act on those intentions (Knight, 2016). If a teacher does not trust their coach, they will dedicate their energy to protecting themselves in case of betrayal or disappointment (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). When teachers trust their coaches, a positive relationship becomes possible. In Heinke's (2013) study of one-on-one coaching interactions, the participants named positive relationships as the most important element of coaching. This need for trust and positive relationships is universal, as humans are hardwired for connection (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). A strong relationship of trust becomes the foundation for coaches to motivate and empower teachers to improve their own performance (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

There are a number of ways in which coaches can actively foster trust. Coaches can build trust by being vulnerable, honest, and open, and by demonstrating genuine concern for the coachee (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Another way for a coach to establish trust is by being reliable. This means being consistent so teachers know they can depend on the coach, and following through on promises (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Finally, coaches can also build trust by demonstrating competence in their subject matter and in the change-management process (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Teachers trust coaches that know their content and understand how to facilitate change. Earning a teacher's trust is not a one-time event. Trust must be earned in each moment of a conversation; it must be

established and continually maintained (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

As such, trust cannot be taken for granted.

Showing Respect. Trust is also established through a communication of respect for

teachers. Coaches must show respect for teachers' contributions. Contribution is a

universal human need; teachers want to know that they are making a difference

(Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).This fits with adult learning, which

asserts that adults want to be treated as equals and shown respect for their knowledge

(Cox, 2006; Knowles, 1950, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Lindeman, 1926

as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches can also demonstrate

respect for teachers by seeking out and acting on their opinions (Knight, 2011). When a

coach fails to respect teacher voice by reverting to a coach-as-expert approach, it violates

trust because "it implies that the coachee is a problem needing help rather than an equal

participant in a collaborative space" (Armstrong, 2012, p.39). In order to convey respect

and consequently foster trust, coaches must approach all interactions with the belief that

the other person has a valid point of view and ideas worth hearing (Wall & Palmer,

2015). This is a compelling argument for a dialogical approach to coaching

conversations, since such a model treats each person as an equal partner (Armstrong,

2012). In short, true dialogue generates respect and trust.

Suspending judgement. Judgement undermines trust. It is imperative that coaches

create safe spaces where teachers can share what they think, even if it conflicts with the

coach's own perspective (Knight, 2016). This safe space is only possible when coaches

are non-judgemental (Knight, 2016). Coaches must live in the present moment of a

conversation, free from judgements, generalizations, and exaggerations

(Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). When coaches make assumptions it

interferes with their ability to listen, because they then interpret what the teacher is saying

through the lens of that assumption (Knight, 2016). Furthermore, when coaches do not set

aside their judgements, they listen for flaws in what the teacher is communicating,

looking for ways to discredit them (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). True dialogue requires

setting aside any preconceptions in order to honestly understand each other's perspectives

(Wall & Palmer, 2015).

Additionally, judgement destroys equality and creates unsafe spaces for

conversations (Knight, 2016). Judgment conveys the message that only one person has

the correct answers (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Judging ideas inhibits the possibility of

creative thinking and problem solving (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). It also causes teachers

to depend on the coach, and undermines their self-confidence (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010).

Avoiding judgement requires the coach to place themselves beside a teacher, instead of

above, therefore subverting a potential asymmetrical power relationship (Johnston, 2012).

Symmetrical power relationships only become possible in a safe, judgement-free

conversation.

Valuing strengths. Effective coaching conversations require coaches to take a

strength-based approach. Coaches must identify and build on teacher's strengths, rather

than taking a deficit-based approach by focusing on finding and "fixing" their

weaknesses (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Acknowledging strengths

has the power to foster respect and trust (Knight, 2016). Knight (2016) calls this "being a

witness to the good," wherein a coach shares positive noticings with a teacher in way that encourages, validates, and inspires them. Whatever a coach celebrates is likely to be replicated, as Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) explain, "what we appreciate, appreciates" (p.238). Dialogical conversations are inherently strengths-based, as they function on the premise that all teachers have the capacity to find their own solutions (Armstrong, 2012).

Employing a strength-based approach means having faith in teachers. Coaches must have faith that every teacher has their students' best interest at heart, and that they are driven by a desire to make a difference in the lives of their students (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010; Wall & Palmer, 2015). To show this faith, coaches need to look for signs of progress, and point out to teachers the difference they are making (Wall & Palmer, 2015). This type of validation ultimately leads to growth and change (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

A strength-based approach meets teachers where they are at in order to move them forward. Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) detail, "We seek to discover the best of what is happening now in order to build those dynamics into the best of what might be possible in the future" (p.247). Coaches must listen to teacher's stories in order to appreciate their strengths (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches can then utilize those strengths to help teachers overcome challenges and obstacles, and achieve their goals.

Listening. Listening lives at the heart of all effective coaching conversations. It is crucial that coaches do more listening than talking (Tschannen-Moran &

Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Listening validates the needs and values of the coachee (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). It also fosters trust, making it a key component of relationship building (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Most importantly, listening to teachers gives them a voice. All humans have a universal need to have a voice, to be valued, and to be recognized as a competent person (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Listening allows teachers to be heard.

Partnerships are created when teachers know their coach wants to hear their ideas. This shows that the coach views the teacher as a partner (Knight, 2011). Coaches demonstrate humility when they engage in honest listening with a spirit of curiosity about the teacher's point of view (Wall & Palmer, 2015). Listening conveys to the coachee that they are valued, that the coach wants to engage in a dialogue, not a monologue (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Johnston (2012) describes the way in which being heard can empower an individual: "It is through persistently being heard that we take ourselves seriously and view ourselves as agentive." (p.102). In sum, when coaches listen to teachers' ideas it sends the message that they are capable of producing ideas worth acting on.

Coaches must avoid dominating the conversation in order for learning to occur (Knight, 2016). When coaches do most of the talking teachers do not have the opportunity to process their thinking, thereby decreasing the potential for teacher learning (Heineke, 2013). Conversely, coaching episodes that include more teacher talk hold more potential for teachers to use language to build meaning (Heineke, 2013). Listening gives the coach access to the teacher's perspective (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Aguilar (2013) explains the power of listening to a teacher's perspective: "The deeper we listen, the

broader our understanding, and the greater our chances are for finding an access point to cause profound transformation" (p.148). A teacher's stories are the raw materials of a coaching conversation (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches listen to a teacher's stories to find what meaning teachers are making of their experiences, what needs are arising, and what strategies are working better than others (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches can then turn a teacher's stories into opportunities for learning and growth (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

Unproductive listening patterns. Coaches must refrain from unproductive listening patterns (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Autobiographical listening is one type of unproductive listening. This occurs when a coach listens for ways in which the teacher's stories connect to their own lives. The coach then tells their connected story, making the conversation about the coach instead of the teacher (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Another type of unproductive listening is solution listening. This happens when the coach is too quick and eager to provide the teacher with a solution (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Rather than trying to solve the teacher's problems for them, coaches must listen without a sense of obligation to act. Teachers may not be sharing their stories because they want a solution. Instead, people often share their stories because they want the listener to witness their passion, acknowledge their feelings of frustration, and show empathy for the concerns (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). A third unproductive listening pattern is interrupting. Listening means avoiding interrupting at all costs (Knight, 2016). Interrupting shifts the focus from the coachee to the coach, and suggests that the coach's ideas are more valuable than the teacher's.

Productive listening habits. There are a number of listening habits coaches should employ. Instead of engaging in autobiographical listening, coaches must learn how to listen until they do not exist (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). This is only possible when coaches set aside their own agenda, which then opens up space for teachers to learn about themselves and discover their own answers (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches can show teachers they are truly listening by paraphrasing what the teacher has said (Knight, 2016).

Along with this, coaches should allow spaces for silence (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Silence communicates comfort and respect, and creates room for teacher's feeling, needs, and desires to arise (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). The silence coaches honor in conversations mirrors the wait time teachers provide their students in classrooms (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Wait time allows for better processing of information. Additionally, given wait time, responses will often include higher order thinking skills (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). In every conversation, coaches must listen deeply by giving teachers their undivided attention (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). This means staying in the present, instead of getting one step ahead of ourselves, and avoiding changing subjects too soon (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

Demonstrating empathy. Another essential component of effective coaching conversations is empathy. Coaches must display empathy for teachers' feelings and universal needs in order to move conversations forward (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). People are more open to change when the process involves

empathy and connection (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Empathy is tied to listening, as it helps teachers feel understood and appreciated, and leaves them feeling truly heard (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

In order to show empathy, it is essential that coaches set aside preconceived notions of the coachee. Before entering a conversation, coaches must clear their minds of negative thoughts that might make it difficult to demonstrate empathy (Knight, 2016). Empathy comes from seeing people as subjects, rather than objects, as Knight (2016) elucidates: "The way to fight for equality, or freedom, or respect is to see all people as fully human, not to dehumanize them by reducing them to a stereotype. And the way to do this is by demonstrating empathy" (p.45). In short, empathy is humanizing. To experience empathy coaches must avoid reducing people to types, and instead see them for their uniqueness (Knight, 2016).

Questioning. Questioning is a key component in effective coaching conversations. It is imperative that coaches must do more asking than telling (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). There are endless benefits to asking instead of telling. Such an approach elevates people as experts in their own lives, establishes trust, creates connections, engages and motivates, assists teachers in accessing their inner expertise and empowers leadership from within (Armstrong, 2012). Furthermore, questions have the power to open up conversations, foster respect, increase learning, and build relationships (Knight, 2016).

Questions also have the power to reduce asymmetrical power relationships (Johnston, 2012). Questions that promote symmetrical power relationships are

open-ended, assume positive intentions, and have multiple answers (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010; Johnston, 2012). Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) assert that coaches must ask powerful questions that open the conversation up, rather than closing it down in ways that put people on the defense and make them feel inadequate, frustrated, or dependent. Powerful questions allow for new perspectives and multiples possible answers, rather than one right answer (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Such questions are solution centered, rather than focusing on problems (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). These types of questions empower teachers, and get at deeper patterns of thinking (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010).

Knight (2016) argues that the particular questioning technique is less important than approaching a conversation with a questioning mindset. A questioning mindset involves entering a conversation with genuine curiosity. Questioning is a form of listening, and coaches can use questioning to learn more about what the teacher is trying to tell them. This type of questioning involves asking questions the coach does not already know the answer to. Knight (2011) explains that "Coaches ask questions of their partners because they are more concerned with getting things right than with being right" (p.21). This level of questioning and listening allows the coach to understand the meaning a teacher is making. With a questioning mindset, coach and coachee co-construct the conversation together. In opposition to a questioning mindset is the use of questions to control the other people. An example of this is when coaches ask questions they think they already know the answer to (Knight, 2016). Questions should be used to explore meaning, not control the coachee.

Reflection. Questioning can support teachers in reflecting on their practices. Reflection occurs when the questions coaches ask support teachers in exploring their stories (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). In collaborative conversations questions can be used as a tool for facilitating the construction of new meaning around the teacher's experiences (Armstrong, 2012). Coaches can use reflective questioning to push the coachee to make new connections and discover alternative viewpoints (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010).

The role of the coach in facilitating reflection is to capture and honor the cognitive shifts that happen during reflection, and articulate what actions teachers will take as a result of those shifts (Armstrong, 2012). Reflective conversations can lead to enhancing techniques that work, adjusting practices that do not work as well as they could, and getting rid of practices that are getting in the way of what does work (Peterson, Taylor, & Schock, 2009).

Ultimately, reflection leads to change. Peterson et al. (2009) explain that the purpose of a reflective conversation with a literacy coach is to, "deepen the teacher's understanding of how students learn by facilitating self-reflection to bring about change in classroom instruction, which has the potential to lead to student achievement" (p.501). It is the students that benefit when coaches engage teachers in reflection on their practice.

Change comes from learning, and learning occurs when people participate in the construction of meaning from their experiences, and then take action (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). However, human brains inherently resist change (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Change in behavior requires new patterns of thinking that result from

deep reflection and ongoing practice. This reflection and ongoing, intentional practice creates new neural pathways in the brain. Coaching conversations allow for the reflection that can ultimately help develop these new neural pathways in the brain (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010).

Inquiry into possibilities. Effective coaching conversations involve inquiry into different possibilities. Exploring different possibilities creates a level of uncertainty needed for true dialogue, as Johnston (2012) explains: "It is the perception of uncertainty that enables dialogue. Dialogue, in turn, sustains uncertainty. If there is certainty, or only one view, there is nothing to learn. Uncertainty is the foundation of inquiry and research" (p.59). Learning is only possible when there is more than one possible answer or outcome.

Being open to possibilities means being unattached to outcomes. Coaches need to let go of the notion that their answer is the only right answer (Knight, 2016). From a social constructivist perspective there are multiple ways of seeing the world, and a coach's way of seeing things is just one way (Armstrong, 2012). Coaches should avoid imposing their experience and ego onto the teacher (Armstrong, 2012). When coaches are attached to a particular outcome, they stifle creativity and limit possibilities (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Teachers need a safe space to take risks and explore ideas freely (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). The coaching space should be a judgement-free space for teachers to explore their intrinsic motivations and identify their best next steps in reaching them (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches need to approach conversations as a "testing ground

for ideas" (Knight, 2016). Coaches can do this by helping teachers brainstorm different possibilities in order to find the answer themselves (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches must repeatedly ask teachers to consider what else is possible in order to raise awareness that there are multiple ways to tell a story (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). This level inquiry leads to innovation of teaching techniques and practices (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

Inquiry into possibilities allows for the complexity of teaching. Because teaching is a complex process, no one practice should be done exactly the same way (Knight, 2011). Different things work for different people. As such, solutions and approaches designed in a coaching conversation must be interesting to the teacher, doable, and relevant to the challenges they encounter (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Coaches should encourage teachers to reflect on how they can adapt a practice to fit their style and meet their student needs (Knight, 2011). Inquiring into different possibilities empowers teachers to individualize practices to fit their classroom.

Exploring possibilities through dialogue leads to a better future (Knight, 2016). Coaches can help teachers see possibilities for the future, moving the teacher from a stance of resistance and ambivalence to a place of enthusiasm and clarity for their vision and goals (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) extol the virtues of exploring possibilities: "Instead of reacting to the worst of what is, teachers will start 'reacting to the best of what might be" (p.251). When the teacher plays a role in generating new meaning and possibilities, the resulting changes they make to their practice are more likely to be sustained (Armstrong, 2012).

The combination of inquiry and empathy opens teachers up to change and engages teachers in the process (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

Empowerment through ownership. Effective coaching conversations empower teachers by giving them ownership over their own growth and learning. Coaches can empower teachers by helping them see themselves as having the capacity to solve their own problems (Armstrong, 2012). Johnston (2012) describes the power of what he calls an "agentive narrative," a narrative where people see themselves as people that act and make decisions that produce a desired outcome. The role of the coach is to assist teachers in rehearsing an agentive narrative, where they view themselves as someone that accomplishes goals by acting strategically (Johnston, 2012).

One way to foster an empowering agentive narrative is to give teachers a great deal of autonomy (Knight, 2016). The idea of ownership through autonomy is supported by adult learning theory, which asserts that adults are autonomous and self-directed (Cox, 2006; Knowles, 1950, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Lindeman, 1926 as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Autonomy is motivating. Learning becomes enjoyable when it is self-directed (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Furthermore, people are more likely to implement and embrace a plan they had a voice in (Knight, 2016). Autonomy can be cultivated through choice (Knight, 2016). Such autonomy is only possible when coaches believe that teachers have the creativity and intelligence to determine for themselves how to achieve success (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). In a truly dialogical conversation the coach respects, rather than undermines, the autonomy of the teacher.

Dialogical conversations are by their very nature empowering. Talking "with" someone gives that person voice, while talking "at" someone diminishes their voice, making them invisible and of little value (Armstrong, 2012). When coaches make meaning with the teacher they empower them, when they provide meaning for the teacher they take away the teacher's power (Armstrong, 2012). Dialogical conversations give teacher a voice by making sure teachers are talking much more than coaches, therefore giving teachers ownership of their own growth and learning (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

Teachers currently experience a great deal of disempowerment in education (Wall & Palmer, 2015). It is the task of the coach to empower teachers to become decision makers and critically thinking problem solvers (Wall & Palmer, 2015). Teachers become empowered when coaches help them discover, acknowledge, and celebrate the competence that already exists within them (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran (2010) explain, "When teachers know that coaches believe in their capacity to change and achieve desired outcomes, they are more likely to get out of their own way and try new strategies" (p.44). An unwavering belief in a teacher's capacity can ultimately empower teachers.

Avoid advice. In direct conflict with empowerment of teachers is the act of giving advice. Scholars agree that coaches should avoid giving teachers advice. Giving advice is an act of dominance (Heineke, 2013). When coaches give advice they make teachers dependent on them for solutions and answers (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Advice giving sends the message that the coach is more capable than the teacher, and that the coach

knows best (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Furthermore, giving advice can interfere with the development of teacher's self-efficacy and limit the ideas teachers come up with themselves (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). It silences other ways of thinking (Armstrong, 2012). Knight (2010) warns: "When professionals are told what to do- and when and how to do it, with no room for their own individual thought- there is a good chance they are not learning at all" (p.19). In short, dispensing advice impedes learning.

Trying to control others through advice giving is dehumanizing (Knight, 2016). Advice shuts down dialogue, as it casts the teacher in the role of someone that is lacking or needs to be fixed it some way (Armstrong, 2012). Truly dialogical conversations view all participants in a conversation as capable, therefore rendering advice in a coaching conversation unnecessary and unproductive.

Feedback. In lieu of advice giving, effective coaching conversations involve providing teachers with feedback. Quality feedback builds teacher capacity (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Johnston (2012) contends: "The purpose of feedback is to improve conceptual understanding or increase strategic options while developing stamina, resilience, and motivation- expanding the vision of what is possible and how to get there" (p.48). Feedback should ultimately create strategic, resilient, and motivated teachers.

Feedback has the power to motivate and inspire learning when it is timely, specific, and strength based (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Feedback should be direct and specific, naming the details of what the coach is praising (Knight, 2016). Adult learning theory maintains that adults benefit from specific, non-evaluative feedback (Cox, 2006;

Knowles, 1950, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Lindeman, 1926 as cited in

Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010).

   Communicative feedback. Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) assert that feedback is most

meaningful when is it communicative rather than conciliatory. They describe conciliatory

feedback as positive, yet vague and empty. In an attempt to avoid offending the listener,

the speaker omits criticism, thereby choosing the relationship over the message. Leaders

that give conciliatory feedback believe they are avoiding being negative and harming the

relationship with the teacher. Instead, conciliatory feedback is perceived as evasive or

superficial (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). In contrast, communicative feedback first clarifies

the idea being explored, and then communicates both positive components and areas for

improvement. Teachers perceive communicative feedback as honest and respectful

(Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). While communicative feedback takes more time, thought and

effort, in the end it is more valuable than conciliatory feedback (Cheliotes & Reilly,

2010).

   Feedback fostering a dynamic-learning mindset. Johnston (2012) emphasizes that

the feedback teachers give students impacts the type of narrative they form about

themselves[1]. He argues that teachers should give feedback that furthers an agentive

narrative and a dynamic mindset. The feedback a teacher gives can foster either a

fixed-mindset or a dynamic one. A person with a fixed-performance mindset believes that

people have fixed traits, such as intelligence, that they cannot change (Johnston, 2012).

---

[1] Johnston's work centers on teacher and student relationships, however, because of minimal studies considering the impact of feedback from a coach on a teacher I have turned to the work of Johnston to consider how feedback can impact a teacher's narrative about themselves. Johnston's exploration of how teacher feedback and language shapes student self-views aligns with this capstone's exploration of how a coach's feedback and language influences a teacher's self-efficacy.

An individual with a dynamic-learning mindset believes that people can improve through learning and hard work (Johnston, 2012). People with a fixed-performance view will pass on a learning opportunity rather than risk revealing perceived incompetence. They will choose tasks that are easy in order to have success and look good (Johnston, 2012). Conversely, people with a dynamic-learning view see mistakes as opportunities for learning, and are therefore more willing to take on risks (Johnston, 2012). Furthermore, people with a dynamic view tend to be more open to feedback, since they do not see criticism as personal, but as an opportunity to learn (Johnston, 2012). For these reasons, a coach that aims to support teacher growth and learning must give feedback that encourages a dynamic-learning view.

Feedback that encourages a dynamic mindset focuses on effort, strategy, and process (Johnston, 2012). Conversely, feedback that focuses on performance and permanents traits, such as intelligence, can have a plethora of negative effects. Fixed-view feedback focused on performance and permanent traits can lead the student to enjoy the activity less, making them less likely to choose the activity again (Johnston, 2012). It can also lead to less resilience in the face of challenges, make the student more likely to judge themselves and others, and cause the student to create unproductive narratives to explain their experience (Johnston, 2012). It can be extrapolated that fixed-view feedback could have the same impact on teachers in a coaching conversation as it does on students.

To support a dynamic mindset, feedback should treat all experiences as opportunities for learning (Johnston, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran,

2010). When a teacher makes a mistake, coaches should highlight what worked about the strategy, even though it not entirely successful (Johnston, 2012). When coaches do this it takes the attempts the teacher has already made and turns them into agentive experiences, rather than having them start all over (Johnston, 2012).

Life-giving. The final component of effective coaching conversations is that they are life-giving. Knight (2016) asserts that conversations should be energizing, proclaiming: "I go into conversations expecting that my conversation partners and I will leave conversations feeling more alive for having experienced them" (p.37). Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) concur, attesting that every coaching conversation should be positive and life-giving. Life-giving conversations are characteristized by energy, possibility, and safety, qualities that are only possible through dialogical conversations (Knight, 2016). It becomes clear once again that effective coaching conversations and dialogical conversations are one and the same.

Conversations become life-giving when coaches highlight teachers' aspirations, and help turn them into possibilities and empowered actions (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Life-giving conversations are valuable because they have the power to generate enthusiasm in teachers to take on challenges (Knight, 2016). Such conversations establish a connection between the participants that can inspire greatness (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). These conversations and connections can, in turn, galvanize and challenge teachers to reach levels beyond what they would do alone (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). The inspiration that happens during a life-giving conversation "invests ideas with emotional energy and moves people

to action" (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010, p.252). In summation, life-giving conversations inspire teachers to take action.

Transformation Through Conversations

Improving coaching conversations increases a coach's impact (Knight, 2016). When coaches engage teachers in life-giving dialogical conversations that value trust, empathy, listening, questioning, inquiry, reflection, empowerment through ownership, and feedback, teacher growth becomes possible. It is then up to the teacher to engage in their own transformation.

