Mississippi State University

Scholars Junction

8-15-2014

Teachers' Experiences with Literacy Coaching: Instructional Spaces to Teach Third and Fourth Grade Reading Comprehension

Peggie Joice Liddell

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td

Recommended Citation

Teachers' experiences with literacy coaching: instructional spaces to teach third and

fourth grade reading comprehension

By

Peggie Joice Liddell

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Administration
in the Department of Leadership and Foundations

Mississippi State, Mississippi

August 2014

Teachers' experiences with literacy coaching: instructional spaces to teach third and

fourth grade reading comprehension

By

Peggie Joice Liddell

Approved:

_____
Jianzhong Xu
(Major Professor)

_____
Kay D.Brocato
(Committee Member)

_____
Linda T. Coats
(Committee Member)

_____
Linda W. Morse
(Committee Member)

_____
James E. Davis
(Graduate Coordinator)

_____
Richard L. Blackbourn
Dean
College of Education

Name: Peggie Joice Liddell

Date of Degree:August 15, 2014

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Administration

Major Professor:Dr. Jianzhong Xu

Title of Study: Teachers' experiences with literacy coaching: instructional spaces to teach third and fourth grade reading comprehension

Pages in Study:167

Candidate for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The purpose of the study was to understand teachers' knowledge and experiences associated with teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences. The researcher used qualitative research methods in the form of interview data and classroom observations to examine teachers' sense-making experiences informed through sociocultural theories. The researcher collected data from 5 teacher participants, mostly African Americans, who taught students who were also predominantly African American. Teachers' years of teaching experience ranged from 9 years to 40 years.

The study found that literacy coaching may improve teachers' abilities to scaffold students' cognitive reasoning. The study suggested that more, in-depth learning of subject-matter content, an understanding of students' instructional tasks, and an increase of duration in literacy coaching may be required before teachers can implement literacy instruction above literal comprehension. In contrast, the findingssuggested that additional efforts in literacy coaching may be required to improve teachers' scaffolding of students' background knowledge.The findings revealed that few teachers may understand the influences of students' cultural backgrounds upon students' learning. The present study

implied that additional and closer examination of how teachers scaffold cultural background knowledge during reading instruction may provide insight related to the role of knowledge about teachers' metacognition while engaged in literacy coaching.

Moreover, the results of the present study suggested that literacy coaching may promote teacher and student learning over extended periods of time. The study found that 4thgrade students showed small achievement gains among individual students moving from 3rd grade to 4thgrade during the year of the intervention. Finding of small gains occurring during the year that the intervention was provided may suggest an expectant growth projection over time.

Nonetheless, the present study did not find that literacy coaching conclusively impacted gains in literacy achievement.

Key words: literacy coaching, teachers' metacognition, reading comprehension, comprehension strategy instruction, hybridity theory, activity theory, and critical literacy theory.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research to my parents, the late Evaniel and Annie Cutts Liddell, my sister, Vanessa Liddell Johnson, my son, VanielShesan Liddell, my grandson,Somijae Brandon, and uncles, John Cutts and Willie B. Dugan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB) shifted education policy to the quality of instruction and its impact on student achievement and challenged school districts to achieve systematic instructional reforms. It called attention to achievement gaps between high and low performing children, especially gaps between minority and non-minority children and their more advantage peers. NCLB directed school districts to provide teachers with appropriate, research-based professional development aimed at changing teachers' core practices (Gallucci, 2008).