The responsibility for change lies with the teacher, not the coach (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). The role of the coach is not to be a change agent, it is, instead, to be a catalyst for change, inspiring teachers to change and collaborating with them in the process (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). Teachers take action when they believe they have what it takes (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). For this reason, coaches must convey unwavering confidence in the teacher's ability to learn and grow (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010). A dialogical approach to coaching conversations trusts and empowers teachers to be their own agents of change, as Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) explain, "We have learned that it is tough to get people to change when you are trying to change them. We have also learned that people can change themselves, often profoundly, when they are trusted and empowered to do so" (p.xx). When coaches stop trying to change teachers, instead becoming partners in the teacher's learning journey, teachers take ownership over their own growth and change.

The Language of Coaching Conversations

The previous section set the context for effective, dialogical, and transformative coaching conversations. This next section examines the impact of the words selected in a coaching conversation, in order to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? This section begins by summarizing the social constructivist perspective on dialogue and language. The section then proceeds to discuss the constructive nature of language with regards to meaning, reality, and identity. Next, the section explores dialogue as a tool for fostering new learning and transformation. Finally, this section ends by examining the intentional ways coaches can use language in a conversation.

Social Constructivism and Dialogue. Dialogical conversations favor a social constructivist perspective (Armstrong, 2012). Social constructivists contend that truth is co-constructed in social situations through language (Heineke, 2013). This belief is grounded in the notion that there is no essential truth separate from a person's construction of it (Armstrong, 2012). If there is no truth outside of that which is socially constructed, a coach should focus on the meaning a coachee is making of a given situation, in order to access their version of the truth (Armstrong, 2012).

From a social constructivist perspective, the coach must understand that there is not one universal truth, but instead that there are many ways of looking at an issue (Armstrong, 2012). A coach taking the traditional approach of coach-as-expert focuses on the situation or problem, treating it as something real that exists outside of the coachee, while a collaborative coach works to focus on the coachee as the meaning maker of the

situation (Armstrong, 2012). In this model, the dialogue becomes the space for making and exploring meaning. A social constructivist view of coaching dialogue emphasizes the process, including: listening, empathy, questioning, making links, looking for patterns of meaning, and alternative ways of perceiving (Armstrong, 2012). This focus on the process ultimately generates learning (Armstrong, 2012).

Language is Constructive

If truth is socially constructed, then language serves as the means of that construction. Often, people perceive language as a way to communicate an idea, however, language does not just convey meaning, it also constructs it. Johnston (2004) illuminates: "Language, then, is not merely *representational* (though it is that); it is also *constitutive*. It actually creates realities and invites identities"(p.9). In this sense, language becomes a tool for not only describing reality, but also for constructing it. Language has the power to create meaning, realities, and identities.

Constructing meaning. The power of language lies in its ability to create meaning. Language gives meaning to the events that happen in a school. Johnston (2012) details, "In classrooms, events happen, but their meaning only becomes apparent through the filter of the language in which we immerse them" (p.2). Put simply, no event or situation has inherent meaning. Instead, the words coaches and teachers use give meaning to the things that occur.

If meaning is socially constructed through language then a dialogical approach to conversations becomes especially important in the humanization of teachers. In an anti-dialogical conversation, the coach-as-expert alone has the power to create meaning,

as they are the only participants with a voice in the conversation. Conversely, in a dialogical conversation, each participant contributes equally in the negotiation and construction of meaning (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011). Meaning should be owned by everyone involved (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011). When everyone has a voice in a conversation, everyone has the power to create meaning.

Constructing realities. Language has the power to shape reality. The words a leader chooses influences how a coachee perceives and understands their world. The way a leader frames events impacts what students (or in the case of the coach, teachers) think they are doing (Johnston, 2012). Johnston (2012) elucidates, "As teachers, we choose our words and, in the process, construct the classroom worlds for our students and ourselves. The words we construct offer opportunities and constraints" (p.1.)[2]. Each word a coach employs in a conversation with a teacher attributes meaning onto the coachee's actions and, in turn, defines reality. For example, when a teacher shares a mistake they have made, the language a coach uses frames that mistake. If the coach frames the mistake as a failure, then they construct a world where mistakes are signs of weakness. If the coach frames the mistake as an opportunity for learning, then they create a world where mistakes are part of the growth process. Words construct worlds.

Constructing identities. Language has the power to build identities (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011; Heineke, 2013). A coaching dialogue is a space of creation and recreation of the self (Armstrong, 2012; Heineke, 2013). Armstrong (2012) explains, "From a social constructionist stance, dialogue is the process through which people constitute who they

---

[2] Once again, due to minimal research on the subject, I rely on the work of Johnston to consider the power of language in shaping teacher self-efficacy, operating under the conjecture that his work regarding the teacher-student relationship can be applied to the coaching-teacher relationship.

are and therefore how they act in terms of the situations they face" (p.33). A coaching

dialogue, then, becomes a space for teachers to construct their identity. Consequently the

words a coach selects have the potential to shape the identity the teacher constructs for

themselves.

Language as a Tool

The function of language as a means for constructing meaning, realities,and

identities positions it as a tool that coaches can leverage for co-creation of knowledge

with teachers. Coaches must utilize language as a powerful tool for shaping learning and

fostering joint meaning (Cazden, 2001; Johnston, 2004; Wells, 1999, as cited in Heineke,

2013). Crafton and Kaiser (2011) explain the role language plays in learning: "Language

is central to learning; as people seek to articulate their thinking through language, thought

itself comes to life as words are selected to express situated meaning" (p.108). It is the

very act of processing thinking through dialogue with a coach that teachers can name

their ideas in ways that produce new learning. Dialogue, then, acts as a tool for

constructing new knowledge (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011). The ideas created in these

conversations ultimately become strategies the teacher can own and act on. Johnston

(2012) asserts that conversations generate strategies, consequently increasing both the

strategies available to that individual and the probability that they will use a strategy

discussed.

Coaching through Intentional Language Choice

The constitutive nature of language, and its function as a tool for learning, places

a high level of importance on the language that coaches select during a coaching

conversation. Coaches must be thoughtful and intentional about the specific words they decide to employ, in order to have productive conversations (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Cheliotes and Reilly (2010) assert: "Meaning is always embedded in language . . . By paying attention to the words you choose, you may positively or negatively influence the feelings and thinking of others with whom you are communicating" (p.49). In order to speak purposefully, coaches should have specific goals for each conversation and should then choose their words intentionally in support of those goals (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). Furthermore, coaches must make sure their words during a conversation are aligned with their intentions (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010).

Despite the impact coach's words can have on teachers, very few are aware of it. In her study of one-on-one coaching sessions, Heineke (2013) found that coaches demonstrated very little awareness of how their words influence teacher talk and reflection. Coaches must learn how to use language to facilitate progressive dialogue (Heineke, 2013). They need to become intentional in choosing words that align with the components of effective, dialogical coaching conversations.

Choosing words that support a partnership approach. The specific words a coach utilizes during a dialogue have a significant impact on the coachee. A coach's word choice can foster a sense of collaboration, or reinforce asymmetrical power relationships. The language coaches use is disempowering when it portrays the coach as the expert, and causes the teacher to become reliant on them (Wall & Palmer, 2015). In contrast, language that invites the voice of a coachee is empowering. For example, asking someone to "say more about that" conveys the idea that they have something to say and

that they are respected (Johnston, 2012). Even the language a coach uses to describe their interactions with a teacher fames their relationship to the coachee. For example, Knight (2016) recommends a coach uses the word *collaborate* instead of *help* when describing to a teacher how they will work together.

Choosing words that open up dialogue. A coach's words can open the conversation up, or close the conversation down. In choosing their words carefully, coaches must make sure their words do not become barriers (Knight, 2016). Knight (2016) explicates: "Words have the power to bring people together or push them apart. To find common ground, we should use words that unite and avoid words that divide. The most fundamental word choice is to say *we* instead of *I*, *yes* instead of *no*, and *and* instead of *but*" (p.144). In other words, when a coach uses words that build trust and connection, they open the conversation up. Language that opens up conversations is that which extends talk and allows for the "joint construction of meaning" (Heineke, 2013 p.422). Such language includes requesting information and opinions, or making clarifying statements (Heineke, 2013). Additionally, open-ended questions also open up the conversation and provide opportunities for co-construction of meaning (Knight, 2016).

Choosing words that support inquiry into possibilities. The words a coach selects have the power to either foster or stifle exploration of possibilities. When a coach uses phrases such as *could be* they are suggesting that there is more than one possibility (Johnston, 2012) . Using phrases like *could be* also allows for flexibility and multiple perspectives (Johnston, 2012). Conversely, when a coach uses the word *is* they are

suggesting certainty and fact (Johnston, 2012). Using *is* means there is one right way, one solid truth, thus shutting down all other possibilities (Johnston, 2012).

Choosing words that suspend judgement. Coaches must be intentional in avoiding language that conveys judgement. Often coaches tell teachers they have done a good job, or they like the way the teacher did something. Despite the good intentions behind these statements, they suggest judgement (Johnston, 2012). Johnston (2012) explicates: "If we say 'I'm proud of you' when they're successful, they will fill in the other end of the conversation and infer our disappointment when they are unsuccessful" (p. 38). When coaches say "good job" or "I'm proud of you" their words convey judgement. Furthermore, such statements imply that the teacher's job is to please the coach (Johnston, 2012). To avoid judgement, coaches must set aside praise in general. Praise has little to do with learning and growth, and much more to do with power and control (Johnston, 2012).

Choosing words that encourage empowerment and agency. A coach's words can aid teachers in creating an agentive identity. The words that a coach selects influences the development of particular identities and narratives in the coachee (Johnston, 2012). Johnston (2004) explains, "Saying, 'You are so smart' is very different from saying 'You are so thoughtful.' The phrases invite different views of who I am, and how a person like me behaves" (p.9) As mentioned previously, agentive narratives are ones that position a person as someone who can take action and have an impact (Johnston, 2012). Coaches must select words that help teachers see themselves as someone that accomplishes things by acting strategically (Johnston, 2012). The language

a coach uses in a conversation have the capacity to support such an agentive narrative.

Language that highlights the consequences of a teacher's actions have the potential to build an agentive identity. Johnston (2012) calls these "causal process statements." Causal process statements highlight an action and a direct consequence of the action, for example: "You did this, so this happened" or "This happened because you did this" (Johnston, 2012, p.42). These statements name the consequences of an action or process, and in doing so, turn that process into a strategy that the individual can use again in the future to achieve a similar result (Johnston, 2012). By naming the consequences of a teacher's actions, the coach supports them in shaping an agentive identity. Encouraging a dynamic view requires language that calls attention to, and values, the process, especially causal processes (Johnston, 2012). Coaches should use language that requires teachers to respond in ways that cast them as agents in their own narratives (Johnston, 2002).

Choosing words that foster a dynamic mindset. The language a coach employs in a conversation also has the power to encourage the dynamic mindset necessary for learning and change. Coaches should avoid words that lead to a fixed view of learning, as this leads to a decreased learning and a diminished sense of agency (Johnston, 2012). Using words like *smart* or *good* reinforces a fixed mindset because it supports the idea that characteristics are fixed (Johnston, 2012). Any language that conveys a binary can be damaging to identity and mindset, as Johnston (2012) explains, describing a strategy as *good* "validates the use of a good-bad binary." Such binaries support a fixed mindset, because the teacher knows that if they are *good* today, an action they take in the future

could just as easily be described as *bad*. The teacher then avoids taking risks and trying new tasks in order to avoid negative binary labels.

Language that focuses on efforts and strategies, rather than fixed traits, aids in the development of a dynamic mindset (Knight, 2016). Coaches must use questioning language to access the strategies that teachers use. Johnston (2012) names the benefits of highlighting teacher strategy use: "These 'How did you . . .' and 'What are you thinking?' conversations invite agentive narratives, increase the available strategic information, reduce the likelihood of fixed-performance theories, and, at the same time, invites dynamic learning theories" (p. 32). When coaches draw out the strategies the coachee has used they are co-creating a toolkit of strategies the teacher can later draw on, while simultaneously encouraging the development of an agentive identity and dynamic learning view.

This section explored the importance of language in conversations through the lens of social constructivism. It began with an overview of social constructivist theory. The section then investigated the role of language in constructing meaning, reality, and identity. Next, it discussed language as a tool that coaches can intentionally utilize to facilitate learning. Finally, the section detailed the ways in which coaches can intentionally select language to support a partnership approach, open up dialogue, support inquiry, suspend judgement, empower through agency, and advance a dynamic mindset. The next section weaves the findings from each of the previous three sections together to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher efficacy?

Implications of Literature Review

Over the course of this chapter, I have explored notions of self-efficacy, coaching conversations, and language in an attempt to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher efficacy? A number of key findings emerged from my synthesis of the literature and research.

One important finding was the value of both low and high self-efficacy for learning, growth and implementation of new literacy practices. Low self-efficacy is essential for change to occur. Too high efficacy can create overconfidence and complacency, therefore preventing change and growth. When teachers demonstrate high efficacy in connection to traditional methods and approaches they resist reform. Through the literature it became clear that teachers must experience doubt and a temporary dip in self-efficacy in order to reflect on their practices in ways that lead to change. Eventually, however, teachers need to develop high efficacy for a given task or technique in order to implement it with persistence and resilience.

A second significant finding was that when it comes to learning, change, and efficacy, professional development at the task specific level is most impactful. Because general self-efficacy is stable, while teacher self-efficacy for specific subjects and tasks is more fluid, work on a specific technique or strategy is most likely to affect efficacy and implementation. Such work at the task specific level also then contributes to an overall general efficacy.

A third finding from the literature and research was the importance of coaching in relation to teacher self-efficacy. The literature reveals that self-efficacy requires

reflection to support cognitive processing and shifts. Mastery experiences with coaching support have the largest impact on efficacy, followed closely by coaching support coupled with verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences. Coaches are essential in fostering the reflection on these sources of efficacy, and coaching conversations are the ideal space for this reflection.

A fourth key finding that emerged from the literature was that the dominant model of coaching relies on an inequitable and unbalanced power relationship. Traditional models of coaching conversations dehumanize teachers by creating asymmetrical power relationships and diminishing the teacher's voice. This method undermines reform efforts. Conversely, new models of coaching founded in a dialogical approach have the power to humanize teachers by giving them an equal voice through symmetrical power relationships.

A fifth key finding that surfaced through an analysis of the literature was that effective coaching conversations are dialogical in nature. They involve the co-creation of meaning between the coach and the teacher. Effective coaching conversations require a foundation of trust built and suspension of judgement. Such conversations must focus on valuing a teacher's strengths, listening deeply, demonstrating empathy, questioning instead of telling, reflecting, inquiring into possibilities, empowering teachers through ownership of their learning, and providing feedback rather than giving advice. Most of all, effective, dialogical coaching conversations should be life-giving.

A sixth and final key finding that arose from the literature review is the power of language as a tool for co-construction of knowledge. A social-constructivist perspective

reveals that meaning, identities, and realities are socially co-constructed through language. Because language serves as a tool for creating meaning, a coaching dialogue becomes a space for developing meaning. As such, the words a coach chooses during a dialogue have an impact on the meaning the coachee makes and the identity the coachee constructs. Coaches must become cognizant of the power of language and become intentional in selecting words and phrases that support their dialogical goals. Coaches should employ words and phrases that encourage a partnership approach, open up dialogue, engage teachers in exploration of possibilities, suspend judgement, support empowerment and an agentive identity, and foster a dynamic-learning view.

These key findings from each of the three sections can be synthesized in order to answer the question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? When woven together the findings reveal the importance of fostering a growth mindset, or a dynamic learning view, in teachers in order to increase efficacy, agency, and learning. They reveal the integral role of reflection in the change process. They also highlight the potential impact of a coach as a facilitator of learning. Most of all, these key findings reveal that choosing intentional words in a coaching conversation can foster learning, growth, implementation, and empowerment in a way that ultimately leads to increased teacher efficacy. As a result of my synthesis of the literature and research, I have created a list of prompts for coaching conversations that support teacher efficacy, as well as a list of those that diminish it (see appendix A).

Conclusion

In this chapter I reviewed, analyzed, and synthesized the research and literature

relevant to my question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? I discussed models of self-efficacy and their evolution since Bandura first introduced the notion in 1977. After which, I highlighted the benefits of high self-efficacy in teachers. I then presented an alternative perspective on the disadvantages of high self-efficacy and the benefits of self-efficacy doubts. Next, I described the four sources of efficacy beliefs. Along with this, I named additional positive, negative, and negligible impacts on efficacy. I continued my consideration of impacts on teacher self-efficacy by detailing the positive influence coaching has on both efficacy beliefs and implementation of new literacy practices. I ended my exploration of self-efficacy with an examination of the correlation between efficacy beliefs and educational reform.

I followed this section on self-efficacy with a discussion of coaching conversations. I detailed the nature of traditional coaching conversations and explored the negative consequences of participating in such a model. I then introduced a dialogical model of coaching conversations which lies in direct contrast to the traditional approach. Next, I delineated the key components of an effective dialogical coaching conversation. I closed this section by describing the transformation that becomes possible when coaches engage teachers in effective coaching conversations.

Proceeding the section on coaching conversations was a study of the impact language used by coaches can have on teachers. I contextualized the discussion by explaining the social constructivist perspective on language. Continuing through the lens of social constructivism, I explored the role of language as constructive in regards to

meaning, reality, and identity. Following this, I identified language as a tool that coaches can intentionally employ to facilitate new learning and change. I concluded the section by articulating the way in which coaches can intentionally select words and phrases in a coaching conversation to invite a partnership approach, open up dialogue, foster inquiry, withhold judgement, empower teachers through agency, and further a dynamic mindset.

The final section of this chapter synthesized key findings and themes that emerged from the literature review. I summarized the role that both low and high self-efficacy play in teacher learning, growth, efficacy, and implementation of new practices. I then highlighted the power of work at the task specific level when seeking to impact teacher of efficacy. Next, I reviewed the value of coaching in correlation with teacher self-efficacy that arose from the literature review. I then proceeded to synthesize the unequal power relationships that I discovered in the traditional model of coaching, followed by a consideration of the potential for a dialogical approach to coaching conversations to subvert such asymmetrical power relationships. I culminated the section by illuminating the value of language as a tool that coaches can use in conversations to co-construct meaning and agentive narratives.

In the next chapter, I detail the methodology I used in in order to answer my research question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? I begin with a description of the setting in which I executed the research. I then outline the paradigm and methods design within which I framed my research. Then, I expand on how I conducted the research, and the tools I used to gather data. Finally, I delineate my process for analyzing the data I collected in relation to my research

question.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

"Start measuring your work by the optimism and self-sufficiency you leave behind."
-Peter Block

Introduction

Stepping into the role of literacy coach for the first time, in a district undergoing shifts in literacy practices and instructional models, has caused me to reflect on the way in which the words I choose affect a teacher's self-efficacy. My role in collaborating with teachers as they implement a balanced literacy approach has led me to consider the extent to which the linguistic moves I make in a coaching conversation build trust and empower teachers. As my school district shifts from ability grouping for literacy instruction towards heterogeneous grouping, I have become increasingly aware of a dip in teachers' efficacy beliefs around their ability to meet the needs of all learners. My desire to support teachers during these major changes has inspired me to research the question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy?

My review of the literature revealed that coaching is an essential factor impacting teacher self-efficacy. The conversations a coach facilitates can lead to reflection on sources of efficacy that ultimately produce cognitive shifts and new learning. The type of conversation and the language within that conversation matter greatly. Coaches must engage teachers in dialogical conversations that encourage an equal balance of power between coach and coachee. Such conversations are built on a foundation of trust, favor

listening and questioning over telling, encourage inquiry into possibilities and

empowerment through ownership, involve giving feedback rather than advice, and are

life-giving in nature. Only through such dialogical conversations can teachers create new

meaning and learning that they feel ownership over. The constructive nature of dialogue

suggests that the language used in a coaching conversation has the power to create new

meanings, realities, and identities for teachers. The words a coach employs in a

conversation has the power to influence the narrative a teacher constructs for themselves.

Coaches, then, must be intentional in choosing words that can support the components of

a dialogical conversation in ways that ultimately lead teachers to develop a dynamic

mindset and agentive narrative, and, in turn, increased teacher efficacy.

The next step in my journey was measuring the impact of the words I select in a

coaching conversation, in order to answer the question: How does the language used in

literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? In this chapter, I establish

the setting for my research. I start by introducing the demographics of the district and the

two schools within which I researched my question. I then describe the teachers that

participated in the study. Next, I name the research paradigm and method design that

informed my research. After that, I detail my methods for conducting the research,

including which tools I used to gather data. Finally, I conclude by identifying the steps I

took to analyze the data I collected from those tools.

Setting

In this section I describe the context in which I executed my research. I begin with

the big picture, exploring the demographics of the school district as a whole. I then break

down the demographics of each of the schools where I carried out my research. Finally, I end the section with a description of the participants that were involved in the study.

District Demographics

The research was conducted in a large district within a first-ring suburb. At the time of this study the district employed 1,618 teachers, and served approximately 11,000 students in grades kindergarten through twelve. Of those 11,000 students, 13.3% identified as Asian, 12.8% identified as black, 8.3% identified as Hispanic, 1.2% identified as Native American, and 64.4% of students identified as white. Additionally, of those 11,000 students, 9.6% received special education services and 4.7% were eligible for English as a Second Language services. Finally, 29.8% of the students in the district qualified for free or reduced price lunch.

Site Demographics

I conducted the research at the two schools where I worked as a coach at the time of the study. Both schools serve students in grades first through fifth. The schools are similar in the size of both their student body and staff. There are several notable differences in the demographics of the student body between the two schools.

School one. At the time of my research, Victoria Elementary consisted of 776 students. The majority of the students- 70.9%- identified as white. Of the remaining student body, 15.5% identified as Asian, 8.8% identified as black, 4% identified as Hispanic, and .8% identified as Native American. Of the 776 students, 19.3% were eligible for free and reduced lunch, 8.2% qualified for special education services, and 4.5% received language services. Additionally, there were a total of 36 educators at

Victoria Elementary, 30 of which were classroom teachers, four of which taught special education, and one of which taught English as a Second Language.

School two. Silver Lane Elementary served 708 students at the time I conducted my research. The majority of the students at this school also identified as white, although at 57% of the total population it was a smaller percentage than at Victoria Elementary. Silver Lane also served a larger percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch, at 38.7%, as well as a slightly larger percentage of students with English as a Second Language, at 9.6%. Silver Lane served a smaller percentage of students in special education, with 6.6% qualifying for services. Finally, 41 educators taught at Silver Lane, 29 of which were classroom teachers, 7 of which were intervention teachers, 3 of which were special education teachers, and two of which taught English as a Second Language.

Participants

I identified teachers to participate in the study by asking for volunteers via an email. Six teachers volunteered. Four of the teachers were from Silver Lane Elementary School, and two were from Victoria Elementary. I collected demographic information about the teachers through a Google survey. I also gathered further information about each participant by asking them, via email, to tell a little about themselves by writing a short narrative. I provided questions that they could use to to guide their response, including: *why did you become a teacher?*, *what are your strengths?*, *how would you describe your teaching style?*, and *what are your thoughts on the balanced literacy model our district is implementing?*. Each teacher responded to the email with a brief written teaching narrative that provided further insight into their stories as educators.

Missy. Missy is a third grade teacher at Silver Lane Elementary School. At the time of the study she had been teaching for ten years. Missy identifies as a white female[3]. In her written description of her teaching narrative Missy talked about the profession as a calling: "I couldn't see myself doing anything else. It is truly a calling that I kind of stumbled into in college on accident and fell in love" (Missy, personal communication, August 20, 2018). She also described the strengths she brings to her role, which include: "passion for relationships and engaging students in meaningful and challenging work. I am passionate about fostering a growth mindset in my students." Additionally, Missy wrote about the value she finds in our district's literacy model, explaining, "balanced literacy is a strategy/procedure that enables me to meet the diverse needs of each learner. The intentionality behind individualized instruction to meet kids where they are - get[s] me really fired up." Her teaching narrative reveals Missy as an educator that is passionate about her role and her students, and embraces balanced literacy.

Brynn. Brynn is a third grade teacher at Silver Lane Elementary School. She identifies as a white female. At the time of the study, Brynn had been teaching for three years. In her educational narrative Brynn shared that she became a teacher because she "loved being part of helping someone discover that 'aha moment'" (Brynn, personal communication, October 16, 2018). She did not originally intend to become a teacher, as she detailed:

---

[3] Throughout this capstone I use identity markers such as race and gender to describe participants. Information about how each participant identified was collected via survey. While identity markers provide a label for the demographics of each participants, they also run the risk of being reductive. It is important to understand that such categories are not fixed, and do not communicate the full complexity of each participants' identity and culture. As such, these identity markers should not be used to stereotype participants. The teachers that participated in this study are dynamic and complex humans who bring a variety of personal, cultural, linguistic, and social qualities to their classrooms.

> I originally went to college with plans of working in the field of International Business - I love learning new languages, travelling, and problem-solving - and I wanted a chance to be a part of something big. After doing some tutoring and teaching while in undergrad, I realized that international business was not the best fit for me . . . I now get to constantly solve the 'puzzles' of helping children to find their 'aha' moments across a range of topics.

Brynn brings a number of strengths to her teaching role. She listed her strengths as, "the ability to enter each lesson/day/situation with a positive attitude and energy, my persistence in working through tough lessons/academic challenges with students as they face them, and my ability to flexibly help students work through challenges and to help push them to deeper learning." Brynn also narrated her support of, and struggle with, the literacy approach our district is taking:"I feel that what we are doing greatly benefits students and provides excellent data from which to plan teaching. It can be difficult, however, to fit in and find the time to plan for all of the components that I know are beneficial to students." Brynn's teaching narrative tells the story of an educator that takes pleasure in moments of new learning and discovery for her students, brings a positive, persistent, and flexible mindset to her work, and is trying to figure out how to make all the components of balanced literacy manageable in her classroom.

Quinn. Quinn is a fourth grade teacher at Silver Lane Elementary School. At the time of the study, she had been teaching for nineteen years. Quinn identifies as a white female. It was her own elementary school teacher that inspired Quinn to enter the field. She wrote: "I became a teacher, in part, because of my 3rd grade teacher . . . She was so fun and caring and at the same time, very firm. Even as a young child I could tell that she loved to teach and that each of the students in her classroom meant a great deal to her" (Quinn, personal communication, September 20, 2018). Quinn described her own

strengths similarly, reflecting, "I'm firm and caring. I love to build relationships with students and I'm committed to the success of my students." Her teaching narrative suggests that she works hard to be a caring and firm teacher in the same way that her own elementary school teacher was for her.

Kinsley. At the time of the study, Kinsley was a long-term substitute teacher at Silver Lane Elementary. She was in her first semester of teaching, after completing a student teaching experience in the same first grade classroom that past fall semester. Kinsley identifies as a white female. In her teaching narrative she wrote about her reason for teaching: "I have become a teacher because I love seeing children grow socially, emotionally and academically" (Kinsley, personal communication, October 16, 2018). Similar to Quinn, growing up Kinsley had teacher role-models that influenced her: "I was inspired by a handful of teachers throughout my own school career and strive to show similar qualities that I admired so much about them." As she begins her teaching career Kinsley has a mission for the way she wants to serve her student, as she shared: "A focus of my teaching that I am extra intentional about is differentiation. I feel it is my duty as a teacher to meet each child where they are at and support them to grow from there." Kinsley's teaching narrative depicts an educator inspired by her own teachers who is working hard to meet the social, emotional, and academic needs of each student that enters her room.

Claudia. Claudia is a third grade teacher at Victoria Elementary School. She identifies as a white female. At the time of the study Claudia was in her eleventh year of teaching. Teaching is a second career for her, as she wrote:

> I became a teacher because I feel it is who I am at my core, but I was talked out of it. I 'played school' growing up, every female family member was a teacher (my grandmother was former VP Walter Mondale's 1st grade teacher), and I had an influential English teacher in grades 7-9 and I wanted to do what she did. Fast forward to college… majored in English…. my dad talked me out of teaching. Jobs were hard to come by then, he thought I could 'do more than teach' . . . , and so I got a job as a technical writer for 4 years and HATED every single minute. So I had a kid, went back to get my license/masters, and here I am. (Claudia, personal communication, August 20, 2018).

Claudia's journey to becoming a teacher led her to discover the strengths she brings to this role. She shared: "my philosophy is that Kids Don't Care How Much You Know Until They Know How Much You Care . . . I work hard to develop strong relationships with all of my students, and then they will be willing to stretch themselves, make mistakes, work hard, trust me" She added that, "On the academic side, I am humble and know how much I DON'T know, but am willing and vulnerable enough to read, take a class, ask questions, learn from team mates, ask a coach." Claudia also described her shift towards a balanced literacy model and the ways in which it has helped her as a teacher. She detailed how one year she taught from a scripted curriculum, and the year after that she tried using a balanced literacy approach instead. Claudia noticed a difference between those two years: "Balanced Literacy has really helped me frame my teaching and become more effective at it . . . I noticed significantly more confidence in my ability to focus my teaching, meet each child where he/she was at, and show students their irrefutable successes." Claudia's teaching narrative illustrates an educator that values relationships with her students, approaches her role with a humble willingness to hone her craft, and appreciates balanced literacy as a model that allows her to meet her students needs through focused instruction.

Sadie. Sadie is a fifth grade teacher at Victoria Elementary School. At the time of the study, she had been teaching for four and a half years. Sadie identifies as a white female. The experiences of her brother motivated Sadie to become a teacher, as she explains, "I became a teacher to honor my brother. He struggled with dyslexia as a student and there were numerous nights around our kitchen table where I would be the one who was patient enough to sit with him until he understood his homework. It was during that time that I realized that I wanted to do this all of the time" (Sadie, personal communication, October 16, 2018). Sadie shared the strengths she brings to her role:"I have found that some of my strengths are building relationships with the students and having real conversations with my students." She also wrote about her teaching style, detailing:"I would describe my teaching style as flexible. My students know me enough to know when I mean business, when we need to be serious but also when it is ok to joke around and have fun." Additionally, Sadie described the value she finds in our district's approach to literacy instruction: "I believe that Balanced Literacy is a great model to teach under as it allows all students to receive the same instruction but also allows us as teachers to get to know our students as readers as well." Sadie's teaching narrative portrays an educator dedicated to serving students like her brother, committed to building relationships, and flexible enough to engage students in moments of humor and moments of serious learning. It also indicates that Sadie has adopted the balanced literacy model, and sees it as a way to better know her readers.

In this section I have described the setting of the study. I have detailed the demographics of the school district and each of the schools where I carried out the

research. Finally, I ended with a description of the participants that were involved in the study. In the next section I will expound on the research paradigm and methods approach that inform the study.

Research Paradigm

The theory of social constructivism is at the foundation of this capstone. This theory is grounded in the belief that people seek to construct subjective meaning of their experiences (Creswell, 2014). The main assertion of the social constructivist paradigm is that the process of meaning making is always social, and it is through interactions with others that meaning is created. This capstone seeks to understand how the language used in coaching conversations affects that meaning teachers construct about their own self-efficacy during the interactions between coach and teacher.

Choice of Method

In the previous section I established the social constructivist paradigm from which this research operates. In this section I explain the methods approach I chose to use in answering the question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? I then outline the steps I took in conducting the research. I conclude the section by describing the research tools I developed and the steps I took in analyzing the data I collected.

This research takes a mixed-methods approach. A mixed-methods research design employs both qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2014). The use of a mixed-methods research design resists relying on only one type of data. By drawing on multiple sources of and forms of data, a mixed-methods approach counteracts the

inherent biases and weaknesses of any one type of method. Such an approach allows for triangulation of data sources, opening up multiple possibilities through both closed and open-ended questions.

Methods

After selecting the participants and receiving consent for the project, I began by conducting an initial coaching conversation with each teacher to identify a balanced literacy instructional strategy that they wanted to develop in their practice. The instructional strategies were chosen from a list of the components of balanced literacy laid out in our district's balanced literacy implementation plan.

The study was conducted over a period of ten weeks. During that time, I asked teachers to engage in three learning opportunities. The first learning opportunity was a vicarious experience (Bandura, 1977), involving the teacher observing the strategy being used by myself. As mastery experiences are the most impactful source of teacher efficacy (Tschannen‑Moran & McMaster, 2009), the following two learning opportunities involved me observing the teacher practice the strategy in their classroom. Prior to each learning session I engaged teachers in a coaching conversation to plan the learning opportunity. Furthermore, all three learning opportunities involved a follow-up coaching conversation, thus providing teachers with an additional source of efficacy: verbal persuasion (Bandura, 1977).

Research tools

In order to achieve triangulation through the use of multiple data sources (Creswell, 2014) I created three research-based tools for data collection. As part of using

a mixed-method approach, I developed a combination of qualitative and quantitative

research tools. Two of the tools were qualitative, and the other tool had both quantitative

and qualitative components.

Audio recording. The first tool was an audio recording of each coaching

conversation. Individual coaching conversations typically lasted between twenty to thirty

minutes. All conversations were recorded using a voice recorder application on an Ipad. I

used the audio recordings in conjunction with "Prompts for Building or Diminishing

Teacher Self-Efficacy" (see Appendix A) to measure the number of prompts and

questions I used in a conversation that support efficacy. I also used it to chart the number

of prompts I employed that diminish teacher efficacy.

Coaching conversation survey. The second tool I used was a coaching

conversation survey (see Appendix B). To allow for ease of use, the survey was delivered

and completed using Google Survey technology. I asked teachers to complete the survey

four times: after our initial conversation, and after each conversation following a learning

opportunity. This survey provided both qualitative and quantitative data. The survey

required teachers to rate thirteen statements on a likert scale from one to seven, which

allowed for concrete, qualitative data. The space below each section inviting additional

comments, along with two other items which requested a short answer response, allowed

for open-ended quantitative data.

Coaching journal. I kept a coaching journal to record anecdotal notes. These

notes included planning prior to coaching conversations, reflections after coaching

conversations, and notes from the vicarious and mastery experiences. Journaling my thoughts provided further qualitative data during each part of the coaching cycle.

Data Analysis Methods

Analysis of audio recordings. Once the data was collected I began my analysis. To study the audio recordings of coaching conversations I transcribed them. As a result of my synthesis of the literature and research, I created a list of prompts for coaching conversations that support teacher efficacy, as well as a list of those that diminish it (see Appendix A). After I transcribed the conversations I used this chart to code the language I used during each conversation. I then tallied the number of times I used prompts of each type. Next, I looked for patterns in the types of responses to prompts from teachers. From this I identified nine frequent types of teacher responses. I then coded each conversation transcript using these nine categories. This allowed me to observe relationships between the language I utilized and the corresponding responses from participants My transcription, coding, and analysis of the audio recordings provided insight into both the extent to which I was able to employ prompts to support my goal of impacting teacher efficacy, and the impact of those prompts on teachers.

Analysis of coaching conversations survey data. Analyzing results of the teacher survey was a two step process. First, I approached it from a quantitative lens. Different items on the survey were included for different reasons. Survey items one through nine allowed me to assess my ability to foster the components of effective coaching conversations I identified during the literature review (see Appendix B). The first four items: *my coach created a sense of trust*, *my coach demonstrated care for my*

feelings and needs, *my coach validated my strengths*, and *my coach listened closely to my ideas*, were included to measure the extent to which I built trust, showed empathy, valued strengths, and listened during each conversation. The fifth statement- *my coach asked questions that fostered reflection*- was included to determine whether teachers felt I supported their learning through the use of questioning. The sixth survey item- *my coach helped me explore different possibilities and take risks*- was included to gauge my ability to support teachers in inquiring into different possibilities during our discussions. I included the seventh statement- *my coach treated me as an equal partner*- to assess whether I was able to empower teachers to take ownership through a partnership approach. The eighth survey statement- *my coach gave me feedback that furthered my growth*- was included to judge my capacity for providing teachers with helpful feedback. Finally, survey item nine- *our conversations left me feeling energized and inspired*- was included to evaluate my skills in facilitating a conversation that was life-giving for teachers. The qualitative results from survey items one through nine enabled me to make inferences about the extent to which the language I used during each dialogue fostered the components necessary for effective coaching conversations.

Survey items ten through thirteen supported analysis of teacher self-efficacy regarding the reading instructional strategy each teacher chose to target (see Appendix B). Items ten through twelve connected to a teacher's own sense of efficacy related to the target strategy. I intentionally focused the survey on only one specific literacy teaching strategy, as efficacy research should be done at the task specific level (Wheatley, 2005). These items measured perceived efficacy for that strategy and include: *I feel confident*

that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy, *I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy*, and *I can use this strategy effectively*. The use of three separate items provided detailed information about each teacher's perceived efficacy for the strategy regarding their skills, knowledge, and application. In my analysis I observed whether a teacher's responses for these three items increased over time. Growth in these items by the end of the study was an indicator of their efficacy for their target literacy strategy. Item thirteen- *collaboration with my coach has increased my use of this strategy*- provided insight into whether the teacher perceived the support of the coach as increasing their efficacy in use of the target strategy. Wheatley (2005) suggests that tools measuring efficacy should address the teacher's beliefs about their ability to teach with help. A high response on this item indicated that the teacher believed that collaboration and support increased their own capacity.

I also used a quantitative lens to analyze the results from the survey. Wheatley (2005) states that efficacy tools that are only qualitative fail to provide insight as to what the numerical efficacy ratings actually mean. For this reason, I included a quantitative element to the survey. First, I studied any of the optional additional comments teachers included after each section in order to gain further insight into why they selected a given number on the likert scale. Second, I read their short answer responses, which asked specifically about which of the words and phrases I used were most and least helpful for their learning. I analyzed these responses to determine which words and phrases teacher perceived as beneficial and cross-checked them with the research-based prompts and questions I identified (see Appendix A). Doing so provided confirmation that a word or

phrase builds efficacy, and shed light on why a teacher found a word or phrase more or less helpful.

Analysis of anecdotal notes. Finally, I also analyzed the anecdotal notes I recorded in my coaching journal. I cross-checked my journal entries with each coaching audio recording transcript. Notes from the coaching journal were particularly helpful as I reflected on significant moments from coaching conversations transcripts. In these cases the journal provided further qualitative data on my own intentions and reflections, and the meaning I made during key moments.

Triangulation of Data. Using multiple tools and methods provided a more complete response to my research question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? Results from an audio recording of each coaching conversation enabled me to measure how often I used prompts and questions that I believed would increase teacher efficacy, how often I used prompts that I believed would decrease it, and how frequently such language elicited different types of responses from teachers. Results from the open-response items on the survey provided insight as to whether teachers perceived such prompts and questions to help or hinder their learning. Additionally, numerical results from the survey measured teacher efficacy for a specific strategy over time. Finally, the use of a coaching journal in conjunction with the previous two tools enabled me to gain a more complete picture of the situation, highlighting the meaning that I constructed from our shared experiences. Together, these three tools for collecting data provided a nuanced and detailed view of each coaching conversation that

empowered me to discover the impact that a coach's language has on a teacher's self-efficacy during literacy coaching conversations.

In this section I detailed the mixed-methods design I selected in order to answer my research question: How does the language used in coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? I then laid out the plan I developed for conducting my research. Next, I described the research tools I created in order to collect the data necessary for answering my question. Finally, I discussed my process for analyzing the data I collected during this study in relation to my research question.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I introduced the setting for my research. I provided the demographics of the district and the two schools where I carried out my research. I also described the six participants in the study. Next, I identified the research paradigm and method design I based my research upon. I then outlined the steps I took to conduct my research. Following that, I elucidated which tools I will use to gather data. I closed by detailing my process for analyzing the data I collected from those tools.

Chapter four presents the results and interpretations of my research. I share and analyze the data I gathered from each tool around coaching conversations, teacher self-efficacy, and language. I then synthesize the data to identify key themes and patterns.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis

"Coaching is a conversational process that brings out the greatness in people. It raises the bar of the possible, so that people reinvent themselves and their organizations in the service of transformational learning."
-Bob and Megan Tschannen-Moran

Introduction

This chapter seeks to synthesize the data in order to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? It will include an analysis and interpretation of the data regarding coaching conversations, teacher self-efficacy, and language. I will begin by presenting the context that coaching conversations provided for this research. Then, I will share and analyze the data I collected around teacher self-efficacy for each participant. After which, I will highlight key themes and patterns I identified as a result of cross-case study synthesis. Next, I will detail and analyze the data I gathered around the language I utilized during coaching conversations. An important component of this analysis will be the consideration of patterns and themes regarding the impact such language had on the responses of teachers during coaching conversations. To conclude this chapter I will outline the key findings that surfaced during data analysis and synthesis.

Coaching Conversations

In the opening quote Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) posit the coaching conversation as an interaction that unearths greatness from within its participants. Coaching conversations become the space where teachers can construct new

understandings of their experiences and of themselves as educators.Such conversations were the foundation of my study. Using a partnership approach through the implementation of dialogical conversations allowed me to collaborate with teachers in ways that resulted in their increased efficacy, and consequent implementation of their target literacy strategy. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) contend that coaching leads to an increase in a teacher's self-efficacy and implementation of new literacy practices. My findings support this contention. As table 4.1 illustrates, by the the end of each coaching cycle all six teachers agreed that collaboration with a coach increased their use of their target strategy. In the next section it will become evident that this growth in implementation was mirrored by a rise in self-efficacy.

Table 4.1 *Collaboration with my coach increased my use of this strategy.*				
Conversation	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	4	7	n/a	7
Claudia	5	6	n/a	7
Kinsley	5	6	6	7
Missy	4	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	6	7	6	7

Notes: Brynn and Claudia did not complete a survey after their third conversations. Participants were provided with a likert scale from one to seven to rate their response. A rating of 1 indicates they strongly disagree, 2 indicates they disagree, 3 indicates they slightly disagree, 4 indicates a neutral response, 5 indicates they slightly agree, 6 indicates they agree, and and 7 indicates they strongly agree. This scale can be used to interpret data for all tables in this chapter.

In this section I highlighted coaching conversations as the space where an increase in teacher self-efficacy became possible. In the next section I present the data around self-efficacy. I share and analyze the qualitative and quantitative data in the case of each individual participant. I then synthesize key patterns and themes that emerged from a cross-case study analysis of all six participants. Finally, I highlight the key findings that emerged from the synthesis regarding the development of teachers' self-efficacy including: the importance of self-doubt, the need for teachers to witness student success, the power of fostering a sense of ownership through the development of an agentive narrative, and the value of a coach in facilitating each of these components.

Teacher Self-efficacy

Brynn's Story:The Value of Cognitive Dissonance

Interpretation of survey data. The multiple measures of data collection reveal mixed-results in terms of whether Brynn experienced an increase in self-efficacy. She is the only participant who decreased in efficacy from the initial to the final conversation, according to the results of the survey (see table 4.2). In two out of the three items her efficacy declined from the highest possible score of seven, meaning *strongly agree,* in the beginning, to a six, meaning *agree*, at the end, regarding the statements: *I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy* and *I can teach this strategy effectivel*y. Both the seven and the six reveal high levels of self-efficacy, however, it is interesting that her own self-assessment showed a decline in these two areas. Her self-reported score did increase from a six to a seven for the statement: *I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy*. It is also

worth noting that the statements that she expressed high efficacy for initially dropped down to a five in her second survey and then rose again in the final survey, suggesting an increase in efficacy from the second to final conversations.

Brynn's self-assessment of her own efficacy levels align with Wheatley's (2001, 2005) theory of self-efficacy. She started out with the highest possible levels of efficacy, which could be interpreted as having a detrimental type of self-efficacy that Wheatley (2001) describes as "too-certain self-efficacy." This too-certain self-efficacy can lead to an overconfidence that may cause resistance to change within a teacher. The drop in self-efficacy after the second conversation may reflect the self-doubt in her instructional practice that Wheatley (2005) asserts is necessary in order for a teacher to embrace change and be open to growth. The dip in self-efficacy scores after the second conversation also fit with Tschannen-Moran and McMaster's (2009) research suggesting that teachers often experience a decrease in self-efficacy after a vicarious experience, as they watch a proficient model use the strategy. Watching a task implemented successfully has the potential to lead to self-doubt in a teacher around their ability to implement it with the same level of success. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) also maintain that mastery experiences with coaching conversations have the biggest impact on self-efficacy, and this is supported in the fourth survey, when Brynn's self-efficacy scores rise again. The quantitative data from Brynn's survey results tells the story of a teacher that starts out over efficacious, then experiences self-doubt, which then fuels learning and growth that allows her to build efficacy from mastery experiences and coaching conversations.