NCLB required professional learning of teachers and substantial changes in teachers' instructional practices. Gallucci (2008) maintained that such changes in teachers' practices had not historically produced deep pedagogical changes and had only produced modest changes consistent with teachers' present norms of practices. Gallucci (2008) argued that although school districts created systems of teachers' professional development, such as teachers' coaching aimed at supporting teacher learning, very little was known about how literacy coaching produced professional learning outcomes. Nevertheless, literacy coaching became a popular professional development strategy within school districts (Gallucci, 2008; Sailors & Price, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

Few other studies found in prior research on literacy coaching examined sociocultural principles of literacy coaching with an emphasis in reading comprehension. One exception was the cognitive modeling research conducted by Sailors and Price (2010). They observed very large practical effects of literacy coaching on teachers' knowledge and changes in teachers' practices, especially in teachers' uses of explicit instruction in reading comprehension. Sailors and Price (2010) pointed to gaps in research related to teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences. None of the previous studies on literacy coachingexamined teachers' actions related to power relations and the distribution of knowledge between teachers and their students. Moreover, none of the previous studies on literacy coaching called attention to the instructional uses of students' cultural, everyday knowledge. While other qualitative studies on literacy coaching described roles, responsibilities, and relationships between literacy coaches and teachers (Ippolito, 2010; Marsh et al., 2008; Matsumura, Sartoris, Bickel, &Garnier, 2009; Neumerski, 2013), no other studies that the researcher was aware of on literacy coaching focused on teachers' acts of making sense of literacy coaching and student achievement in reading comprehension.In addition, Lee (2007) pointed to gaps in literacy research as the lack of implementation of teaching strategies that were consistent with reading comprehension informed through students' sociocultural knowledge. Likewise, Hammerberg (2004) contended that comprehension strategy instruction informed through sociocultural principles encouraged active thinking and aided students to draw on prior knowledge and their cultural background knowledge to interpret text.

Furthermore, Lee (1995) contended that teachers' lack of understanding of the influences of cultural background was a problem in teachers' practices. She declared that teachers' lack of understanding of the influences of cultural background may distort, as well as support students' comprehension. Consequently, Lee (2007) asserted that leveraging students' everyday knowledge during instruction was essential. For this reason, she argued for teachers' understanding of the significance of the practices youths engaged out of school, e.g., extracurricular, religious, social, and cultural events. Likewise, Lee (2007) reasoned that in order for students' knowledge to become valued, teachers had to understand how drawing on cultural knowledge was useful and observe where connections between everyday knowledge and school-based knowledge were most productive. Lee (1995, 2007) suggested that strategy instruction may support teachers to become more culturally responsive. She contended that strategy instruction supported teachers to make student learning public, visible, and strategic. Moreover, Borko (2004) maintained that it was easy for teachers to incorporate strategies that elicited student thinking but implied that teachers needed improvement to use what they hear from students to make instructional decisions during situated practice. In addition, Hammerberg (2004) maintained that how well teachers used students' background knowledge depended on how well they set up students' instructional tasks using prior knowledge and social backgrounds.

Along these lines, Lee (1995) argued that the influences of cultural background knowledge on reading comprehension were particularly problematic for students whose language or dialect differed from the language taught in in-school literacy. Thus, she offered the proposition of a cultural responsive pedagogy recognizing multiple modes of

narration in literacy comprehension and drawing on linguistic strengths that students

bring from their homes and communities. Likewise, she emphasized that general reading

strategies and task-specific strategies for literacy interpretation combined with prior,

social and cultural knowledge supported problem solving. Further, Lee (1995) argued

that when texts contained scripts for culturally specific events and social interactions

where inferences were to be constructed, readers tended to draw on their prior, social

knowledge to build interpretations.

Research Questions

Prior research by Sailors and Price (2010) suggested additional research

investigating the role of knowledge of teachers while engaged in professional

development. Sailors and Price (2010) contended that despite the widespread

endorsement of coaching, very little was known about how literacy coaching actually

worked in producing teacher learning outcomes that changed teachers' ways of knowing

and teaching. Thus, the present study addressed gaps in research associated with teachers'

sense-making of literacy coaching experiences.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How did teachers create instructional spaces for students' active
   engagement and reasoning to foster student learning?