Table 4.2 Brynn's Coaching Conversation Survey Results Items 10 through 12				
Conversation:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.	6	6	n/a	7
I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.	7	5	n/a	6
I can teach this strategy effectively.	7	5	n/a	6

Interpretation of audio recordings and coaching journal. The data gathered from transcribed coaching conversations tells a different story regarding Brynn's self-efficacy. While her initial survey results indicate high levels of efficacy, she began the first conversation expressing a great deal of self-doubt surrounding the instructional strategy she chose to target. Brynn identified guided reading lessons as her target strategy. She expressed a desire to improve in her ability to plan these lessons based on the skills her students need, along with her ability to know when students have mastered a given skill. When discussing her struggle with what skills to focus on and knowing what to plan in guided reading Brynn shared: " I feel like I spend a lot of time thinking about it and then don't actually produce anything because I don't know which direction to take" (Brynn, personal communication, March 23, 2018). This comment reveals uncertainty around her own efficacy regarding the target strategy. Such self-doubt was a thread throughout the first conversation, as evidenced in a later comment by Brynn around her implementation of guided reading groups: "I feel like I do parts of it well or I start out strong and then I taper off . . . or I don't start very strong and then all the sudden I get it and then- it's just the whole thing is not cohesive" (Brynn, personal communication,

March 23, 2018). In fact, across the entire first conversation Brynn made fourteen statements that could be categorized as self-doubt. While she may have reported that she had the knowledge and ability to effectively implement her target strategy on the survey, her own comments during our conversation provide insight into some doubts she may have been unwittingly harboring.

One possible reason that Brynn's survey suggested higher levels of efficacy than she communicated during the conversation may be that towards the end of the conversation I made some moves to empower her in ways that may have impacted her efficacy. During our first dialogue Brynn expressed a great deal of doubt about her own ability to know what her students needed instructionally. As she talked about her students, I heard her speak specifically about their different needs. I called attention to this, saying: "it seems like you do actually know what skills to focus on cause you just referenced like their work that they've done and what you've noticed in group and what you've noticed on their DCAs and on their formatives" (Nicole, personal communication, March 23, 2018). By listening carefully to both Brynn's self-doubt and her comments about her students I was able to see what she was not: she knew well what her students needed. This may have caused an increase in confidence for Brynn, as in her additional comments on the first survey she shared: "It was challenging and reassuring to go through this conversation about student strengths and needs as it showed me what I really do already know about my students- it's more than I thought!" (Brynn, survey, April 4, 2018). This comment leads me to believe that in naming for her what she did know I was able to empower Brynn, and in turn, possibly make a beginning impact on her efficacy.

In my interpretation of Brynn's self-efficacy survey results I theorized that the vicarious experience led to a decrease in her efficacy. The transcription of the coaching conversation aligns with this theory. The vicarious experienced led to some cognitive dissonance for Brynn. She discussed how watching me implement the target strategy led her to reflect on her own use of the strategy:

> N: So what do you think about how it went?
> B: I think that it was really great to see, because it's the way that I would love to run a group but feel like I've never been intentional enough or felt like I . . . it reflected some of what I've done which was helpful like to know that I have been doing some of and that, so that when I do my own it's not like reinventing- its not like I've never done any of it before, but I think like watching you even look at the prompts or like knowing that you had a prompt makes me feel more comfortable and helps me with the idea that I can still- I can do this. (Brynn, personal communication, April 4, 2018)

In my coaching journal I reflected on these comments, noting that "Brynn's response let me know that she saw some of what she was already doing in my modeling . . . [it] also told me that what she saw as the difference between her own practice and what I am doing was the intentionality" (Journal entry, April 4, 2018). In short, the vicarious experience was both affirming and clarifying for Brynn. By watching my teaching and then reflecting with me she was able to name which part of the strategy she specifically needed to improve upon. Without the self-doubt that arose from this observation and reflection Brynn may not have felt any need to improve her practice, and while her efficacy may have been high, her actual ability may not have matched it.

Although I did not have survey data from Brynn after the first mastery experience and third conversation, my notes from my coaching journal and the transcription of the dialogue provide insight into the moment where Brynn starts to grow in her self-efficacy.

During the mastery experience Brynn saw beginning evidence of student success. In our third conversation she shared: "I noticed that the strategies that you had taught the two fluency students before had been successful because they were much more careful, it's amazing how just that one lesson- they took that on and understood how to extend it or just how to start doing it consistently" (Brynn, personal communication, April 13, 2018). In my own coaching journal I reflected on the potentially positive impact of this successful mastery experience and evidence of student success, stating: "She also said she was pleasantly surprised to see what her students could do. I think seeing her students experience success during her use of the strategy will also lead to an increase in her efficacy." (Journal entry, April 13, 2018). This evidence of student success was, in fact, accompanied by a decrease in statements that could be categorized as self-doubt. In the second conversation Brynn made fifteen self-doubt statements, while in the third conversation this decreased to only six. Brynn's experiences and comments align with Tschannen-Moran & Johnson's (2011) assertion that teachers need to see an increase in student learning in order for their self-efficacy to increase, as well as Tschannen-Moran and McMaster's (2009) research which shows that teachers self-efficacy results from mastery experiences with coaching.

The transcription from the fourth and final coaching conversation reveal an increase in self-efficacy. In this final interaction she made eight comments that could be categorized as self-doubt, as compared to the fifteen she made during our first conversation. Furthermore, Brynn was able to speak in detail about how she has grown in

her practice. When I asked Brynn how she felt she had benefited from the coaching cycle

she explained:

> I do think I've benefited from it because it's enabled me to better focus on what
> I'm trying to attend to for each student, and in the past I've tried so hard to create
> schedules that are like 'ok I'm meeting this group and this group and this group.'
> I've been trying to put kids in boxes together so I can attend to their box needs at
> the same time and it just hasn't been working, and so being able to engage in this
> and better understand how I can attend to each need individually while they're in
> the same group has been very helpful. That's a piece that I've really been missing
> and it's one of the reasons why I have not felt good about doing groups this year,
> and frankly I haven't done them as much as I should because I just haven't felt
> good about them and it's hard to sit here and feel like "ok well let's do this next
> thing I'm not sure if it's gonna be helpful but let's sit back here and do it" but I
> feel like I have a trajectory and I'm already thinking about how I can manage this
> for next year like organizationally and start out doing a better job of attending to
> these needs early on and helping them grow. (Brynn, personal communication,
> May 8, 2018)

This excerpt highlights a clear shift Brynn made from being rigid to being responsive and

intentional. This levels of responsiveness and intentionally only became possible because,

as she states, she better understands how to attend to students' individual needs in a

group. This quote truly captures the essence of self-efficacy as a belief in future success,

as Brynn speaks to her plans for how she will be applying it next year "early on." That

she is planning for using the strategy next year implies both that she believes in the

usefulness of the strategy and in her own efficacy to efficiently use the strategy.

Claudia's Story: The Transformation from Traditional to Progressive Goals

   Interpretation of survey data. Both qualitative and quantitative data indicate an

increase in self-efficacy for Claudia. The survey data reveals that on all three statements

measuring efficacy she initially selected four, which represents a neutral response (see

table 4.3). Across all three statements Claudia's rankings of efficacy increased

consistently, moving to a five, or *slightly agree*, by the second conversation, and either a

six, meaning *agree*, or in the case of her confidence in her knowledge around

implementing the strategy, a seven, meaning *strongly agree*, by the fourth conversation.

These results demonstrate a clear trend of self-efficacy growth with each conversation.

Table 4.3 Claudia's Coaching Conversation Survey Results Items 10 through 12				
Conversation:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.	4	5	n/a	6
I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.	4	5	n/a	7
I can teach this strategy effectively.	4	5	n/a	6

Interpretation of audio recordings and coaching journal. The transcripts of

our coaching conversations and notes from my coaching journal also indicate an increase

in efficacy for Claudia. She selected the strategy of conferring with readers in order to

assess their transfer of whole class skills to their own independent texts. Our first

coaching dialogue reflects high levels of uncertainty around this practice. She shared that

through conferring with students she might be able to learn more about students' ability

to authentically transfer a skill to their texts, yet a barrier to doing this work was being

able to get around to confer with all students. Claudia expressed concerns, explaining:

"for me I think it's- it's definitely small group and transferring to their independent work

and being able to follow through on that. It's hard there's so many kids and so many

needs" (Claudia, personal communication, March 22, 2018). Further evidence of

Claudia's low efficacy emerged as we wrapped up the first conversation. I shared with

Claudia that I was excited for the work we were going to embark on together and she

replied: "me too. you're gonna fix me" (Claudia, personal communication, March 22,

2018).That Claudia believed that she needed to be "fixed" implies that she believed

something was wrong with her. This uncertainty pervaded the entire discussion,

evidenced by the twelve statements Claudia made that could be characterized as

self-doubt. This self-doubt appeared to inspire her to try new practices in order to

challenge herself. As I noted in my journal: "Later in the conversation she pushed herself

to take a risk. She said she wanted to try doing partnerships whole class, rather than a few

at a time"(Journal entry, April 10, 2018). Claudia's own words at this point in the

conversation reflect her desire to grow, as she stated: "I'm not comfortable with it so- and

I'd like to be" (Claudia, personal communication, March 22, 2018). It seems that

self-doubt and uncertainty around her practices led Claudia to seek out opportunities for

growth. She may have had the low efficacy that Wheatley (2005) argues is needed in

order for change and reform to occur.

The transcript from our second conversation substantiated the rise in Claudia's

self-efficacy seen in her survey results. The number of statements that she made that

could be characterized as self-doubt decreased to only four. While Claudia did not

express much self-doubt, she did convey doubt in her target instructional strategy. As she

looked at the notes I had taken while conferring with students Claudia was skeptical,

saying: "I don't know. I guess I would be curious to know how- how accurate you think

all this is I mean are they- are they blowing smoke- are they- I mean is it authentic? How

can you tell?" (Claudia, personal communication, April 10, 2018). This comment

suggests that she was uncertain whether the target strategy she chose would truly allow her to assess if students are transferring a skill they have learned whole class to their independent reading. I noted in my journal that Claudia appeared to be experiencing the struggle that comes from moving away from traditional practices, reflecting that:

> This fits with my research that teachers lose efficacy when they moves towards more progressive, less traditional ways of measuring student success. It is much easier to feel that student has been successful by looking at a test score than looking at an open-ended response during a reading conference. (Journal entry, April 10, 2018)

Here I am referencing Wheatley's (2001) research around types of harmful self-efficacy. Claudia may have self-efficacy around traditional goals, which are typically easier to measure. Uncertainty around more progressive, less concrete forms of assessment has the potential to prevent a teacher from embracing reform and building efficacy around a new, progressive practice.

While Claudia reported a slight increase in her self-efficacy after our third conversation, the transcript indicates prevailing self-doubt and uncertainty around her target strategy. She oscillated between doubt and confidence throughout the discussion. She shared concerns as to whether she was implementing the strategy correctly. For example, when I acknowledged that conferring can be tricky when she has not read the book, yet she was able to get at student thinking by asking general questions, Claudia replied: "That's the part that makes me just uncomfortable nervous, like am I doing it right cause I haven't read it, I don't know" (Claudia, personal communication, April 24, 2018). This was one of many declarations of doubt during this conversation. In fact, her self-doubts statements increased from four in the previous conversation to fifteen. Yet,

Claudia also made remarks that indicated a beginning level of belief in her ability to

impact students learning:

> C: I think they know. In fact I corrected their post-test last night and almost everybody improved so something's working.
> N: Yeah.
> C: And it might be that and other things that we do, but no I- and I was also impressed with really how many kids I was able to get through in not a ton of time. (Claudia, personal communication, April 24, 2018)

Through these remarks it is evident that Claudia is starting to see student success. She

also expresses a level of tenaciousness around what might be causing student success,

saying it might be the conferring or it might be "other things." What is particularly

interesting is that Claudia still relied on a post-test, a more traditional form of assessment,

to ascertain whether it was truly working. This fits with my observations from the second

conversation that she was grappling with the move away from traditional assessment

towards the less concrete assessment that accompanies progressive reform. Additionally,

at the end of our conversation I celebrated the work Claudia was doing and she responded

with skepticism, saying, "we have the testing coming- we'll see" (Claudia, personal

communication, April 24, 2018). This tells me that standardized tests have a significant

impact on how she views and measures herself as a teacher. Claudia believed that she

needed to wait for a traditional measure of achievement before she could believe in

herself and her abilities. At this point in the cycle, she was not yet ready to trust the data

she got from assessment through conferring and she was not yet ready to attribute student

success to the target strategy.

Our fourth and final conversation after her second mastery experience mirrors the

increase in self-efficacy that Claudia reported on her survey. I coded only six statements

that could be characterized as self-doubt, as compared to the fifteen in the third

conversation. Heading into this discussion I worried that this would not be the case, given

the recent test results she had just gotten. As I detailed in my journal: "Right before our

conversation Claudia had gotten back the results from a standardized reading test. She

was unhappy with the results and this came up several times during our conversation"

(Journal entry, May 15, 2018). Her dissatisfaction with the test scores did lead to

moments of self-doubt. For example, when I made the life-giving statement: "your

commitment to your job and to your students really really inspires me and I think your

students are incredibly lucky to have a teacher that cares as much as you do," Claudia

responded by saying, "Did you not look at these scores?" (Claudia, personal

communication, May 15, 2018). In that moment she used her student's standardized test

scores as evidence to undercut the positive comments I made about her. The test scores

stood in direct contradiction to the student success she witnessed during the second

mastery experience. When I asked what she learned about her students from conferring

Claudia responded:

> Well for myself I think I've learned that I'm more comfortable and confident in
> knowing what I know, and sometimes knowing what I don't know and kind of
> working through it when I'm with the student. For my students I- I think I learned
> that- aside from today's MAP test . . . that some of them are doing . . . they're
> doing the work that I'm asking them to do at least. (Claudia, personal
> communication, May 15, 2018)

This remark shows a shift that began to happen in this fourth conversation: Claudia began

to trust the student success she was seeing through her conferring. As the discussion

continued, she expressed confidence in student learning several times. For example, she

talked about the transfer she was noticing "We've been talking about themes in the mini

lessons and not only were they able to pull those themes out of their books but they were also able to apply it to something in their lives, which is what it asked them to do"(Claudia, personal communication, May 15, 2018). Once again, this fits with the research that teachers need to see evidence of student success in order to experience an increase in their own efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et. al., 1998).

Claudia's increase in her own efficacy became clear by the end of the conversation. In her final survey she commented " . . . loved this experience- it was just what I needed to improve upon conferring" (Claudia, survey, May 15, 2018). In our conversation Claudia proclaimed:

> I have a lot more confidence in knowing what conferring should look like feel like. Not only how to do it effectively that's part of it but all the information I can get from a student when I haven't read the book in terms of their comprehension and their thinking. (Claudia, personal communication, May 15, 2018)

This belief in her own ability to implement the strategy of conferring effectively was accompanied by a growing belief in the data she was collecting about her students through conferring. The shift towards a more progressive, less concrete way of measuring student success was powerful. It can be seen in her response after I acknowledged the frustration around test scores. Claudia replied: "These kids love to read most of them love to read and who could ask for more than that?" (Claudia, personal communication, May 15, 2018). Here Claudia turns from a very traditional, concrete yet isolated form of data- a standardized test score- to a measure much more subjective and authentic to the reading process: her students love to read. As she shifted to a more progressive way of measuring student learning, her self-efficacy flourished.

Kinsley's Story: The Impact of Work at the Task Specific Level on Efficacy

Interpretation of survey data. All three sources of data show a steady increase in Kinsley's self-efficacy over the course of the coaching cycle. On the survey, she reported her efficacy around the target as a five, or *slightly agree*, after our initial conversation regarding all three efficacy statements (see table 4.4). By the final conversation her self-assessed efficacy levels rose to seven in all three areas, indicating she strongly agreed with each statement.

Table 4.4 Kinsley's Coaching Conversation Survey Results Items 10 through 12				
Conversation:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.	5	6	6	7
I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.	5	5	6	7
I can teach this strategy effectively.	5	7	6	7

Interpretation of audio recordings and coaching journal. Data from conversation transcripts and my coaching journal support a narrative of Kinsley's self-efficacy growth. From the first dialogue it is clear that she already had some confidence in her target strategy. In comparing the initial conversations of all six participants she had the lowest amount of statements- only three- that could be characterized as self-doubt. Kinsley chose a strategy that she felt strongly about and wanted to increase her intentionality in. As she explained herself, during her read alouds she wanted to, "be more intentional about like throughout the book to be stopping so I feel like what I'm currently doing is like after a book kind of referencing it more or like

doing the strategy versus throughout throughout the reading" (Kinsley, personal communication, March 23, 2018). Our first discussion revealed a teacher that already had some efficacy around her target strategy, yet also identified opportunities for growth in that strategy.

Our second coaching conversation, which followed a vicarious experience, unearthed evidence of student success connected to the target strategy. Kinsley observed the impact intentional think alouds and questions had on her students. She celebrated:

> I was also surprised by how in depth some of the others went when you gave the sentence starters and the predictions they were making . . . I'm like oh my gosh this is so cool, that it's more than just fun for them to listen to them, that they're engaging. (Kinsley, personal communication, April 5, 2018)

This excerpt shows that Kinsley was already beginning to see the student engagement and depth of thinking that can result when purposeful modeling and questioning is incorporated into a read aloud. The corresponding increase in her efficacy on the survey may be tied to this evidence of student success.

Kinsley's second conversation did contain some level of self-doubt. She made six statements that could be characterized as self-doubt, which is double the amount she made in the first conversation. These statements did not convey a lack of belief in her own abilities, but rather communicated a reflection on areas she realized as opportunities for refinement of her practice. For example, as we wrapped up our discussion I asked about what specifically Kinsley wanted me to watch for in her first mastery experience. She replied:

> I really liked how you rephrased the strategy that you used and it was concise and I have that problem, which you maybe have noticed, when I'm explaining something I know that I go into too much detail when sometimes just less is more and I- that's something I'm really working on in here. (Kinsley, personal

communication, April 5, 2018)

This reflection captures a dissonance between what Kinsley observed in my modeling versus what she sees in her own teaching. The dissonance did not impact her efficacy levels on the survey, however, it did seem to encourage her to consider how she would continue to grow in her own implementation of the target strategy.

Kinsley's first mastery experience left her with both feelings of success and opportunities for growth. During our third conversation, when I asked her what went well during her lesson, Kinsley responded:

> I think that the turn and talks went well the . . . the noticing . . . and I feel like it went pretty- I feel like it went smooth. I feel like there were parts of it like, what were some of them in particular, that when I would say something they would be like 'oh.' I could see them nodding along when I would say my noticings which was fun. I like watching that- that might have brought their attention to something else, I feel like that tells me it was working- what my goal was. (Kinsley, personal communication, April 13, 2018)

This excerpt demonstrates Kinsley's increasing confidence around her target strategy as she saw students engaged in her lesson and benefiting from her modeling. The comment that her goal was working conveys a belief in the effectiveness of her target strategy and her own ability to implement it successfully. This evidence of student success correlates with a decrease in self-doubt from the second to third conversation. She made only two remarks that could be categorized as self-doubt in this discussion.

In alignment with the results of her final survey, the transcript from our fourth coaching dialogue demonstrates Kinsley's strong efficacy around her target strategy. Once again this efficacy correlates with student success. When I questioned how the work we did together benefited her students, Kinsley enumerated:

> I think that . . . I think that their turn and talk whether it's in read alouds or we do it sometimes in mornings with greetings or weekend shares or little things like that . . . are more . . . what's the word- cooperative . . . I think that they have learned or grown with working together and listening to each other also. (Kinsley, personal communication, April 26, 2018)

In this interaction Kinsley is able to articulate how her students have benefited as a result of her own increased efficacy surrounding the instructional practice of read alouds. Furthermore, during this conversation Kinsley described the agentive narrative (Johnston, 2012) she has developed regarding her ability to engage students in an intentionally interactive read aloud. I asked Kinsley what she did that led to student success in the lesson, and she expressed: "Intention beforehand too, again with choosing specific people as partners and then also my questions and when I would rephrase or give my noticings versus when I would have students share or make that into a turn and talk (Kinsley, personal communication, April 26, 2018). In this excerpt she is naming the moves she was able to make to impact student learning, moves that we had been discussing as possibilities across all of our coaching conversations. Her confidence around her abilities is evident, and she makes only two statements of self-doubt during this final conversation. Kinsley spoke at length about the affect of the coaching cycle on her read aloud practices:

> Our work has helped me put together more intentional read alouds and to I've- I always just love reading books so it's fun and I think they think it's fun, but that they can learning something from it too while it's still fun, and that benefits them because they don't even realize sometimes like all the learning that they're doing . . . so I think that they're benefiting because they're learning way more skills when I'm intentional" (Kinsley, personal communication, April 26, 2018)

When we first started our coaching work Kinsley's goal was to take read aloud time and make it equally fun and educational. In this excerpt it is clear that she feels she has achieved this goal. Student success, and an agentive narrative tied to that success, appeared to have led to a high level of self-efficacy.

By the end of our coaching cycle Kinsley experienced a level of efficacy around her literacy practices in a way that carried over to other subject areas. When I asked her how her thinking has grown or changed from our work together Kinsley talked about becoming more intentional in many other aspects of her instructional practices. She detailed:

> I have really been focusing on my language and teaching and how I can make that as clear and concise as possible, both in with our meeting together has made me focus on it in real aloud, but I have since then have really tried to expand that throughout like the day. (Kinsley, personal communication, April 26, 2018)

This excerpt highlights the way in which the work we did building efficacy in one specific literacy practice carried over to other areas of Kinsley's instruction. Additionally, in the comment section of her final survey she reports, "Not only do I feel more confident about putting together and doing interactive and intentional read alouds, but our work together pushed me to think about how these skills can be applied to other aspects of teaching." (Kinsley, survey, April 27, 2018). Working on incorporating more explicit modeling of skills and more opportunities for student voice through turn and talks during her read aloud helped Kinsley build her abilities to incorporate these same practices in other parts of her day. This fits with the research suggesting that work done increasing teacher self-efficacy on a particular task can impact a teacher's general efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Wyatt, 2016). The way in which Kinsley's

increased efficacy for interactive read alouds transferred to other areas of her teaching

demonstrates the power of efficacy work at a task specific level.

Missy's Story: A Shift From Traditional to Progressive Teaching Methods

   Interpretation of survey data. Qualitative results from Missy's self-assessment

on the survey depict an increase in efficacy levels. In her initial survey, Missy rated her

efficacy for her target strategy at lower levels in comparison to the other five participants

on all three efficacy statements (see table 4.5). She was the only participant to rate herself

as a three on a statement, indicating *slightly disagree*, in the case of the statement *I can*

teach this strategy effectively. She rated her inital efficacy levels as a five, or *slightly*

agree, for the other two statements. These lower initial efficacy ratings suggest that

Missy chose a target strategy in which she had doubts regarding her ability to implement

effectively. Her self-efficacy for this strategy increased with each survey. By the end of

our coaching cycle, her belief in her ability to teach the strategy effectively rose from the

initial three to a six, indicating she agreed with the statement. Missy also self-assessed

her skills and knowledge regarding the target strategy as a seven, or *strongly agree*, by

the final survey. Overall, Missy's survey results illustrate an initially low level of

self-efficacy for the target strategy that then steadily increased throughout the coaching

cycle.