2. How did teachers support students' views and experiences to generate
   cultural knowledge and interactions?

3. How did teachers describe their sense-making about literacy coaching and
   student learning?

Purpose of the Study

The present study addressed gaps in prior research on literacy coaching and reading comprehension. The purpose of the present study was to examine teachers' knowledge and experiences associated with teachers' sense-making of literacy coaching. Given that previous quantitative and correlation studies on literacy coaching focused on literacy coaching and student achievement, the present study extended prior research with a focus on teachers' literacy coaching experiences within a sociocultural framework. No other studies in prior research on literacy coaching that the researcher was aware of examined sociocultural principles that described teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences with an emphasis in reading comprehension. Consistent with sociocultural principles, the theory of action in the present study emphasized that learning was situated in everyday, social contexts and involved changes in participation through human interactions.

Theoretical Positioning

The present study proceeded from a sociocultural perspective of related theories that literacy comprehension was situated and sustained through social and cultural context in which it was practiced (Perry, 2012) and human activities informed through hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories. Thus, the assumptions were that teachers created hybrid spaces that aided students to connect knowledge to their cultural backgrounds (Moje et al., 2004); provided students multiple opportunities to construct knowledge through cultural lenses (Barton, Tan, & Rivet, 2008; Gee, 1999; Guterriez, Morales, & Martinez, 2009), and included culture and social context that described

events, occasions, and outcomes that varied from one culture or context to another (Street, 2003; Perry, 2012).

Hybridity Theory

In the present study, hybridity theory illustrated how teachers searched to understand students' practices, concentrated attention on interpersonal characteristics, and made pedagogical and cultural changes within situated practices. Following the lead of Barton et al. (2008) and Moje et al. (2004), the present study used hybridity theory to describe third spaces in literacy as (a) bridging of reasoning, (b) navigating students' cultural funds of knowledge to bear on school learning, and (c) transforming spaces based on the integration of knowledge after teachers participated in literacy coaching. Moreover, following the thinking of Vygotsky's theoretical positioning, the present study used Chaiklin (p. 53, as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003) to define students' subjective, mental functions as maturing functions in which students will be able to take advantage of assistance with instructional tasks. Further, to illustrate teaching aspects, the present study employed hybridity theory to demonstrate how teachers guided students through the zone of proximal development in which students become independently proficient as the result of teachers providing guided practice and releasing responsibility of the students' instructional tasks over a period of time. Thus, one assumption in the present study was that as the result of literacy coaching, teachers evolved to construct situations and times for interactions that allowed students to connect to the literacy text.

Along these lines, the assumptions were that the conceptual first space was a space that teachers situated their knowledge, pedagogical skills, and experiences into their social practices. The second space was a space that teachers supported students to

connect knowledge to self and their cultural backgrounds. Consequently, the third space was a value-added, conceptual space that teachers used to generate new knowledge in order to make sense of their literacy coaching experiences. As a result, in the present study, *a hybrid or third space* viewpoint,argued for an in-depth awareness of teachers' norms of practices and a sense-making perspective of literacy coaching.

Activity Theory

Activity theory focused attention on the active roles of teachers as learners attempting to make sense of their literacy coaching experiences. Following the lead of Feryok (2009) and Rogoff (1995), the present study utilized activity theory to illustrate how teachers' social experiences assisted their cognitive functions to help with sense-making. As followed, activity theory described teachers' internalization of norms occurring after they participated in literacy coaching. Moreover, activity theory described means as deliberated and conscious understandings of how goals and means impacted outcomes. Thus, activity theory illustrated how literacy events involved interactions through guided participation of coordinated and shared efforts. In the present study, one theoretical assumption was that teachers learned as the result of their literacy coaching experiences. Another assumption was that roles and relationships among teachers and their students shifted and changed as the result of literacy events. As followed, learning was characterized as social and cultural acts that accounted for the relationships among language, thinking, and concept formation. In these instances, learning was not reduced to acquiring domain-specific knowledge. Rather, the present study utilized Giest and Lompscher's (p.269, as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003), theoretical positioning of students' changing roles as learners who shaped literacy through every day processes of cultural

experiences. Giest and Lompscher (p. 270 as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003) contended that the primary task of the teacher was to set up situations and create conditions in which students can make sense of learning. As a result, through activity theory, learning was illustrated as being student-centered, which illustrated that students were to become aware of the goals and draw from their own efforts.