Table 4.5 Missy's Coaching Conversation Survey Results Items 10 through 12				
Conversation:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.	5	5	6	7
I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.	5	6	7	7

I can teach this strategy effectively.	3	6	6	6

Interpretation of audio recordings and coaching journal. Analysis of Missy's

efficacy in our first conversation align with the results of the survey. During our initial

dialogue Missy selected strategy groups as her target instructional practice. She shared

her challenges in implementing this practice:

> So one area I know that is my biggest struggle is strategy groups. I have a really- I
> feel like when I went to college guided reading was still a big thing, so our switch
> you know to the guided reading model was not a switch to me, it's how I've done
> my instruction, but strategy group is new . . . a strategy group in which the
> students I'm meeting are at different levels is something I'm still not versed in
> and because I'm not versed in and not as confident in it I tend to shy away from it.
> (Missy, personal communication, March 20, 2018)

Missy's self-efficacy around guided reading groups may actually have served as a barrier

to her efficacy and implementation of strategy groups. This aligns with Wheatley's

(2001) assertion that self-efficacy in traditional teaching methods can cause teachers to

resist trying new methods. Missy continued: "I'm afraid that I'm wasting valuable time

that I could be use- doing guided reading that I know is successful" (Missy, personal

communication, March 20, 2018). In this excerpt Missy expressed a hesitancy to attempt

strategy groups when she knew that another, more traditional type of small group was

effective. She questioned switching to a strategy she was less certain would have a

positive impact on student learning.

Wheatley (2001) maintains that self-efficacy in a traditional teaching method can

result in a lack of motivation to try a new method because they have experienced success

with a different method. In Missy's case, she fully admitted that she had low efficacy

around strategy groups, and shared that she was unlikely to implement them without

support. During this conversation Missy shared other concerns around implementing her target instructional strategy, as I noted in my coaching journal: "Her barriers include wanting to do things perfectly- a sense that she wants everything to go exactly as planned" (Journal entry, March 20, 2018). Missy's desire to implement a strategy perfectly during her first attempts further illuminates her resistance to new methods, as mistakes are a natural consequence of trying new approaches. In sum, Missy knew she could implement guided reading groups and have them go "exactly as planned" in a way that positively impacted her students; she could not be certain that the same would happen when she tried to teach using strategy groups. It should be noted, however, that with the support of a coach, Missy was willing to take the risk and try this newer strategy.

This theme of doubt regarding the method of strategy groups continued in our second coaching conversation. Missy made seven remarks that could be characterized as doubting the approach or strategy she had chosen- the highest amount of such remarks in all of my twenty-four coaching conversations. The vicarious experience we engaged in prior to the coaching conversation led Missy to further question the value of her target strategy. She commented on how hard I seemed to be working during the group, reflecting: " I noticed is how exhausting it was and I was tired for you I was like oh my gosh how are you doing this right now" (Missy, personal communication, March 27, 2018). When I asked her to talk more about this she explicated:

> I just I have a hard time putting a lot of time into planning when I don't see the outcomes right away. I don't know if that makes a lot of sense but I feel like sometimes I just like- the work you put into that both in planning and in delivery was a lot. It was a lot of work and when I look at what was accomplished I'm like 'oh like this person was kinda helped, this person was kinda helped, these ones not so much.' I just think like oh did I get the most bang for my buck, and that's where I often steer away from strategy groups cause I feel that way. I feel like I

spend too much time planning and too much time exhausting over something that like isn't working and would it be better to just be reading a book at their level where we're working, you know, in a guided reading group with other people and I- I just I don't know. (Missy, personal communication, March 27, 2018)

In this excerpt it is evident that Missy is worried about the effectiveness of doing a strategy group, especially given how much work it seemed to require of the teacher, and would rather stick with guided reading groups where she has already witnessed a positive impact for her students.

At this point in the coaching cycle Missy's efficacy around the strategy as reported in her survey does not align with my observations of her efficacy. In my journal, I reflected that Missy's efficacy seemed to decrease, noting:

> Seeing me do the group may have lead to a decrease in her sense of efficacy around strategy groups . . . it will be important for Missy to experience some success and reflect on that success in both of the mastery experiences in order for an increase in self-efficacy to occur. (Journal entry, March 27, 2018)

This stands in juxtaposition to her survey results, where Missy reports an increase in efficacy. In fact, her rating for the statement *I can teach this strategy effectively* actually doubled from the first conversation. Upon reflection, I now believe Missy's self-efficacy may have increased at the same time that her doubts around the effectiveness of the strategy did so. This corresponds with Bandura's (1977, 1986) distinction between efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Missy now held the belief that she could successfully carry out the behaviors need to perform the task of a strategy group in the future, suggesting she had efficacy expectations, however, she continued to doubt the outcomes of a strategy group, suggesting she held doubts around the outcome expectancies. As I state in chapter two, this is important because an individual may have

efficacy for a given task, yet may not engage in that task if they do not believe the outcomes will led to desired results.

Towards the end of our discussion Missy and I were able to engage in some reflection surrounding the barriers for her in implementing the target strategy. I asked Missy to reflect on what the difference between implementing a strategy group and a guided reading group were for her. She was able to articulate that it had to do with how much control she had and her own comfort zone (Missy, personal communication, March 27, 2018). In my journal I reflected on this:

> I think this was a powerful reflection and conveyed a sense of ownership over these barriers, as a well as a growth mindset that she is still willing to work on strategy groups even though they are outside of her comfort zone. (Journal entry, March 27, 2018)

Amidst her own doubts of the strategy Missy was able to own her reluctance to step outside of her comfort zone and give up some control. This is an important moment, because if Missy only found fault with the strategy and did not acknowledge her discomfort with trying something new, she may not have been able to move forward with implementation of it. Missy's dynamic mindset seemed to be at play here. She pushed herself to experiment with a newer method that felt risky, even though she was not yet certain it would have a positive impact on her students.

In our third coaching conversation Missy began to observe a positive impact on her students. In her mastery experience Missy engaged students in a strategy group, and as became clear in our discussion, she did witness student success. Missy celebrated: "So I feel like I think that they were able to grasp the concepts of the strategy and were mostly able to apply it some- some with a little more help than others"(Missy, personal

communication, April 18, 2018). Missy also made fewer statements that could be characterized as self-doubt, only four, as well as fewer that could be characterized as doubting the target strategy, with a decrease from seven in the previous conversation to only one in this discussion.

By the fourth conversation Missy had efficacy for the target strategy and believed in its outcome expectancies. She made zero statements doubting the target strategy, and only four comments indicating self-doubt, down from nine in the initial conversation. Additionally, Missy articulated: "I definitely am a little more confident in my ability to lead a strategy group" (Missy, personal communication, April 18, 2018), thus suggesting an increase in self-efficacy for her target instructional strategy. As I remarked in my journal: "She said strategy groups are something she wants to implement more- which shows growth in her openness to the strategy . . . She shared a plan for how she might work them into her schedule next year" (Journal entry, May 18, 2018). My reflection reveals the value I saw in Missy's comments: she was making plans to use the strategy in the future, a clear sign of increased efficacy, which in its very nature is a future-oriented belief.

There are several factors which may have impacted Missy's increase in both self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for strategy groups despite initial reservations and self-efficacy for traditional teaching methods. First, I believe Missy approached our final conversation with a dynamic mindset. When I asked her how she thought the strategy group she taught went, Missy replied: "I think there were successes for sure I def think there were also areas for growth" (Missy, personal communication, May 18, 2018). This

statement demonstrates Missy's belief that she had room for growth even as she celebrated what went well. Findings from Missy's case study analysis suggests that I that teacher's belief that abilities and strategies can be learned and improved positively impacts a teacher's efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1993 as cited in Tschannen-Moran et. al, 1998).

Second, I also believe Missy's self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for strategy groups increased because she witnessed student success. She described the way students took to the strategy she taught them, saying," I really felt like Jonah and Melanie both really clung to it" (Missy, personal communication, May 18, 2018). In my journal I interpreted this comment: "I took [this] to mean they embraced and applied the strategy" (Journal entry, May 18, 2018). Moreover, Missy communicated an agentive narrative (Johnston, 2012) about the role she played in such success, proclaiming: "I feel strong that I had a good sense of students' needs and what they needed" (Missy, personal communication, May 18, 2018). Analysis of this excerpt shows that Missy saw herself as a teacher that recognizes and responds to her students different needs through strategy groups.

Finally, Missy's increased efficacy and outcome expectancies for strategy groups may also have come because she found a way to make it fit with her teaching style. A common theme across our coaching conversations was how much Missy valued efficiency. Ultimately, she was able to find the efficiency in strategy groups. This is evident as Missy talked about how our work together impacted her instruction. She explained:

> Just the increased confidence and ability and understanding in what goes into a strategy group, and how to lead it, and that its not different than conferring it's just more efficient more bang for your buck more kids at once- its right up my alley. (Missy, personal communication, May 18, 2018)

I reflected in my journal: "Indeed, efficiency is a value she has expressed in many of our conversations, so I would imagine that seeing the efficiency in strategy groups helped her buy into the instructional strategy" (Journal entry, May 18, 2018). By the end of our coaching cycle Missy was able to add the new method of strategy groups to her repertoire of small groups because she saw the value in it.

Quinn's Case Study: The Influence of Change on Teacher Self-Efficacy

Interpretation of survey data. Quinn's survey results tell the story of a teacher that started and ended with high self-efficacy for her target strategy. In her self-assessment after our initial conversation Quinn indicated with a seven that she *strongly agreed* that she had both the skills and knowledge necessary to implement the strategy effectively (see table 4.6). She also rated the statement *I can teach this strategy effectively* as a six, suggesting she *agreed* with it. By the end of the coaching cycle, she rated all three efficacy items as a seven, or *strongly agree*. In short, the results of the survey suggest that Quinn chose to work on a strategy where she already felt a great deal of efficacy, and our work together only furthered that sense of efficacy.

Table 4.6 Quinn's Coaching Conversation Survey Results Items 10 through 12				
Conversation:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.	7	6	7	7
I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.	7	7	7	7

I can teach this strategy effectively.	6	7	6	7

Interpretation of audio recordings and coaching journal. In our first coaching conversation Quinn demonstrated a little self-doubt around the work she was doing in her target strategy of book clubs. During this discussion she made only four comments that could be characterized as self-doubt, a smaller amount compared to the other teachers in this study during their initial coaching conversations. This aligns with the survey results, which show that Quinn began our coaching cycle with self-efficacy for her target instructional strategy. Quinn did seem to have enough self-doubt, however, to allow for room to grow in her target strategy. For example, as she talked about the conversations one book club was having she expressed: "It was good, yeah this group is usually pretty good but I just sometimes don't feel like I'm- I don't know- doing enough like helping them enough in the group- in the book clubs" (Quinn, personal communication, March 20, 2018). Quinn felt that her book club groups were already engaging in some quality work, but that she could be doing more to help them.

In our second conversation, Quinn did not appear to have a drop in self-efficacy following the vicarious experience. She made only five statements that could be characterized as self-doubt. In fact, rather than watching me lead a book club and then doubting her own ability to do so, Quinn took ideas from the observation and implemented them immediately (Quinn, personal communication, April 4, 2018). This willingness to try what she had noticed suggests that Quinn did not experience significant dissonance between what she observed me doing and what she believed she could do. Her efficacy levels around her target strategy remained high.

An area of low-efficacy and self-doubt did emerge during our second discussion.

This self-doubt had more to do with her teaching practices in general rather than the

target strategy. Towards the end of our conversation Quinn reflected that seeing me use

conversation starter popsicle sticks during the book club surprised her because it was

something she used to do, but she stopped doing it because she did not believe it fit with

balanced literacy. The exchange below captures Quinn's self-doubt:

> Q: Like I just- that was something that I've done in the past like for regular guided reading groups like 900 years ago when I used to teach.
> N: Sure.
> Q: I would do stuff like that all the time.
> N: And why didn't you think it was right now?
> Q: Because it's balanced literacy now it's all about the talking and the you don't- I always just felt like you can't use anything like that you can't use a graphic organizer.
> N: Oh ok.
> Q: You know what I mean that kind of stuff, so when you brought those I was like oh well Ok well I'm liking that now- that made me feel more comfortable because I've always just been a little hesitant to do anything that wasn't like- I'm using air quotes- balanced literacy.
> N: Oh my gosh I have so many questions now- like how- in your thinking how . . . what makes something quote unquote balanced literacy?
> Q: Yeah I don't know it's like the classes that we took for our literacy stuff and then your [professional development] days it's like I don't know it all seemed like it was this- I don't know I can't even think of the word I want to say . . . I don't know what the word is but I just I kinda felt like you couldn't pull in any of those kinds of things to use at the guided reading group.
> N: Alright.
> Q: I don't know why I just did, which I probably really- I don't know why I thought that cause I know better than that.
> N: Is it almost like by learning new things you felt like you had to leave behind everything that you did before-
> Q: I- Maybe yeah maybe maybe that it like they weren't good practices anymore. (Quinn, personal communication, April 4, 2018)

This part of the conversation left me shocked (Journal entry, April 4, 2018). Quinn is a

veteran teacher, with years of experience, and yet in her comments I heard her saying that

she felt like she had to leave all that experience behind when embracing the move towards balanced literacy. Wheatley (2000) asserts that coaches leading reform must find ways to recognize and deal with the loss of efficacy around traditional teaching practices that will occur when teachers experiment with new reform methods. This excerpt leads me to believe that I had not done a sufficient job supporting Quinn in dealing with the loss of efficacy around her traditional practices, because she seemed to believe that the only way to move to balanced literacy was to leave all practices behind, when in fact, some of her practices fit with a balanced literacy approach. So while Quinn was reporting high levels of efficacy around her current practices, she expressed low efficacy surrounding anything she had done before balanced literacy.

Our third coaching conversation, following the first mastery experience, once again reflected Quinn's self-efficacy around the target strategy yet self-doubt in other aspects of balanced literacy. The conversation began with a celebration of all that the students were able to do. Quinn reflected in detail on all that students were able to accomplish:

> Well I thought that their jots have improved since the initial time when you came in and even since the beginning of the year. I especially just- one student in particular Vince- he has just- always he's just reluctant like to do anything. He doesn't like to jot, he doesn't want to read and I've been you know, finding books for him. He's coming around . . . I just think overall they're reading, they're digging in deep- deeper than they were previously. (Quinn, personal communication, April 13, 2018)

It is evident in this excerpt that Quinn saw student success, even for her student that was typically a reluctant learner. The work she did with this group of students led to them engaging in deeper thinking than they were previously, which was the ultimate goal for

our work together. Yet, when I challenged her to reflect on what she did that led to that success, Quinn responded: "Well I don't think I really did a very good job yesterday" (Quinn, personal communication, April 13, 2018). As I noted in my own journal, "This line surprised me, and conveyed a sense of disempowerment" (Journal entry, April 13, 2018). I believed that in order to experience increased self-efficacy Quinn would need to see student success as a result of her implementation of the strategy (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et. al., 1998). While she did witness student success, Quinn did not see herself as having made moves that led to that success. As I dug deeper into what she meant by "not doing a good job" I discovered that her self-doubt was not tied to the target instructional strategy, but instead was connected to her perceived failure to implement professional development we had recently done around teacher language that promotes growth mindset in students, as the following interaction revealed:

> N: Ok you said- what did you say to me you said it didn't go well or something like that.
> Q: Oh I wasn't using the language.
> N: Ok.
> Q: You know.
> N: Say more about that.
> Q: Well cause I was like 'I just love the way' you know I was doing that I mean it's not like like the like the prop- you know you're not supposed to do that, that's not how I am, the way that I talk is- that is how I teach and I make no apologies for that and I know that there's supposed to be like a way like you're supposed to talk with kids. (Quinn, personal communication, April 13, 2018)

Here it becomes clear that Quinn is struggling with a need to implement everything she learns during professional development immediately and perfectly. I further reflected in my journal:

> This conveyed to me a sense that she feels conflict between how she talks to her students and the learning we have done around how to use language to foster a growth mindset. Even though she said she 'makes no apologies' she was clearly

feeling like she did something wrong. (Journal entry, April 13, 2018)

What I may have been witnessing in this interaction was the self-doubt in the language she used with students, which may have come as a result of professional learning we engaged in as a whole school. In her willingness to implement balanced literacy methods even as a veteran teacher, Quinn has shown herself as someone that embraces reform. Given this openness to try new practices, this self-doubt may be necessary for her continued growth.

Our fourth and final conversation brought with it further evidence of student success as a result of Quinn's work on the target instructional strategy. Just as in the third discussion, she articulated how her students were able to achieve at high levels, and once again, does not see herself as playing a role in that student success. It was important to me that I help her continue to build her efficacy around book clubs by tying her instructional moves to student success she was witnesses. After talking about what her students were capable of, I asked Quinn what she did that led to that success, to which she responded: "nothing I'm serious really out of all the groups they're probably the ones that I've worked the least on getting the type of jot and conversation that I want. (Quinn, personal communication, April 18, 2018). In response to this I inferred in my journal:"This . . . showed me that she does not feel ownership over the work and learning this group is doing." (Journal entry, April 18, 2018). As in the previous conversation, I asked reflective questions that would allow Quinn to see the impact she had on the students, in order to create a sense of ownership over their achievement. At first she denied playing any part in their success, responding "they just do that" several times

when I highlighted different aspects of the quality work the students did (Quinn, personal

communication, April 18, 2018). Finally, through questioning and paraphrasing we were

able to discover explicit instruction Quinn had done that had impacted this particular

book club:

> Q: They're really good at that. That's something I- we started way at the beginning if you're going to quote something from the text you need to make sure that you have that page number in case somebody from the groups wants to go back and read along with you while you're quoting . . . to get a little bit more understanding of what the character or what that particular evidence was about so-
> N: So what I'm hearing you say is you you taught them that.
> Q: Well I guess I did. I guess I didn't really think about that but yeah I kinda did. (Quinn, personal communication, April 18, 2018)

This interaction reveals the moment where Quinn realized her instructional choices have

made a difference for the book club. As I reflected in my journal: "This was the moment

of ownership I was looking for! . . . Quinn had not until this moment believed that she

had made any sort of impact on this group of higher level readers." (Journal entry, April

18, 2018). This is important because, in order to experience an increase in her

self-efficacy, Quinn must view herself as someone that has a positive impact on student

achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et. al., 1998).

Through our conversations I questioned Quinn's overall teacher self-efficacy. At

times such as the last interaction it has seemed that she has a low belief in her ability to

impact student outcomes, or in other words low teacher self-efficacy (Wheatley, 2002;

Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), despite her high self-efficacy in the task specific area

of using the strategy of book clubs. For example, when I asked Quinn which of her

strengths were serving her well right now, she responded, "Oh well- which of my

strengths I have no strengths" (Quinn, personal communication, April 18, 2018). While

with further prompting and questioning she was able to identify strengths, this indicates that Quinn may actually have low teacher self-efficacy. Wyatt (2016) asserts that teacher self-efficacy beliefs are more easily impacted by change and self-doubt as compared to general self-efficacy. So, while Quinn embraces the changes that come with balanced literacy she may be experiencing a dip in self-efficacy. Work done increasing her self-efficacy on a particular task, such as book clubs, may enhance her general self-efficacy.

As the survey data indicates, Quinn did leave our coaching cycle with an increased sense of self-efficacy for her target instructional strategy. When I asked how this experience led to her growth, she talked about how it had made her more intentional in thinking about the things she was saying and doing and how that would impact the level of jots she got from students (Quinn, personal communication, April 18, 2018). She also talked about "thinking about what I'm going to do next time, putting some of the ideas that we've talked about trying those out" (Quinn, personal communication, April 18, 2018). This suggests that Quinn viewed the strategies we have worked on together as tools she can implement herself successfully in the future, which to me indicates a high level of self-efficacy. Whether this self-efficacy at the task specific level positively impacted her teacher self-efficacy is yet to be seen. However, her openness to change implies that her learning will continue. As Quinn ended our conversation with the reflection: "I'm constantly learning, I'm constantly readjusting to fit the needs of the kids in the group" (Quinn, personal communication, April 18, 2018). It seems to me that a

teacher so dedicated to growth and with such a strong desire to meet her students' needs will likely continue the work of developing her own efficacy in all areas.

Sadie's Story: The Power of Fostering Teacher Ownership Over Student Success

Interpretation of survey data. Qualitative and quantitative data depict an overall increase in self-efficacy for Sadie across the coaching cycle. Sadie's self-assessment of her own skills and abilities around the target instructional strategy increased from her initial to final conversations (see table 4.7). To begin with Sadie rated all three statements measuring efficacy as a five, or *slightly agree*. By the final conversation she rated the statements around her confidence in her own skills and knowledge around the target strategy as a six, or *agree*, and rated her ability to teach the strategy effectively as a seven, or *strongly agree*.

Table 4.7 Sadie's Coaching Conversation Survey Results Items 10 through 12				
Conversation:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.	5	5	7	6
I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.	5	7	7	6
I can teach this strategy effectively.	5	6	7	7

Interpretation of audio recordings and coaching journal. The data from our coaching conversations furthers the narrative of an increase in Sadie's efficacy from the start of our coaching cycle to the end. During our first discussion she chose the target strategy of end-of-reading share time, and shared her perceived inability to implement this strategy successfully, using phrases such as "I don't know how to effectively do it"

and "I don't feel like I'm doing a good job" (Sadie, personal communication, March 27, 2018). Through reflective questioning I was able to uncover what Sadie meant when she said she was not doing a good job. She explained that the end-of-reading shares she planned did not feel very intentional or authentic, and that "it just kind of feels like slap it on the end of the lesson" (Sadie, personal communication, March 27, 2018). In naming these concerns we were then able to define what success would look like: a share that was intentional, connected to the lesson, and authentic in the sense that in gave students real reasons for sharing. Even still, Sadie sounded doubtful about her use of the strategy. She made eleven statements that could be characterized as self-doubt. I witnessed her uncertainty, remarking in my own journal: "Sadie used a lot of language like 'I would hope so' and 'I would like to think so.' These phrases sound uncertain to me, and make me wonder if she [doubts] the impact the work will have on students" (Journal entry, March 27, 2018). If self-doubt is a prerequisite for change as Wheatley (2002) claims, then Sadie's comments from our first dialogue indicate she was ready to grow.