Critical Literacy Theory

In critical literacy theory, change was an important aspect of literary and required a certain amount of fluidity (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Street, 2003). In the present study, critical literacy theory described features and ideologies of literacy events and social identities enacted through language and actions. As followed, in the present study, critical literacy differentiated literacy practices as having socially constructed principles, ways of acquiring knowledge through human experiences. Hence, through socially constructed ways or actions, literacy practices varied from one context to another and one culture to another and were described as not neutral or universal (Street, 2003). Along these lines, Barton and Hamilton (2005), Hull and Schultz (2001) and Street (2001) contended that literacy practices embodied folk models and beliefs, and literacy events consisted of repeated occurrences or instances. In the present study, literacy practices were literacy coaching and teachers' instructional practices. The literacy event was student learning.

In addition, in the present study, critical literacy illustrated what relations of power were enacted or produced during literacy coaching and instruction. Critical literacy theory examined interactions and power relationships between teachers and their students. Critical literacy theory described how teachers relinquished power and

distributed instructional tasks that engaged students in activities that required sharing of power through interactions and students' cultural funds of knowledge about their lives and experiences. Moreover, as illustrated through critical literacy theory, some literacy practices were more dominant and privileged than others and consequently exhibited ways in which power relationships were enacted within literacy events (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Street, 2003). Along these lines, critical literacy theory illustrated that literacy events may depict multiple and sometimes conflicting purposes(Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Street, 2003).

Justification of the Study

Sailors and Price (2010) indicated voids in qualitative research related to teachers' knowledge about their literacy coaching experiences.Prior research by Sailors and Price (2010) recommended future studies related to teachers' metacognition as they participated in professional development. Thus, the present study addressed Sailors and Price's recommendations but added a sociocultural perspective that offered teachers' sense-making after they participated in literacy coaching. Berg (2009, p. 319) defined sense-making as the manner in which people, groups, and organizations made sense of events in which they were confronted, how participants framed what they saw and heard, how participants perceived and interpreted information, and thus how participants interpreted their own actions and solved problems and interacted with others.

Prior research by Lee (1995, 2007) suggested that teachers did not understand the influences of students' cultural backgrounds on students learning. Hammerberg (2004) and Lee (1995, 2007) contended that teachers did not implement comprehension strategies that were consistent with reading comprehension research informed through

students' sociocultural knowledge. Moreover, Matsumura, Garnier, Correnti, Junker, and Bickel (2010) maintained that literacy coaching supported teachers' norms of practices. Hence, the present study described teachers' ways of thinking and knowing about literacy instruction after they participated in literacy coaching.

In the present study, one assumption was that literacy coaching impacted teacher learning and teacher learning impacted student learning. Another assumption was that literacy coaching, with the uses of comprehension strategy instruction, influenced teachers' practices. The theory of action was that literacy coaching addressed teacher learning; teacher learning impacted teachers' instructional practices; teachers' instructional practices impacted student learning in reading comprehension.

Definition of Terms

The following terms may need further clarification:

1. *Background knowledge* encompassed all instructional strategies that acknowledged the social and cultural contexts of students as important aspects of textual interpretation (Hammerberg, 2004).

2. *Cognitive modeling* required direct teaching of mental modeling and thinking aloud (Sailors & Price, 2010) and scaffolding of students' thinking and reasoning (Barton et al., 2008).

3. *Comprehension* involved the construction of meaning through activating and using background knowledge, generating and asking questions, making inferences, predicting, summarizing, visualizing, and monitoring of students' comprehension (Palinscar & Brown, 1984)).

4. *Comprehension strategy instruction* (same as explicit strategy instruction) included the teaching of intentional learning about reading strategies, such as questioning, making connections, thinking aloud, summarizing, creating visual imagines, making predictions, clarifying, and using any other linguistic resources (Duke & Pearson, 2002; Handsfield & Jimenez, 2009). Also, comprehension strategy instruction included direct teaching of thinking aloud strategies (Sailor & Price, 2010).