The theme of self-doubt carried into our second coaching conversation. For the vicarious experience Sadie taught the reading lesson and I led the share afterwards. Comments made by Sadie during this discussion revealed disappointment, as I reflected in my journal, "She then used the following phrases to describe the lesson she taught that day: 'disjointed,' 'didn't feel fluid,' and 'compartmentalized.' These words revealed her underlying concerns with the lesson" (Journal entry, April 13, 2018). It was evident that the lesson did not go as she intended, and that her concerns from our first conversation about the end-of-reading share feeling disconnected were reaffirmed.

Sadie's third coaching conversation followed a mastery experience that she felt was successful. A corresponding decrease in Saide's self-doubt ensued. The number of statements she made that could be characterized as self-doubt declined to only three. Additionally, Sadie's language describing her use of the target strategy became more positive, as she reflected that it felt "continuous" and "smooth" (Sadie, personal communication, May 3, 2018). Her perception of a successful lesson coincided with evidence of student success. She detailed:

> S: It just felt like they were engaged, and then like talking in their book clubs they were truly having conversations about books, they weren't talking about anything else- this is what she's asking us to do- yes some of them rounded the corner faster than others, but I don't know, I felt like they did a good job.
> N: What did you as the teacher do to help the students have that success?
> S: I looked at it before I taught it. (Sadie, personal communication, May 3, 2018)

This excerpt shows that Sadie felt students did a job and were engaged. For the first time in our coaching cycle she witnessed student success as a result of the target strategy.

Interestingly, Sadie's comments in the previous excerpt also illuminate a lack of ownership over that success. By saying that the only thing she did that led to it was looking at the lesson before she taught it, Sadie seems to be saying that it was the lesson, and not her instructional decisions and moves, that led to student success. I believed that in order to for her to experience a sense of efficacy around the student success she witnessed Sadie would need to feel she played an impactful role in it. Thus, I further questioned Sadie in hopes of helping her create an agentive narrative (Johnston, 2012). I asked her what else she did that led to that student success and engagement, to which she replied: "I don't feel like I did anything else"(Sadie, personal communication, May 3, 2018). I reflected in my journal on this lack of ownership, exclaiming:

This surprised me because, from my perspective, there are many moves she made as a teacher that led to student engagement. How interesting that she thought the lesson went well and yet saw herself as playing only a small role in that success (Journal entry, May 3, 2018).

By the end of our third dialogue I was able to help Sadie reflect on what she had done to led to student success. She ultimately realized that it was by holding students accountable for the expectations she set and continually returning to the purpose of their work that students were able to engage with the work and achieve at a higher level (Sadie, personal communication, May 3, 2018). I believe that it was this evidence of student success, coupled with the agentive narrative we were eventually able to create around that success, which led Sadie to experience an increase in self-efficacy and decrease in self-doubt by the closing of our third coaching conversation.

Sadie's increased self-efficacy around the target strategy continued in our fourth conversation. While she felt the mastery experience lesson was "hard overall for students" (Sadie, personal communication, May 30, 2018), Sadie still felt students were engaged. Additionally, her reflections on her use of the target strategy indicated a belief in the effectiveness of it. For example, as I gave Sadie feedback, saying she made her end-of-reading share meaningful and purposeful by connecting it to the learning target she responded:

S: But it works.
N: Yeah.
S: Obviously it works. (Sadie, personal communication, May 30, 2018)

I took note of this excerpt in my journal, especially her repetition in asserting the effectiveness of the strategy. I reflected:"This repetition tells me that she really feels efficacy around the use of this strategy" (Journal entry, May 30, 2018). The uncertainty I

observed in our first coaching dialogue had been replaced by confidence. Through further

questioning I invited Sadie to name what she was seeing that made her think the strategy

works. She responded with an agentive narrative:

> Well I think like trying to be intentional about a closing that gets them back to what we started with, if they know like [I'm] gonna keep pulling it back to it, then they're more engaged throughout the whole thing and I think they're accountable for something like, 'she is gonna ask me a question at the end' but everybody is asked the same question it's not one kid being asked, but they know they're true-they're keyed into what they need to be doing. (Sadie, personal communication, May 30, 2018)

Here Sadie described a narrative where she is someone that can have an impact on her

students' engagement and learning by being intentional and holding them accountable for

the learning target.

With a sense of agency and evidence of student success, Sadie was able to build

her self-efficacy for her target instructional strategy. Further confirmation of her growth

around the strategy came at the close of our final coaching conversation. Sadie shared

that implementing her target strategy "seems easier" and added, it doesn't seem like one

more thing to do it just seems like this is what you need to be doing to make it work"

(Sadie, personal communication, May 30, 2018). In these comments I see a great deal of

belief in future success around the strategy. As I explicated in my journal: "That

statement makes me think she sees value in this instructional strategy and that it now

feels like a cohesive piece of her practice" (Journal entry, May 30, 2018). Our

collaboration allowed Sadie to take a strategy that originally felt disjointed, and turn it

into a practice that felt intentional and purposeful.

Themes and Patterns

A number of noteworthy patterns and themes surfaced during my analysis of the data through the lens of self-efficacy. Patterns of Wheatley's (2001) harmful types of high efficacy emerged across several of the case studies. For Brynn it was too-certain self-efficacy, for Claudia it was high self-efficacy in traditional goals, and for Missy it was high self-efficacy in traditional teaching methods. The content analysis revealed that each of these teachers needed to experience a decrease in these types of harmful self-efficacy before they were able to experience an increase in self-efficacy for their target strategy.

A theme in connection to these harmful types of efficacy was the importance of self-doubt in the process of building efficacy for new practices. This aligns with Wheatley's (2002) assertion that doubts in self-efficacy are important because they create a cognitive dissonance that encourages reflection. Such self-doubt and consequent reflection motivates teachers to make changes to their practice, as was evident across the experiences of all six participants. This theme also reinforces the value of a coach, as it was through coaching that teachers were able to explore and reflect on their self-doubt. Furthermore, coaching allowed the teachers an opportunity to leverage self-doubt as a catalyst for learning, rather than allowing it to become disempowering in ways that could decrease efficacy. This supports the research from the literature review that asserted coaching can help mitigate the doubts that come from attempting to implement a new technique in ways that encourage the teacher to persist in implementation (Guskey 1986, 1989 as cited by Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998) As a result of coaching self-doubt in the short term became self-efficacy in the long run.

An additional theme that unfolded from my cross-case synthesis was the importance of teacher's witnessing evidence of student success. An increase in self-efficacy for the target strategy frequently coincided with each participant's observations of the positive impact that strategy had on their students. This fits with the research stating that teachers need to see a positive outcome for students and an increase in learning before their own efficacy similarly increases (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Once again the importance of a coach is underscored by this pattern, as it was often through coach questioning and feedback that reflection on student success occured.

Finally, cross-case analysis also revealed a pattern in teachers experiencing an increase in efficacy in correlation with their development of an agentive narrative. In the case of several participants transcriptions from early in the coaching cycle indicated a sense of disempowerment and lack of ownership regarding student success. As the cycle continued teachers began to develop what Johnston (2012) calls an agentive narrative, a narrative where teachers view themselves as someone that accomplishes goals by acting strategically. This construction of an agentive narrative demonstrated that teachers were gaining a sense of ownership and agency while simultaneously shedding the sense of disempowerment from earlier conversations. It can be inferred from this positive correlation that co-constructing an agentive narrative with a teacher is a key part of the process in building teacher self-efficacy. Once more the theme of coaches as essential to increasing teacher self-efficacy for new instructional practices is reinforced by this

pattern. Coaches can use language such as Johnston's (2012) casual process statements to co-construct agentive narratives with a teacher.

Cross-case analysis uncovered patterns and themes that point to integral components in building teacher self-efficacy. Experiences of self-doubt, in conjunction with reflection, observation of evidence of student success, and the development of an agentive narrative, came together to create an increased efficacy for teachers around their target literacy practice. Finally, the underlying theme that connects each of these patterns is the value of a coach. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) maintain that coaching leads to an increase in teacher's self-efficacy. Indeed, the results from cross-case analysis suggest that reflection on self-doubt, noticing and naming student success, and the creation of an agentive narrative became possible only through the support of a coach.

In this section I shared and analyzed both the quantitative and qualitative results for each of the six participants regarding their self-efficacy. I then highlighted the patterns and themes that arose from a cross-case analysis of the six case studies. In the next section I explore how the language I used as a coach during this study connects to the impacts on self-efficacy I discovered in the previous section. I begin by reviewing my method for analyzing the data around the language I employed. I then summarize and analyze the impact each category of language had on teachers. Finally, I explore themes and patterns that surfaced across all types of language. My examination of themes and patterns led to the identification of three key findings regarding language that increases teacher self-efficacy. These findings show that language for building self-efficacy

unearths self-doubt within teachers that leads to reflection, produces new ideas and new learning for teachers, and, finally, supports teachers in creating agentive narratives.

The Impact of Language

In order to determine the impact that the use of specific language had on teachers I looked for patterns in their responses. Nine categories of teacher responses emerged from the research. These categories included: responses that indicate self-confidence, or conversely, responses that convey self-doubt, statements that suggest doubts around an approach or strategy, expressions of belief in future success, expressions of uncertainty in future success, responses revealing new ideas or new learning, responses that indicate evidence of student success, responses that convey ownership- meaning they attribute an outcome to their actions- and conversely, responses that attribute outcomes to outside factors. Once I identified these categories of teacher responses I analyzed how often a prompt from each of the categories I identified in Appendix A led to one of these eight teacher responses.

Trust, Listening, and Empathy Prompts: Results and Analysis

By far the language that I employed most frequently during the twenty-four coaching conversations in this study were prompts for building trust, listening, and showing empathy. I used such prompts approximately 854 times. Teachers most commonly cited these prompts when asked *which words or phrases were most helpful in your learning?*, especially the prompt "I hear you saying." Claudia responded to the same question by stating: "Everything Nicole says is affirming and makes me feel very safe" (Claudia, survey, May 15, 2018). Furthermore, the results of surveys reinforced the

impact of language for building trust, listening, and showing empathy. One hundred

percent of participants said they *strongly agreed* with the statements: *My coach created a*

sense of trust and *My coach listened closely to my ideas* (see Appendix C, table 4.8 and

4.9). Additionally, one hundred percent of participants either *agreed* or *strongly agreed*

with the statements: *My coach demonstrated care for my feelings and needs* and *My*

coach validated my strengths (see Appendix C, table 4.10 and 4.11). These survey results

lead me to believe that by using specific language I was able to develop a sense of trust,

listen closely, convey care and empathy, and acknowledge teachers' strengths.

Prompts for building trust, listening, and showing empathy typically led to teacher

responses indicating new ideas or new learning, self-doubt, and ownership. There were

eighty-five instances where prompts for trust, listening, and empathy resulted in new

ideas or new learning for teachers. Evidence of such an interaction lies in my fourth

coaching conversation with Kinsley, as we discuss which moments she was choosing to

call on students individually and which moments she was having all students turn and

talk with each other:

> K: So that one could have been more of a turn and talk too probably.
> N: Can you- I'm intrigued by that, say more about why that one could have been a turn and talk.
> K: They all quite a few of them came up with different answers- now I'm forgetting specifically what they said but-
> N: So am I couldn't keep up.
> K: . . . because in my head I was thinking and also because I read the book hoping for somebody to be like 'oh he's like saving it for something maybe he wants to buy bigger,' but there were can't remember exactly what they were saying there were a few before that- 'that's a really good idea.' (Kinsley, personal communication, April 26, 2018).

Here I encouraged reflection by prompting Kinsley to say more about why that particular question could have been answered by students through a turn and talk. In her reflection Kinsley revealed that she had a specific answer in her mind, but that students had come up with other possible answers. In asking her to elaborate on her thinking I invited Kinsley to reexamine her instructional choices. As a result, she was able to discover that there were other ways of thinking about the book beyond the one answer she had in mind, and that allowing students to turn and talk could open up the possible responses students offer. Her new learning was a direct consequence of my listening and prompting.

Interestingly, language conveying trust, listening, and empathy also frequently unearthed feelings of self-doubt. I counted eighty-one interactions where such prompts resulted in expressions of doubt in a teacher. Often times asking teachers to tell more about something caused them to reveal underlying doubts. An example of this is during my third conversation with Quinn, after she tells me she did not do a very good job during the lesson:

> N: Say more about that.
> Q: Well cause I was like 'I just love the way you' know I was doing that, I mean it's not like like the like the prop- you know you're not supposed to do that, that's not how I am the way that I talk is that is how I teach and I make no apologies for that and I know that there's supposed to be like a way like you're supposed to talk with kids like "what do you see can you explain that to me" and I mean that kind of and I do that but when I'm excited about something you know that kinda also goes out the window so if that's what you we're looking for you probably didn't see that. (Quinn, personal communication, April 13, 2018)

By prompting Quinn to tell more about why she thought the lesson did not go well I uncovered the story she was telling herself about a lesson that did not go well because she did not apply learning from a professional development we just had. Tschannen-Moran

and Tschannen-Moran (2010) state that coaches must listen to teachers' stories to find out

what meaning they are making out of their experiences. Listening to Quinn and

encouraging her to share her story helped me understand why she thought the lesson did

not go well, and also provided me insight into what her needs were. I saw that fear of not

implementing everything perfectly right away was causing her to view the lesson

negatively. I was able to remind Quinn that her language was not the focus of our cycle,

and then guide her in reflecting on what went well with the instructional strategy that was

the focus of our work.

Prompts for building trust, listening, and empathy also led to a sense of ownership

in teachers. I calculated sixty-two times where such prompts caused teacher to articulate

ownership over outcomes. One such instance occurred during my fourth conversation

with Brynn:

> N: I feel like I hear you saying that part of it is being explicit in strategy
> instruction and that if- am I correct in thinking you're saying if they're not getting
> it that then you're going to go back to one of those strategies and prompt a little
> bit more into strategy use?
> B: Yes
> N: Is that correct?
> B: Yep, and if that doesn't work I'll have to figure something else out I'll have to
> figure out what is really kind of the disconnect between it but I think that maybe I
> just wasn't explicit enough with this group of kids and need to go back and
> review. those (Brynn, personal communication, May 8, 2018)

Knight (2016) maintains that coaches can show they are listening by paraphrasing what a

teacher has said. In this excerpt I paraphrase what Brynn had said by using the prompt "I

feel like I hear you saying." She then confirms that I understood her correctly and

proceeds to talk about what she will do if her approach does not work. Making a plan for

what she will do if it does not work, along with attributing the disconnect to her own

failure to be explicit, conveys a sense of ownership. In the additional comments of her

fourth survey Brynn details how this use of paraphrasing benefited her:

> The rephrasing or paraphrasing of what I had just said helped me a lot in being able to organize my thoughts and to realize the things that I clearly know or recognized in the lesson. This helped me reflect and move forward to the next lesson/steps in planning. (Brynn, survey, May 23, 2018)

Through paraphrasing I was able to both communicate that I was listening to Brynn and

mirror back to her her own ideas in a way that then allowed her to reflect and plan her

next steps. The end result was a sense of ownership and agency in Brynn.

Prompts for Questioning and Reflection: Results and Analysis

Over the course of the twenty-four coaching conversations I engaged teachers in,

I asked approximately 239 questions to foster reflection. My use of reflective questioning

was further evidenced by the results of the surveys, as seen in table 4.12 (see Appendix

C), where in twenty-one out of the twenty-two conversations teachers reported that they

either *agreed* or *strongly agreed* with the statement *my coach asked questions that*

fostered reflection. The top three responses to reflective questions included: new ideas or

new learning, self-doubt, and ownership.

Reflective questioning most frequently lead to a new idea or new learning for the

teacher. I calculated sixty-four times where a questioning had such an impact. Indeed, in

her second survey, in the additional comments section, Kinsley commented: "Questions

fostered deep reflection to guide me to find my own answers" (Kinsley, survey, April 5,

2018). Reflective questioning also often uncovered self-doubt. I coded forty-five

instances where reflective question was followed by a statement of self-doubt. Evidence

of new learning and self-doubt as a result of questioning is clear in the following excerpt

from my second coaching conversation with Sadie, as we reflected on students' response

to a prompt I gave them:

> N: . . . what about the piece . . . of how- 'how did this strategy that you learned in the mini lesson help you today?'
> S: I think a lot of them got stuck there.
> N: Yeah. I noticed the same thing. Why do you think that was?
> S: I think because they were focused on- a lot of them were looking like 'what strategy is she really- where is the correct answer.'
> N: It became about the right answer.
> S: And I don't know how we got there. (Sadie personal communication, April 13, 2018)

Here questioning led Sadie to realize that students became stuck because they were

focused on finding the one "correct answer" rather than using a strategy that worked for

them. Questioning led to a cognitive shift for Sadie that has the potential to produce

change in her instructional practices (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010). At the same time that

questioning resulted in new learning for Sadie, it also caused some self-doubt. Her

statement "and I don't know how we got there" conveys uncertainty. She saw her

students worried about getting the right answer- an outcome she finds undesirable- and

she knew something led to this but she was not sure what it was. This self-doubt caused

cognitive dissonance for Sadie that fueled our conversation, resulting in further

exploration of what caused students to become so focused on getting the right answer,

and, even more importantly, what she would do differently in the future based on this

reflection.

Reflective questioning also often led to a sense of ownership in the teacher. I

totaled thirty-eight cases where a reflective question resulted in a statement indicating

ownership on the behalf of the teacher. It seems that through questioning I was able to

empower teachers to discover their ability to impact student learning. For example, when

Brynn was struggling with being intentional in planning her guided reading groups I used

questioning to help her discover her own solution:

> N: So if that's something you've been struggling with how might you- what might
> be your next step with that then- how do you intend to get started with being more
> intentional around that?
> B: . . . so I think just organizing my notes better sometimes I mean more often
> than not I kind of fly by the seat of my pants, kind of like guided reading group
> let's just practice reading kinda checking it's more just anecdotal like I said in our
> last meeting, and I haven't really kept consistent notes with progressions like this
> so I think that's my first step honestly is being able to look here at what we have
> and just student by student recognizing what they need. (Brynn, personal
> communication, April 4, 2018)

Here reflective questioning resulted in Brynn coming to her own realization that "flying

by the seat of her pants" was not helping her reach her goal of responding to student need

in guided reading groups. She owned her lack of intentionality and then developed her

own plan for keeping consistent notes during group in order to look at where students are

and what they need next. This fits with the work of Armstrong (2012) who asserts that

questioning allows teachers to access their inner expertise and empowers leadership from

within. In this study reflective questioning both fostered teachers' ownership over their

actions and empowered them to to develop their own solutions and next steps.

Prompts for Empowerment and Ownership: Results and Analysis

During the twenty-four coaching dialogues I participated in I used approximately

141 prompts for promoting empowerment and ownership. In twenty-one out of the

twenty-two coaching conversations teachers indicated in their survey that they *strongly*

agreed with the statement "*My coach treated me as an equal partner*" (see table 4.13 in

Appendix C), It is possible that my use of prompts for empowerment and ownership may

have created this sense of partnership. Most frequently such prompts led to teacher responses indicating new ideas or new learning, ownership, and self-doubt.

The employment of language that I categorized as prompts for empowerment and ownership most often resulted new ideas or new learning. I counted twenty-seven times where this was the case. For example, during my second dialogue with Missy I positioned her as capable of identifying her own next steps in response to a struggle:

> N: Right, so I hear you're still really wondering how you can plan for a strategy group in a way that's intentional without spending too much time.
> M: Right.
> N: How do you intend to start as we move forward now to another strategy group?
> M: Well I think that I will start with a pre-assessment that maybe gives me a little more information about students and think a little more about whose in the group and why. (Missy, personal communication, March 27, 2018)

Missy's response reflects a new idea: that effective strategy group planning starts with a quality pre-assessment. Empowering Missy to find her own solution not only helped her see herself as someone capable of solving her own problems, but it also led to a new realization for her. An alternative response to Missy's problem would have been to fix it for her by giving advice. This, however, would have prevented her own sense of efficacy and could not have resulted in new learning for Missy (Knight, 2016). In fact, she came up with a solution that I had not thought of in that moment. This supports Armstrong's (2012) claim that giving advice silences other ways of thinking. Empowering language leads to new ideas and new learning that, in turn, can positively impact a teacher's sense of self-efficacy.

It should come as no surprise that prompts for empowerment and ownership also often resulted in responses that indicated ownership. I coded twenty-three instances

where empowering language caused teachers to attribute an outcome to their actions.

Additionally, prompts for empowerment generated responses of self-doubt almost as

frequently as ones of ownership. There were twenty-one cases where a prompt for

empowerment or ownership led to such expressions of doubt. An example of both the

ownership and doubt that empowering language produced comes from my third

conversation with Claudia. In my attempt to help her create an agentive narrative around

the student success she witnessed I asked her what she did to help her students succeed.

She answered:

> Well I always think about what I didn't do- what did I do well? I think probed,
> kept after them, challenged them to think like with Ben sitting down with him and
> working through that. Cameron- I don't know I guess that's probably been
> something that's been evolving over time, like I always think its not there but then
> he surprises me and it is so I think relationship is important in that specific- for
> that student . . . yeah sometimes I felt like I was leading them too much you
> know. (Claudia, personal communication, April 24,2018)

This statement contains equal parts doubt and ownership. Claudia starts and ends with

self-doubt, sharing that she tends to see her actions through a deficit lens, and ending by

saying that she may have been leading her students too much. In between these

expressions of doubt is ownership over the positive actions she did take, including the

probing and challenging of students. Here the language of empowerment helped Claudia

see herself as someone that acts strategically in way that positively impacts her students,

or in other words, supported her in creating what Johnston (2012) calls an agentive

narrative.

Feedback Prompts: Results and Analysis

Throughout the twenty-four coaching conversations teachers and I participated in I provided teachers with 221 feedback prompts. Teachers rarely replied to the feedback with more than a simple one-word response. Even still, their notes in the comments section of the survey suggested that they found the feedback helpful. When asked "*Which words or phrases were most helpful in your learning*?" Brynn and Quinn included the language I used around noticing, such as "I noticed . . ." (Brynn, survey, May 23, 2018; Quinn, survey, June 8, 2018) and Sadie (survey, May 30, 2018) mentioned my use of the causal process statement:"When you do . . . the result is . . ." These qualitative results from the survey reinforce the notion that teachers found the feedback valuable. In twenty of twenty-two coaching conversations teachers said they *strongly agreed* that I gave them feedback that furthered their growth (see table 4.13 in Appendix C).