5. *Concept formation* encompassed the acquisition of knowledge for meaning (Giest & Lompscher, p. 270, as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003).

6. *Conceptual spaces* required uses of metaphors, such as hybrid spaces using different funds of knowledge and discourses to destabilize and expand boundaries (Barton & Tan, 2008).

7. *Constructivist principles* described how social realities related to other things and existed within a larger environment or organized system and how these social realities depended upon the contrast between the subjective and objective views (Searle, 1995).

8. *Cross-case-comparison* described methods in qualitative research to examine patterns and relationships across cases (Miles & Hubermann, 1994).

9. *Culture* described systematic waysof communicating meaning through language and other symbols (Lee, 1995).

10. *Cultural background knowledge* recognized students' funds of linguistic and cultural knowledge that students bring to school from their homes and

communities to use while engaged in academic tasks (Moje et al., 2004; Lee, 2007).

11. *Cultural data sets* involved familiar anchors in literacy comprehension used to connect existing knowledge to new knowledge (Lee, 2007).

12. *Cultural funds of knowledge* described students' experiences outside of school (Moll & Gonzales, 2004).

13. *Cultural modeling* described the uses of prior experience to make connections, face-to-face interactions, and explicit strategies (Lee, 2007).

14. *Cultural responsive pedagogy* included uses of teaching strategies that linked the social languages of home, school, and literature (Lee, 1995) in order to scaffold students' connections between prior knowledge and new problems in academic discourses (Lee, 2007).

15. *Deficit assumptions* assigned reductive notions of non-dominant students' language and literacy practicesas essentially missing and not useful prior knowledge (Gutierrez et al., 2009; Lee, 1995, 2007).

16. *Discourses* explained ways of knowing, reading, writing, and talking that youths bring to school and try to learn (Gee, 1996); ways of talking within and about an academic discipline (Moje et al., 2004).

17. *Discursive forces* illustrated metaphorically how oppositional forces worked together to create something new in literacy (Bhabha, 1994; Moje et al. 2004).

18. *Elementary Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver* described alternate approaches that the federal government granted to States to meet accountability requirements of NCLB of 2001 (Shelly, 2011).

19. *Funds of Knowledge Framework* explained the practices of adults as they examined students' out-of-school literacy practices (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Lee, 2007).

20. *Hybrid Spaces* included different funds of knowledge and discourses coalescing and expanding the boundaries in literacy of Discourse (Barton et al., 2008).

21. *Imitation* described the understandings of intentions behind the behavior and means in order to have ownership of means and goals (Feryok, 2009).

22. *Interactional talk* involved talk scaffold through guided discussions (Gee, 1999; Sailors & Price, 2010).

23. *Literacy* involved social acts (Street 2003) and ways readers engaged in texts (Perry, 2012).

24. Metacognition described recognition of one's own knowledge and experiences (Sailors & Price, 2010). It pointed to a shift away from teachers' behavior relying on the imitation of expert behavior (Feryok, 2009).

25. *Mississippi Curriculum Test 2* described the official state's assessments in language arts and mathematics in third through eighth grades and science in fifth and eighth grades. Retrieved from www.mde.k12.ms.us

26. *NCLB* described the reauthorization of ESEA(Shelly, 2011).

27. *Sense-making* involved the manner in which people, groups, and organizations interpreted actions, solved problems, and interacted with others (Berg, 2009).

28. *Sociocultural context* described the environment in which the learner and learning became situated in literacy (Hammerberg, 2004).

29. *Sociocultural perspectives* emphasized culture, identify, power relations, and sense-making in human activities; described literacy as a social practice (Perry, 2012).

30. *Sociocultural theories* of literacy illustrated social practices embedded within the structure of power (Street, 2003), interactive processes emphasizing students' cultural identities (Street, 2003), and acts of making meaning within social contexts (Hammerberg, 2004).