During coaching conversations, in the rare cases where teachers did respond to the feedback it typically led to one of the following outcomes: ownership, new ideas or new learnings, and self-doubt. I counted seventeen occasions where feedback resulted in a teacher expressing ownership over outcomes. A powerful example of one such interaction comes from my fourth dialogue with Brynn:

> N: I noticed that you do a lot of things at the beginning of small group that sets kids up for engagement. So you give them time to preview the book and really kind of you seem to have found that sweet spot of like enough time for them to look through without losing the whole group time to-
> B: Yeah.
> N: Looking at- you move it along at a nice pace and you honor like what are you guys noticing you said, 'is there anything that jumped out at you?' and every single student had something to share. They were so engaged and ready to read the text when you sent them off and you also said to them 'let's dive in and maybe your questions will be answered' because a lot of them had questions like 'how did they get up on the roof?' and so by setting that purpose and telling them 'you're a reader you have questions, and as you read you'll find the answers' that creates engagement and that creates purpose. Those kids- I think we both agree

they were working really hard- for them this particular work wasn't easy and they put in the work, and I think a lot of that was because you set up that engagement for them.
B: I didn't even notice I said some of those things.
N: Yeah.
B: Now that you say it, oh yeah I did say that.
N: Yep, every time you know give them the time to do that and set a purpose you're increasing engagement so keep doing that.
B: That makes me feel good because I don't always realize that I actually do that. (Brynn, personal communication, May 8, 2018)

It is evident that by naming in a non-evaluative manner the instructional moves that Brynn made I was able to foster in her a sense of ownership. Her statements saying she did not even realize she was doing these things tell me that the feedback guided her to notice her actions and the positive impact they had. This correlation between feedback and a sense of ownership fits with Johnston's (2012) claim that feedback should further an agentive narrative. In this particular instance, the feedback I gave Brynn helped us co-construct a narrative of her as a teacher that makes choices which lead to positive outcomes for her students.

New ideas and new learning were also generated as a result of feedback in the coaching conversations. I calculated twelve times where the use of feedback language spurred a new idea or new learning for the teacher. Interestingly, self-doubt was an equally common response to feedback, with twelve moments where feedback cultivated doubt. Both new learning and self-doubt are evident in the following excerpt from my third conversation with Missy, where I used feedback to help her discover that she was doing a lot of the problem-solving for her students:

N: You figured out that it wasn't lending itself to the strategy and you picked a new section for her.
M: And I think for me I'm just so efficiency minded that like I just want to get you in a section where you can do the work and I know you can do the work and

> so I- I now when you repeat think that, yeah, I should have waited and I should have let her tell me. I could have prompted with questions rather than giving her the answers or saying those things. The hard part for me is like waiting while this other student also is ready and is like, I don't know, that's what's hard for me. (Missy, personal communication, April 18, 2018)

In the first line I deliver feedback by simply stating what I noticed her do with a particular student. I do not state whether I think this is good or bad and I do not offer alternatives; I merely share my observation. Self-doubt is evident in Missy's remarks, as she says "I don't know" and that this work is hard for her. As she responds, Missy also experiences new learning. She comes to the realization that her own desire for efficiency led her to give the student the answer. Missy then develops her own possible solution: she could have prompted the student with questioning. This fits with Cheliotes and Reilly's (2010) assertion that quality feedback builds a teacher's capacity. Rather than telling Missy how to solve her problem, her reflection around my feedback helped her discover her own answers.

Life-Giving Prompts: Results and Analysis

In the duration of the twenty-four coaching conversation I facilitated, I made sixty-two life-giving statements. The intention behind using life-giving language was to energize and inspire teachers. The results from teacher surveys depicted in table 4.15 (see Appendix C) show that this goal was achieved. One hundred percent of the teachers reported feeling energized and inspired in each of our conversations. It is likely that the life-giving prompts I used had an impact on these results. Interestingly, in looking across the coaching conversations, the most common responses to life-giving prompts were statements of self-doubt and statements of self-confidence.

The most frequent response to a life-giving statement was self-doubt. In ten of the sixty-two instances where I employed a life-giving prompt the teacher's response revealed doubt. For example, in my attempt to energize and inspire Claudia during our final conversation I exclaimed:"your commitment to your job and to your students really inspires me and I think your students are incredibly lucky to have a teacher that cares as much as you do." Claudia countered my statement by responding: "Did you not look at these scores" (Claudia, personal communication, May 15, 2018). Her retort suggests that the test scores cast doubt on her abilities as a teacher. Looking back on my literature review I struggled to find research that shed light on why teachers would respond to life-giving language with self-doubt. While I could find no such scholarly insight, I do wonder if these responses reflect the sense of pervasive sense of disempowerment teachers in education experience that Wall and Palmer (2015) write about. It is possible that when faced with affirmations teachers' initial response is to counter them with self-doubt because of an overall sense of disempowerment.

Conversely, teachers responded to life-giving statements with confidence at an equivalent frequency. Of the sixty-two instances where I used such a prompt the teacher's answer showed a sense of self-confidence. This is evident in the following interaction with Brynn:

> N: As we've been talking we've been able to celebrate a lot of things, so one of my last questions for you is which of your strengths are serving you well right now?
> B: I think my ability to adjust in the moment. Where I had problems was not having enough mental preparation, but now that I had those questions written down my ability to flex in the moment was really strong.
> N: Yep, what else?
> B: I think that I do a pretty good job of also connecting what they can do at least with them like helping them recognize 'I see what you are doing' and it's not just

you need to fix this or do this, connecting to what they already can do to move
forward. (Brynn, personal communication, April 13, 2018)

In this excerpt I used the question about her strengths to empower and inspire Brynn.

This language clearly leads her to express confidence in her abilities, as she talks about

being able to respond to student need in the moment and building on what students can

do to move them forward. This confidence is also empowering, as Brynn talks about

herself as a teacher that makes effective instructional moves.

Prompts for Inquiry Into Possibilities: Results and Analysis

Across the twenty-four coaching conversations I engaged in with teachers I made

230 statements inquiring into possibilities. Table 4.16 (see Appendix C) highlights my

use of such language, as in twenty-one of the twenty-two conversations teachers either

agreed or *strongly agreed* with the statement: *My coach helped me explore different*

possibilities and take risks. The most common responses to language supporting the

inquiry into possibilities was new ideas or new learning and self-doubt.

Language encouraging the exploration of different possibilities most frequently

resulted in new ideas or new learning for teachers. I coded thirty-seven instances that

captured the new thinking that came from prompts for inquiring into possibilities. One

such example arose during my third conversation with Kinsley. She had mentioned that a

lot of students were talking out of turn during her read alouds, so I asked her to consider

how she might create a space for students' ideas as they bubble up, she replied:

> K: Sharing either out loud to the whole class or another turn and talk even if it
> wasn't planned. I could- if I noticed they're all excited about something bring that
> in there instead of- I don't have to just do the ones that are planned if I see that
> they're excited about something.
> N: Yeah, when you do that- when you see that they're excited and then you throw
> in a turn and talk you don't plan- what you're saying to them is their ideas matter

that you have a voice too and you've got a lot to say about this we'd better pause and talk about this.

K: Yes.

N: What else could you- what might you try when you start to notice they've got some ideas that they're dying to share?

K: I mean a stop and jot would be a good . . . a good way for them to share possibly. . . (Kinsley, personal communication, April 13, 2018)

Here I first asked Kinsley to create her own solution to the problem of students talking out of turn, and she devised her own solution of giving the students an opportunity to turn and talk about their thinking with a partner when she starts to notice many of the students getting excited about something. In order to convey that this was one possibility of many I then asked her "what else?" and this led her to the idea that another possibility would be having the students stop and write down the ideas they want to share. As a result of the language I used, Kinsley left our conversation with two possibilities that she came up with in response to a problem. This aligns with Johnston's (2012) claim that learning is only possible when there is more than one possible answer or outcome.

Through my analysis I also discovered that language inquiring into multiple possibilities often led to self-doubt. I calculated twenty-one times when self-doubt was the outcome of inquiry based prompts and questioning. One such instance comes from my second dialogue with Brynn, as we discuss choosing prompts intentionally:

N: Yeah, so what else might you do in addition to keeping, you know, notes that kind of track where they are with their target area- what else could you do to be intentional in the prompts you use?

B: Hmmm . . . I- I honestly don't know really. (Brynn, personal communication, April 4, 2018)

In this example, I attempted to open the conversation to the exploration of different possibilities by asking Brynn what else she might do, in addition to an idea she had

already given. This led to self-doubt for Brynn, as evidenced in her response that she really does not know. Brynn's comments in the survey she completed after this conversation shed further light on the frustration and self-doubt such inquiries fostered. In response to "*which words or phrases were least helpful in your learning?* Brynn wrote:

> 'What other strategies or questions will you ask?' This is because I really didn't have any additional thoughts on what else to ask in the moment- if I had pulled out a resource to look at, I think it would have been just fine, but in the moment, I was blanking. (Brynn, survey, April 4, 2018)

This comment tells me that Brynn felt like she did not have any other ideas in the moment, which then made the question "*what else?*" frustrating. Reflecting on this, I wonder if it would make sense to have varying degrees of prompts for inquiring into possibilities. The question "what else" is very open-ended and offers the teacher little support. There are moments where it would be appropriate, such as in the previous example with Kinsley where it led to new learning, and moments where it can lead to frustration and doubt. A prompt such as "what do you think would happen if . . ." involves more scaffolding for the teacher since it involves them responding to a possibility that the coach puts forth. I think it might be helpful if I categorized my prompts for inquiry into categories based on how much scaffolding they provide. This would allow me to then choose prompts for inquiry into possibilities with the appropriate amount of support for a teacher during a conversation based on what they seem to need in the moment.

Prompts that Diminish Efficacy

Despite my best attempts to avoid language that had the potential to diminish teacher efficacy, I made 261 statements across the twenty-four coaching conversations that fell into that category. Although teachers did not include any of these prompts in the section of the survey that asked *which words or phrases were least helpful in your learning*, it is evident that these statements frequently shut down the conversation, leading teachers to respond with only one-word answers. Furthermore, the most frequent response to prompts that diminish efficacy was self-doubt, followed by new ideas or new learning, and attributing outcomes to outside factors.

That the prompts I identified as diminishing efficacy had the potential to undercut a teacher's sense of confidence is supported by the fact that the most frequent response to these prompts were expressions of self-doubt. I calculated thirty incidents where I employed language that had the potential to diminish efficacy and it elicited a response of self-doubt. Along with this, teachers were likely to respond by attributing outcomes to outside factors rather than their own actions. This is interesting because prompts that diminish efficacy are the only ones, amongst that the seven prompts that I coded, that had a response of attributing outcomes to outside factors as one of the top three responses. An example of a response that conveys self-doubt and a lack of ownership over the outcome is found in my fourth conversation with Sadie, as we discuss a student that, after some struggle, landed on a deep insight about his book:

> N: He want- like but he sat with the struggle and were there- when he got to mirrors- did you coach him?
> S: No, No but then I circled back I think and saw him and he was like 'I got it' ok that's awesome.
> N: Yeah.
> S: And that's you know pure luck on that one cause he does sit and struggle. (Sadie, personal communication, May 30, 2018).

In the first line of this excerpt I made two moves that could potentially diminish efficacy. First, I said "but" where I should have said "and." Knight (2016) asserts that "but: is a word that divides rather than unites. Second, I asked a closed-ended question that could only be answered with "yes" or "no." Knight also claims that such closed questions shut down the conversation and prevent opportunities for co-construction of meaning. Sadie had no choice but to respond with "no," which then took away her ownership immediately. This student had a moment of deep learning, and because of the way I asked the question, Sadie could only say that no, she did not play a role in his learning. This then led her to attribute his learning to "pure luck," a statement which conveys a lack of ownership in his learning and doubt in her ability to impact his success. In this moment, one single question had the power to construct a narrative where learning happens by chance.

It is compelling to note that the use of prompts that diminish efficacy also often produced new ideas of new learning in teachers. I totaled fifteen moments where language that had the potential to diminish efficacy resulted in the teacher coming to new realizations. For example, in my fourth coaching conversation with Brynn, she asked my advice on what to do in groups when students finish early. According to Knight (2016) the act of giving advice can subvert a teacher's sense of self-efficacy. Despite this, I advised Brynn to have students read the next text in the multi-text book she had them reading. I wondered if perhaps she had intentionally not wanted students to read on for some reason so I questioned further:

N: Is there a particular reason you didn't want them to read the next text?

B: I just hadn't planned- I just hadn't looked at it and I usually like to have some idea of what's going on it before I- nah I- I don't know.
N: Sure.
B: I just sometimes I get like too focused on what we're doing and I don't- just like too busy to- I feel like I was too busy to say move on I don't know.
N: Right
B: I didn't have any burning reason not to, I just didn't even think of it. (Brynn, personal communication, May 8, 2018)

In this excerpt, I asked a closed-ended question, and use the word "is." Johnston (2012) warns against the word "is," suggesting that it means there is one solid answer, and that it can close down all other possibilities worth exploring. This question put Brynn in a position where she had to admit that she had not planned intentionally for this. It also unearthed self-doubt, as she says "I don't know" two times. At the same time, this question led Brynn to new learning. She realized both that she sometimes gets "too focused" and "too busy" to help her students determine what to do next, and she also became aware that this is something she needs to think of and plan for ahead of time. In the end, although I did employ a significant number of prompts that had the potential to diminish efficacy, teachers still experienced increases in efficacy, as evidenced by the results of the surveys they completed. Perhaps the abundance of language that demonstrated listening and empathy and fostered empowerment, ownership, and confidence created enough trust and sense of possibility to counter the potentially damaging effects of language that otherwise would have diminished the teachers' overall self-efficacy.

Themes and Patterns

Several significant themes and patterns emerged from my analysis of the language I used in coaching conversations and its impact on teachers. The most prevalent pattern

was the way in which much of the language resulted in expressions of self-doubt. All six of the categories for prompts that increase self-efficacy, as well as prompts that diminish efficacy, included self-doubt as one of the top three most common teacher responses. This fits with a theme surfacing from my research around the value of self-doubt in building self-efficacy for new instructional practices. I employed language that elicited a response of self-doubt, thereby laying the foundation for consequent cognitive dissonance, reflection, and new learning.

A second key pattern that emerged was the way in which the language I used frequently resulted in new ideas or new learning for teachers. This fits with Crafton and Kaiser's (2011) notion that dialogue is a tool for constructing new learning. Five of the six categories for language that I identified as increasing self-efficacy, along with prompts that diminish efficacy, elicited a response of new ideas or new learning. This outcome aligns with Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran's (2010) assertion that learning occurs when people participate in the construction of meaning from their experiences and Armstrong's (2012) claim that the role of the coach is to facilitate reflection in order to capture and honor teacher's cognitive shifts. The language I used in conversations allowed for teacher reflection, and in turn, new learning.

Cross-case study analysis also unveiled a third pattern connecting language for building self-efficacy with an increased sense of ownership for teachers. All six of the categories of prompts for building efficacy led teachers to express ownership over student outcomes and success. This aligns with Johnston's (2012) assertion that language is a tool for constructing agentive identities. Once again this pattern correlates with a theme that

emerged in my analysis of the data through the lens of self-efficacy. The data suggests

that creating a sense of ownership by co-constructing an agentive narrative with a teacher

is an important part of the process in increasing teacher self-efficacy for new practices.

A synthesis of the results reveals that the language I originally hypothesized

would increase teacher self-efficacy did have such an impact. The language uncovered

self-doubts within teachers that we were then able to reflect on together. Prompts and

questions turned teachers' self-doubts into new ideas or new learning. Finally, words and

phrases for building self-efficacy then empowered teachers to construct agentive

narratives, consequently taking ownership over student outcomes. New ideas, new

learning, and a sense of ownership correlated with an increase in teacher self-efficacy for

their target strategy.

This section detailed how the language I employed as a coaching across all

twenty-four coaching conversations impacted teachers. I shared my process for

categorizing and analyzing teachers' responses to specific prompts. Next I presented and

studied the data regarding each category of prompts for building, as well as diminishing,

teacher efficacy in relation to the responses elicited from teachers. Finally, I highlighted

recurring patterns and themes that emerged across all categories of language for fostering

efficacy. In the next section I conclude the chapter with a summary of the key findings

from my research.

Conclusion

A correlation exists between the survey results, data from audio recordings of

coaching conversations, and anecdotal notes from my coaching journal.The results of the

survey indicated both that I was able to implement the components of an effective coaching conversation and that teachers overall experienced an increase in self-efficacy for their target literacy strategy. The transcription and coding of each conversation demonstrated that I was able to use the language I identified as increasing teacher efficacy, while also enabling me to observe the impact such language had on teachers' self-efficacy. Themes and patterns surfaced during my cross-case study analysis of each teacher's self-efficacy that were reinforced by my analysis of the types of language I used. Amidst the wealth of valuable quantitative and qualitative data that I gathered three significant findings emerged as essential to the process of building teacher self-efficacy: self-doubt, evidence of students success, and an agentive narrative of ownership. Connecting all three of these findings was the role of the coach. Through this study it became abundantly clear that coaching using a partnership approach, coupled with intentional language use, is the key element in building teacher efficacy for new literacy practices.

In this chapter I outlined, analyzed, and synthesized the data I collected. I first established dialogical coaching conversations as the core space for the work of this study. I then detailed the data I gathered regarding teacher self-efficacy, and my analysis of it. Next I shared and analyzed the data regarding the language I employed during coaching conversations and its impact on teachers. Finally, I summarized the key findings that I identified from the themes and patterns that emerged from my synthesis of the data.

In chapter five I conclude with a reflection on my research. I begin by revisiting the literature review and highlighting which parts proved most important for my study. I

then consider the implications of the key findings from my research. After which, I identify some of the limitations of my study. Finally, I explore possibilities for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

"Talk is action- a very powerful action that can change and transform people and organisations."
-Hilary Armstrong

Introduction

This capstone arose from my own opportunities for growth as I stepped into the role of literacy coach for the first time. My desire to empower teachers during coaching conversations, along with my belief in the power of words, lead me to inquire: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? To answer this question I engaged six teachers in individual coaching cycles, including vicarious and maserstry experiences accompanied by coaching conversations. Throughout the course of the coaching cycle I used multiple measures to assess teacher self-efficacy and the impact of the language I employed in conversations. The data from these assessments was analyzed and interpreted in chapter four. In this chapter I draw conclusions based on those findings.

I begin this chapter with a consideration of how research from the literature review connects to key findings from my study. I then contemplate the implications of my research in the context of my role as a literacy coach. Next, I reflect on the limitations of my study and possible future research connected to those limitations. After which, I articulate my next steps in moving forward with my findings. I conclude by reflecting on my own growth during this process.

Literature Review Connections

The findings of this capstone reinforce key concepts from the research presented in the literature review. There are six areas from the review that proved most important for my research around building teacher self-efficacy: the benefits of self-doubt, the importance of reflection, the significance of mastery experiences and witnessing of student success, the value of fostering ownership through an agentive narrative, the function of language as a tool for constructing meaning and identity, and the need for a coach to facilitate each of these components. Every one of these areas from the review were supported by the findings of my study as integral components in cultivating self-efficacy through coaching conversations.

Wheatley's (2001, 2002) research regarding the value of low efficacy and self-doubt proved salient in understanding and interpreting patterns that emerged from the data. Wheatley (2002) asserts that doubts in self-efficacy are necessary for teachers to learn and grow. Self-doubt creates cognitive dissonance that humans have a psychological need to resolve (Wheatley, 2002). This disequilibrium in teachers' thinking has the potential to inspire them to reflect on and change their practice. Wheatley's model of self-efficacy fits with patterns that surfaced during my research. Half of the participants demonstrated one of Wheatley's (2001) types of harmful teacher self-efficacy. I found that these teachers needed to experience a decrease in this harmful high efficacy before an increase in self-efficacy for their new target instructional strategy could occur. Overall, most of the participants expressed a high level of self-doubt for their target strategy at the beginning of the coaching cycle, which proved beneficial as it

fueled their desire to learn and grow. It was important, however, that teachers in my study

ultimately experienced an increase in efficacy. Cantrell and Callaway (2008) argue that

there exists a curvilinear relationship between teacher efficacy and change

implementation. Change coincides with an initial decrease in teacher efficacy. Eventually

teachers then develop high efficacy for a given instructional practice in a way that allows

them to implement it with persistence. This curvilinear relationship held true for the

participants in my research. All demonstrated high efficacy for their target strategy by the

end of our coaching cycle.

      Wyatt's (2012, 2016) research around the importance of reflection in building

self-efficacy also played a critical role in this capstone. Wyatt (2016) argues that

receiving input from sources of self efficacy, such as vicarious or mastery experiences,

does not automatically lead to cognitive processing of that information. He suggests that

the missing component in traditional self-efficacy models is reflection. In my research the

reflection that happened during coaching conversations supported teachers in turning

their self-doubts into new learning, new ideas, and plans for changes in their practice.

This aligns with Crafton and Kaiser's (2011) contention that dialogue is a tool for naming

ideas in ways that result in new learning. Furthermore, it also fits with Armstrong's

(2012) assertion that reflection is a tool for facilitating the construction of new meaning

from teacher's stories. The research showed, and this capstone concurred, that a coach's

job is to elicit, capture, and honor cognitive shifts that take place during reflection in

order to foster new learning.

Another principal piece of research in relation to this study was the power of mastery experiences and student success in strengthening teacher efficacy. Tschannen-Moran and Johnson (2011) and Tschannen-Moran et. al. (1998) claim that mastery experiences, coupled with coaching, are the most influential sources of self-efficacy. When a teacher experiences success with a given task they are more likely to believe in their ability to execute it again successfully in the future. In my study I discovered that teachers typically began to demonstrate an increase in self-efficacy after their first or second mastery experience. I also found that this increased efficacy correlated with evidence of student success. This aligns with research from the literature review, which maintains that teachers need to witness growth in student learning in order for their own self-efficacy to increase (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et. al, 1998). Teacher self-efficacy comes from successful mastery experiences and evidence of gains in student achievement.

Also informative in understanding and interpreting my research is Johnston's (2012) notion of the agentive narrative. Johnston (2012) introduces this concept as an individual's narrative of themselves as a person that acts and makes decisions based on a desired outcome. My research revealed that fostering a sense of ownership in teachers over their actions and outcomes in ways that co-constructed an agentive narrative was an important part of cultivating teacher self-efficacy. This also aligns with the work of Wall and Palmer (2015) who assert that coaches must empower teachers to become decision makers and problem solvers. Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2010) maintain that coaches can do this by helping teachers discover, acknowledge, and celebrate the

competence that is already within them. Johnston (2012) asserts that it is by being heard that individuals take themselves seriously and consequently views themselves agentively. The role of the coach, then, is to assist teachers in rehearsing an agentive narrative by giving them a voice during coaching conversations.