31. *Task Criteria* described the specific performance and cognitive conditions necessary for task completion (Feryok, 2009).

32. *Task execution* described what means lead to expected outcomes (Feryok, 2009).

33. *Variable-oriented approach* described methods in qualitative research used to identify repeated themes and emerging patterns within and across cases (Miles & Hubermann, 1994).

34. *Zones of proximal development* described interactions of tasks between a more competent person and a less competent person, in which given a period of time, the less competent became independently proficient (Chaiklin, as cited in Kozulin et al. 2003).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Much of the published qualitative research on literacy coaching described roles, responsibilities, and relationships between literacy coaches and teachers (Ippolito, 2010; Marsh et al., 2008; Matsumura et al., 2009; Neumerski, 2013). In contrast, the present study described teachers' literacy coaching experiences and student learning in literacy comprehension. The study utilized sociocultural perspectives, emphasizing hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories. Likewise, the present study, like Hammerberg (2004) contended that literacy, in sociocultural terms, emphasized the social and cultural identities of students and the acts of making meaning within social context. The present study, similar to Barton and Hamilton (2005) and Street (2003) posited that literacy was fluid, varied from one context and culture to another, and impacted learning differently under different conditions.

Moreover, Street (2003) proposed the notion of multiple literacies and distinguished the difference between autonomous and ideological models of literacy and further distinguished literacy events and literacy practices. According to Street (2003), the standard view was that literacy was autonomous. In the autonomous model, literacy was a set of skills that were applied to any situation and had effects upon other social and cognitive practices. Street (2003) suggested that the autonomous model of literacy

presented itself as neutral and universal and without implications of cultural effects. Hence, Street (2003) argued for an ideological model of literacy as a set of literacy practices, which offered a cultural view of literacy, a view embedded in socially constructed principles of knowing through experiences. Street (1995, 2003) maintained that literacy was always a social act and argued that literacy was ways in which teachers or facilitators and their students interacted and was already a social practice that affected the nature of the literacy being learned. Thus, according to Street (2003), literacy was related to power relations and the distribution of knowledge and discourses within literacy practices. Similarly, Perry (2012) conceptualized literacy as a set of practices that were grounded within social context and linked to power structures.

Likewise, the literature review in the present study examined literacy coaching and student outcome measures as literacy events and occasions. In the present literature review, interpretation and explanations considered literacy events, occasions, and means as the social aspects of literacy that participants used to give meaning to their literacy coaching experiences. Moreover, the literature review in the present study examined relations of power through the lenses of critical literary theory and pointed to how local-global encounters adapted to local circumstances within teachers' instructional practices. Also, in the present literature review, assumptions were that local literacy practices may have been the products of global designs of literacy originating elsewhere and may not have been self-invented at the local level. In addition, the literature review examined theoretical implications and assumptions related to comprehension literacy. Thus, arguments, interpretations, and plausible explanations were derived through theoretical applications. The literature review in the present study looked at multiple resources or

funds to make sense of findings in the extant literature in order to examine competing knowledge and discourses as sense-making tools. This line of inquiry was consistent with prior research posited by Brandt & Clinton (2002) and Street (2003).

In the present study, the literature review examined three current views of hybridity theory in literacy. The first view offered by Gutierrez et al. (2009) advocated for a linguistically *third space* perspective. Gutierrez et al. (2009) argued for third spaceto bridge or scaffold social and cognitive development in order to move students through zones of proximal development toward better academic knowledge. Another view of third space as offered by Barton and Tan (2008) and Moje et al. (2004) suggested third space as a navigational tool, a way of crossing content boundaries and succeeding in literacy within different disciplines. Likewise, another view of third space, as offered by Moje et al. (2004) and Moll and Gonzales (1994) contended that third space was a space of cultural, social, and epistemological changes in which competing knowledge and discourses influenced literacy practices.