Equally pertinent to this capstone was the notion of language as a tool for constructing meaning. Johnston (2004) argues that language creates realities and identities. Coaching dialogues, then, are a space for socially co-constructing meaning and the self (Armstrong, 2012; Heineke, 2013). Words have an impact on the meaning the teacher makes and the identity they construct. The words a coach chooses influence the development of particular narratives in the teacher (Johnston, 2012). This means that the language a coach employs in a conversation with a teacher attributes meaning onto their actions, and therefore defines reality. My research fit with this interpretation of language as constructive. I found that our coaching conversations became a place where we created meaning out of shared experiences, and co-constructed an agentive identity about the teacher's role in said events.

Finally, the research concerning the value of a coach in building self-efficacy proved relevant to this capstone. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) argue that coaching results in an increase in a teacher's self-efficacy in their literacy practices. They explain that coaches support cognitive processing of four sources of efficacy in ways that lead to improved efficacy. Further, they suggest that vicarious experiences without coaching for cognitive processing can lead to a decrease in efficacy, whereas, coaching with vicarious and mastery experiences allows for reflective conversations to overcome

doubts that rise when teacher views gaps between their practice and the new skill (Tschannen-Moran and McMaster, 2009). Along with this, coaching counteracts dips in efficacy during change process in ways that encourage teachers to persevere (Guskey 1986, 1989 as cited by Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). My research holds true to these beliefs around coaching. Engaging teachers in reflective conversations after vicarious and mastery experiences supported teachers in processing sources of efficacy in ways that led to new learning and increased efficacy.

In this previous section I outlined six areas of research that I found most important in making meaning of my data. I then discussed how each area was relevant to the patterns and themes that arose from my study. In the next section I consider the implications of my findings in the context of my role as a literacy coach.

Implications

My own wonderings around the impact of the language I choose during a coaching conversation launched my research. Perhaps one of the most significant implications of my findings was that the words a coach employs during a coaching conversation have the power to impact the meaning teachers make and the identity they create for themselves. This suggests that coaches must be incredibly intentional about the words they choose in any given coaching dialogue. Initially I believed that it was important to use words from each of the categories I identified as building teacher self-efficacy during every conversation. However, my analysis of teacher responses to types of coaching language revealed that the same three responses emerged regardless of the category of the prompt. This outcome shifted my thinking. I now contend that it is

less important to use language from each category, and more important to employ any combination of the prompts for building efficacy. Overall, my findings suggest that coaches seeking to increase teacher self-efficacy must be deliberate in selecting words that unearth doubts, lead to reflection, and foster new learning and an agentive narrative.

Another implication from my research was the value of the coaching cycle. This implication stems from the salience of self-doubt, reflection, mastery experiences, and evidence of student success. These pieces take time and a great deal of conversation, revealing the value of the coaching cycle and coaching conversations. The length of a coaching cycle enables the time and space teachers need to first experience doubt, followed by successful mastery experiences, evidence of student achievement, and an eventual increase in self-efficacy for a new practice. One-and-done coaching experiences do not provide the opportunity for this type of growth.

Along with the importance of engaging in a coaching cycle over time is the importance of dialogical coaching conversations embedded throughout the cycle. The coaching cycle, with its mastery experiences, allows teachers to experience success in ways that lead them to believe in their ability to experience future success. The coaching conversation allows teachers to reflect on and own that success. A coaching cycle without reflection robs teachers of the opportunity to make meaning out of each vicarious or mastery experience. The coaching conversation also allows for teachers to process self-doubt, process mastery experiences, and reflect in ways that lead to new learning. The implication is clear: to make the space, time, and dialogue for teachers to experience

an increase in self-efficacy, coaches and teachers must participate in a coaching cycle with multiple opportunities for coaching conversations.

Finally, inherent within the two previous findings is the implication that a coach is an invaluable facilitator of the reflection and learning necessary for teacher efficacy growth. It is the coach that establishes the conditions of a true dialogical coaching conversation in ways that allow for co-construction of meaning and identities based on vicarious and mastery experiences. It is the coach that intentionally selects words and phrases that unearth self-doubts, and then turn those doubts into new learning and increased efficacy through reflection. My findings assert that a coach has the potential to be the most essential component in cultivating a teacher's sense of self-efficacy for a new instructional strategy.

In this section I presented the four most significant implications resulting from my research findings. I discussed the ways in which my study showed the value of intentionality in the language a coach utilizes during coaching conversations, the importance of engaging teachers in a coaching conversation over time, as well as embedding dialogical coaching conversations into the cycle, and the significance of the role of the coach at the core of the work in increasing teacher efficacy. In the following section I name the limitations of this study, and explore possibilities for future research.

Limitations and Future Research

Selecting a focused research question inevitably meant limiting the scope of my capstone. In reflecting on my study I have identified four significant limitations centering on four areas: non-verbal communication, cultural differences in communication styles,

narrow selection of participants, and impact on teacher practice. Once explored and inspected these limitations become opportunities for future research.

Communication

      Non-verbal communication. This capstone sought to discover the impact verbal communication has on teachers during a coaching conversation. One limitation of study was that it did not consider what role non-verbal communication played. Meaning can be conveyed through many different non-verbal sources, such as facial expression and body language. By only focusing on verbal language, I made the assumption that the trust, reflection, ownership and other impacts I had on teachers came from my words alone. I would be curious to know to what extent my body language, facial expressions, hand gestures, and even the tone of my voice, helped or hindered my efforts to implement the components of an effective coaching conversation and, in turn, my ability to increase teacher self-efficacy.

      Cultural connotations. A further limitation of this study was the lack of consideration of cultural differences in communication styles. In the literature review I detailed the components of effective coaching conversations without examining whether these components were founded on a white, middle class style of communication. As the facilitator of these conversations, it is important to note that I identify as white, female, and middle-class. Additionally, all six of the participants identified as white females. As such the results of this study demonstrate how the language used in a literacy coaching conversation impacts the self-efficacy of white, female teachers. I am curious to know more about whether the components of a transformative coaching conversation are

universal for all humans, or whether cultural differences in communication might lead to different components of an effective conversation. As a researcher operating from a privileged position because of my race it is incumbent upon me to consider the impact of my notions of dialogue on teachers from a variety of cultures.

Volunteer Participants

Another limitation of this capstone was the method for finding participants. In chapter three I described how I sent an email looking for teachers to volunteer. The six teachers that signed up to participate are ones that I had worked with before and had already established some relationship of trust. Furthermore, that they volunteered for such an experience indicates a certain openness to change and new learning. Thus, the results from this study reflect how language in a literacy coaching conversation impacts teacher self-efficacy in the case of teachers that trust the coach and embrace opportunities for growth. I wonder how the results from the study might differ if the participants were ones that had not worked with a coach, or at least me specifically, before and were resistant to change or new learning.

Impact on Teacher Practice

One other limitation of this study worth noting was the exclusion of a means for measuring implementation of the target instructional strategy. This capstone measured an increase in efficacy for the strategy, however it is yet to be seen whether such an increase in efficacy leads to the teachers integrating the new instructional practice into their teaching. I would be interested to learn more about what happened after our coaching

cycle ended. I wonder whether teachers truly had enough self-efficacy for the strategy to transfer it to their practice without the support of a coach.

Future Research

These limitations reveal opportunities for future research. First, given the nuanced meanings that non-verbal communication can convey, further research is needed to examine how elements such as a coach's facial expressions and body language contribute to teachers' responses during the coaching conversations in ways that may impact teacher self-efficacy. Second, and for me the area of highest interest, is learning more about how cultural differences contribute to the components of an effective coaching conversation. Such research could explore whether the components of an effective dialogue hold true regardless of a teacher's culture or whether cultural differences around styles of communication require different components, and therefore different language. Third, a study similar to this one, yet with a wider variety of participants, would shed further light on the validity of my findings. I am particularly interested in discovering more about the impact a coach's language can have on teacher self-efficacy in cases where the participants do not yet trust the coach, are resistant to change, and/or have a fixed mindset. Finally, research that measures the extent to which teachers implemented their target instructional strategy would be beneficial. This would provide insight into whether work around increasing a teacher's self-efficacy around a new strategy ultimately leads to integration of that strategy into their practice.

Scaffolding prompts. One additional opportunity for further research emerged from my reflection on the degree of scaffolding each prompt for building efficacy offers.

In chapter four, when reflecting on prompts for inquiry into possibilities, I realized that some of the prompts I used offered heavier scaffolding for teacher thinking than others. For example, "we could try . . . or we could try. . ." offers heavier scaffolding for exploring possibilities than "what else could we try?" This reflection leads me to believe that, just as I scaffolded my prompts as a classroom teacher to match student need, I might need to adjust my prompting for teachers during a coaching conversation. This would require categorizing prompts according to how heavy or lean they are, and then choosing a a prompt according to how much support I perceive a teacher to need in a given moment. I would be interested in conducting further research to explore the impact scaffolding prompts in such a way would have on teacher efficacy.

In this section I articulated four key limitations of my research. I then considered the possibilities these limitations opened up for future research. Following that I discussed one other opportunity worth future exploration. In the next section I outline my plan for moving forward with the findings of my study.

Moving Forward

Armed with key findings from my research I now have an obligation to apply and share my learning. This begins with my own practice as a literacy coach. I plan on integrating coaching cycles, including mastery experiences and reflective coaching conversations, into my practice. This will require familiarizing teachers with, and generating buy-in for, such a model of coaching. Along with this, I will intentionally plan for the language I will employ in coaching conversations by using the prompts I have identified as impacting teacher self-efficacy. I also intend to share the key findings from

my research with my colleagues on the district literacy coaching team. This will allow me to both share my learning and to then receive feedback and further from team members that choose to apply it. Ultimately, I believe that sharing my learning with fellow coaches and intentionally applying it to my own practice will benefit coaches, teachers, and students in our system.

Conclusion

I began this capstone seeking to answer the question: How does the language used in literacy coaching conversations impact teacher self-efficacy? In the process of engaging in this study I grew both in my own learning about teachers and about myself. Tracking, analyzing, and interpreting both teacher self-efficacy and my own language has furthered my conviction that a coach's role is to use language in ways that empower teachers' to believe in their capacity for future success.

Appendix A: Prompts for Building or Diminishing Teacher Self-Efficacy

Prompts for building trust, listening, and showing empathy
We… (Knight, 2016) I'm here for you. (Knight, 2016) Say more about that. (Johnston, 2012) I'm interested in hearing more about . . . (Aguilar, 2013) It would help my understanding if you gave an example of . . . (Aguilar, 2013) So . . . In other words . . . (Aguilar, 2013) What I'm hearing, then, . . . is that correct? (Aguilar, 2013) What I hear you saying is . . . Am I missing anything? (Aguilar, 2013) I'm hearing many things . . . (Aguilar, 2013) As I listen to you, I'm hearing . . . . Is there anything else you feel I should know? (Aguilar, 2013) Let me see if I understand . . . (Aguilar, 2013) I'm curious to know more about . . . (Aguilar, 2013) I'm intrigued by . . . (Aguilar, 2013) I'm interested in hearing more about . . . (Aguilar, 2013) Thank you for sharing your thoughts. Can you tell me more about …? (Aguilar, 2013) I'm noticing that you're experiencing some feelings. Would it be OK to explore those for a few minutes? (Aguilar, 2013) I hear you. How else might you describe this situation? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010) I understand and would feel the same in your place. (Wall and Palmer)

Prompts for questioning and reflection
What has challenged you and excited you since the last time we met? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010) I wonder . . . (Aguilar, 2013) What's getting in the way? (Wall and Palmer) What might it look like if we solved this problem? (Wall and Palmer) Do you think it has been successful? If so, what made the difference? (Wall and Palmer) What criteria do you use to . . . . ? (Aguilar, 2013) How did you decide . . . ? (Aguilar, 2013)

What do you think? (Aguilar, 2013)

How did you do that? (Johnston, 2012)

What are you thinking? (Johnston, 2012)

What is your next step?

After hearing yourself tell me about this situation, what are you thinking now? (Armstrong, 2012)

What are you thinking now? (Armstrong, 2012)

What has been your major take-away from this session? (Armstrong, 2012)

What are you noticing? . . . Any other patterns or things that surprise you? (Johnston, 2004)

How did you do that? (Johnston, 2012)

What do you think about.. (Knight, 2016)

What leads you to believe… (Knight, 2016)

What went well? (Knight, 2016)

What surprised you? (Knight, 2016)

What did you learn? (Knight, 2016)

What will you do differently next time? (Knight, 2016)

What are you seeing that shows that the strategy is successful (Steve Barkley as cited in Knight, 2016)

What were the children able to do in this lesson? What went well? (Peterson et al., 2009)

What else could have been done to make the lesson even stronger or to help students be even more successful? (Peterson et al., 2009)

What are you considering in regard to . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)

How do you see this different from . . . ? (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)

How did your students respond? (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)

What are you thinking will be a barrier? How will you plan for this? (Mine)

What is working with your approach? What else is working? What else? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

What would success look like? What else? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

How did you grow? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

How did this experience contribute to your growth? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

What did you learn about your students? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

Prompts for inquiring into possibilities

Maybe (Johnston, 2012)

Perhaps (Johnston, 2012)

Could be (Johnston, 2012)

What is another way you might . . . (Aguilar, 2013)

190

What would it look like if . . . ? (Aguilar, 2013)
What do you think would happen if . . . ? (Aguilar, 2013)
What sort of effect do you think . . . ? (Aguilar, 2013)
How might you….? What else might you try? (Aguilar, 2013)
What is another way you might…? (Aguilar, 2013)
What are some ways we can look at that? (Knight, 2016)
You found a way to do it, could you think of other ways that would also work? (Johnston, 2012)
It sounds like you have a number of ideas to try out! It'll be exciting to see which works best for you! (Aguilar, 2013)
I wonder what would happen if . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
What other considerations are you thinking about? (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)

Prompts for empowerment and ownership

What did you do to make the lesson so successful? (Aguilar, 2013)
What did you as the teacher do to help the students succeed? (Peterson et al., 2009)
Talk about a previous time when you . . . How did you deal with that? (Aguilar, 2013)
I hear you're struggling with . . . how do you intend to start? (Aguilar, 2013)
It sounds like you're unsatisfied with...what would you do differently next time? (Aguilar, 2013)
Remember the at first when you had to really work at ----? Now you do it automatically. (Johnston, 2004)

Prompts for feedback

Yes… (Knight, 2016)
And… (Knight, 2016)
I noticed . . . (Johnston, 2012)
I see evidence of . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
You did this, with this consequence (or outcome?) (Johnston, 2012)
You did this, so thus happened (Johnston, 2012)
This happened because you did this (Johnston, 2012)
Because you . . . your students . . . (Johnston, 2012)
I noticed when you . . . the students . . . (Aguilar, 2013)
You tried really hard (Johnston, 2012)
The strength of the idea is . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
You have really thought deeply about . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
This provides high engagement for students by . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)

Life-giving prompts

Your commitment is really inspiring to me. (Aguilar, 2013)
It sounds like you handled that in a confident way. (Aguilar, 2013)
I'm confident you'll be successful. (Aguilar, 2013)
What fills you with energy and hope? What else? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)
What is the positive intent of your actions? What else? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)
How do you want your students to remember you? (Aguilar, 2013)
How do you want to remember this time or situation in fifteen years? (Aguilar, 2013)
Who do you want to be in this situation? (Aguilar, 2013)
What is your hope for . . . (Knight, 2016)
I can tell you are excited about . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
What did you learn about yourself and your values today? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)
Which of your strengths are serving you well? What else? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)
What's the best thing that's happening now? What else? (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2010)

Prompts that Diminish Teacher Efficacy

No (Knight, 2016)
But (Knight, 2016)
Is (Johnston, 2012)
Right (Johnston, 2012)
Did you . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
Have you . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
Have you thought about . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
Right (Johnston, 2012)
Good job (Johnston, 2012)
Great work.
You're very good at . . . (Johnston, 2012)
I am proud of you (Johnston, 2012)
You are so smart (Johnston, 2004)
I like the way you . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
I love how you . . .
You are doing a good job at . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
You are a great teacher.
I would like you to consider . . . (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)
Here is an area of concern (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010)

Appendix B: Coaching Conversation Survey

Consider today's coaching conversation. Rate each of the following statements on a scale from 1 to 7, with one indicating you strongly disagree, 2 indicating you disagree, 3 indicating you slightly disagree, 4 indicating you are neutral, 5 indicating you slightly agree, 6 indicating you are, amd 7 indicating you strongly agree.

1. My coach created a sense of trust.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. My coach demonstrated care for my feelings and needs.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. My coach validated my strengths.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. My coach listened closely to my ideas.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. My coach asked questions that fostered reflection.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. My coach helped me explore different possibilities and take risks.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. My coach treated me as an equal partner.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. My coach gave me feedback that furthered my growth.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. Our conversation left me feeling energized and inspired.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Additional Comments:

Coaching Language

Consider the words and phrases your coach used during the conversation:

Which words or phrases were most helpful in your learning?

Which words or phrases were least helpful in your learning?

Additional comments:

Reading Instructional Strategy
Consider your target reading instructional strategy. *Rate each of the following statements on a scale from 1 to 7, with one indicating you strongly disagree, 2 indicating you disagree, 3 indicating you slightly disagree, 4 indicating you are neutral, 5 indicating you slightly agree, 6 indicating you are, amd 7 indicating you strongly agree.*

10. I feel confident that I have the skills necessary to implement this reading strategy.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

11. I feel confident that I have the knowledge necessary to implement this reading strategy.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7

12. I can teach this strategy effectively.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7

13. Collaboration with my coach has increased my use of this strategy.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Additional Comments:

Appendix C: Coaching Conversation Survey Results

Table 4.8 *My coach created a sense of trust.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	7	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7
Missy	7	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	7	7	7	7
Participants were provided with a likert scale from one to seven to rate their response. A rating of 1 indicates they strongly disagree, 2 indicates they disagree, 3 indicates they slightly disagree, 4 indicates a neutral response, 5 indicates they slightly agree, 6 indicates they agree, and and 7 indicates they strongly agree. This scale can be used to interpret data for all tables in this appendix.				

Table 4.9 *My coach listened closely to my ideas.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	7	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7
Missy	7	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	7	7	7	7

Table 4.10 *My coach demonstrated care for my feelings and needs.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	7	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7

Missy	7	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	7	6	7	7

Table 4.11 *My coach validated my strengths.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	7	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7
Missy	7	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	6	7	7	7

Table 4.12 *My coach asked questions that fostered reflection.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	5	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7
Missy	7	6	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	6	7	7	7

Table 4.13 *My coach treated me as an equal partner.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	7	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7

Missy	7	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	7	6	7	7

Table 4.14 *My coach gave me feedback that furthered my growth.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	7	7	n/a	7
Claudia	5	7	n/a	6
Kinsley	7	7	7	7
Missy	7	7	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	7	7	7	7

Table 4.15 *Our conversation left me feeling energized and inspired.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	6	6	n/a	7
Claudia	7	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7
Missy	7	6	7	7
Quinn	7	7	7	7
Sadie	7	6	7	7

Table 4.16 *My coach helped me explore different possibilities and take risks.*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Brynn	6	7	n/a	7
Claudia	5	7	n/a	7
Kinsley	7	7	7	7

Missy	7	6	7	7
Quinn	6	7	7	7
Sadie	7	6	6	6

REFERENCES

Aguilar, E. (2013). *The art of coaching: effective strategies for school transformation*. San Francisco: Wiley.

Armstrong, H. (2012). Coaching as dialogue: Creating spaces for (mis) understandings. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching & Mentoring, 10*(1)

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Burić, I., & Macuka, I. (2017). Self-Efficacy, Emotions and Work Engagement Among Teachers: A Two Wave Cross-Lagged Analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. doi:10.1007/s10902-017-9903-9

Cantrell, S. C., & Callaway, P. (2008). High and low implementers of content literacy instruction: Portraits of teacher efficacy.*Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(7), 1739-1750.

Cheliotes, L., & Reilly, M. (2010). *Coaching conversations: Transforming your school one conversation at a time*. Thousand Oaks: United States, California, Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press. doi:10.4135/9781452219615

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative,*

quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House Incorporated.

Freire, P. (1970, 1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. UK: Penguin Classics.

Gibson, S. A. (2011). Coaching conversations: Enacting instructional scaffolding. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 24*(1)

Heineke, S. F. (2013). Coaching discourse: Supporting teachers' professional learning. The Elementary School Journal, 113(3), 409-433.

Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures.*Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(4), 343-356.

Johnston, P. H. (2004). *Choice words: how our language affects children's learning*. Portland, Me.: Stenhouse.

Johnston, P. H. (2012). *Opening minds: using language to change lives*. Portland, Me.: Stenhouse .

Knight, J. (2011). What good coaches do. *Educational Leadership, 69*(2), 18-22.

Knight, J. (2016). *Better conversations: coaching ourselves and each other to be more credible, caring, and connected*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, A Sage Company.

Miller, A. D., Ramirez, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (2017). The influence of teachers' self-efficacy on perceptions: Perceived teacher competence and respect and student effort and achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 64*, 260-269. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.02.008

Peterson, D. S., Taylor, B. M., Burnham, B., & Schock, R. (2009). Reflective coaching conversations: A missing piece. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(6), 500-509.

Shidler, L. (2009). The impact of time spent coaching for teacher efficacy on student achievement. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 36*(5), 453-460.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(6), 944-956.

Tschannen‑Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of Self‑Efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to Self‑Efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(2), 228-245. doi:10.1086/605771

Tschannen-Moran, B., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2010). *Evocative coaching: transforming schools one conversation at a time*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(4), 751-761. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005

Wall, H., & Palmer, M. (2015). Courage to Love. *The Reading Teacher, 68*(8), 627-635. doi:10.1002/trtr.1353

Wheatley, K. F. (2000). Positive teacher efficacy as an obstacle to educational reform. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 34*(1), 14-27.

Wheatley, K. F. (2002). The potential benefits of teacher efficacy doubts for educational reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 5-22. doi:10.1016/s0742-051x(01)00047-6

Wheatley, K. F. (2005). The case for reconceptualizing teacher efficacy research. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(7), 747-766. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.009

Wyatt, M. (2016). "Are they becoming more reflective and/or efficacious?" A conceptual model mapping how teachers' self-efficacy beliefs might grow. *Educational Review, 68*(1), 114-137.