Moreover, the literature review in the present study examined students' cultural and cognitive resources. Hammerberg (2004) found that the experiences students bring to school were often viewed as useless experiences outside of the skills students needed to learn in-school literacy. However, the primary focus of the literature review in the present study was to examine literary coaching from a discursive point of view. A discursive point of view of hybridity suggested that in literacy, even what appeared to be oppositional spaces worked together to generate something new. Thus, literacy was open to divergent interpretations and negotiations. Symbols in literacy became appropriated, translated, rehistoricized, and read anew into something different and unique (Bhabha,

1994). The characters, plots, signs, and symbols of a text became open to multiple interpretations and meanings. Therefore, readers were interactive participants who created meanings relevant to particular situations or purposes (Hammerberg, 2004).

Hence, a discursive analysis of hybridity destabilized what had been counted as knowledgeable practices, for or against the effectiveness of literacy coaching upon teacher learning. Along these lines, a hybrid argument may suggest that measures in the extant literature research did not have absolute values. Consequently, a discursive analysis of the extant literature suggested alternatives or third space understandings and explanations from which to convey new knowledge. The hybrid argument suggested that research findings in the extant literature on literacy coaching had a privileged or favorable position in literacy discourse and the privileged position may have limited interpretations and meanings of prior research findings. In this way, the privileged position of power linked to findings in literacy coaching discourse may have previously distracted from other discussions about relationships amongliteracy coaching, teachers' instructional practices, and student learning in reading comprehension.

In addition, the present study used activity theory to examined literacy as social and cultural acts that accounted for the relationships among language, thinking, and concept formation. Thus,activity theory illustrated the shifting of thinking away from acquiring knowledge for information purposes to acquiring knowledge for concept formation (Giest and Lompscher, p.269, as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003). In this way,activity theory illustrated the importance of the construction of meaning through discourse within social context and made more obvious how social experiences assisted cognitive functions and helped with sense-making. Likewise, a discursive analysis

18

through activity theory called attention to schema activation grounded through social interactions and experiences. Activity theory metaphorically redefined bridging or scaffolding that guided learning through zones of proximal development (Chaiklin, p. 51, as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003). Moreover, activity theory called attention to imitation as having a conscious understanding of the means and goals necessary to maintain control of learning outcomes (Feryok, 2009).

This literature review examined two impact studies, two quasi-experimental studies, two experimental studies, and one correlation study. The review did not locate a qualitative study in the extant literature that linked literacy coaching and student achievement in reading comprehension.

Impact Studies

Gamse, Jacobs, Horst, Boulay, and Unla (2008) conducted a national evaluation of Reading First Programs in 248 schools in 17 school districts in 12 states investigating the impact of Reading First in Kindergarten through third grade over a period of three years, not to include the three years of follow-up study. They examined what happened in Reading First Programs after programs were launched compared to what would have happened without the Reading First Programs. They considered three categories of outcome measures: (a) student reading comprehension, (b) classroom reading instruction, and (c) student engagement with print during reading instruction. The study did not find a strong association or relationship between reading comprehension and student achievement related to literacy coaching. In other words, the difference in students' achievement scores in first grade, second grade, and third gradewere not statistically significant; thus, Reading First with its components of literacy coaching, did not show

19

strong effects on student achievement in reading comprehension. Likewise, researchers found that Reading First's impact on classroom instruction varied from year to year.

Thus, Gamse et al. (2008) offered two plausible explanations for their findings. One explanation was that the time required to launch the initiative may have interfered with the professional development fidelity to train coaches and teachers to implement the scientifically-based reading strategies of the five essential components. Another explanation offered was that the focal point of the professional development and instruction may have been directed to phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary, not fluency and comprehension. However, another plausible explanation for Gamse et al.'s (2008) findings may have been related to imitation of activity. In activity theory, the means (literacy coaching and teacher's practice) and the end activities (student outcomes in literacy) were linked as identical activities. Because phonics and vocabulary were emphasized in teacher's practices, the outcome was identical to what occurred. Means were not informed through students' sociocultural knowledge and thus may have resulted in Gamse et al.'s (2008) findings that literacy coaching did not have a strong impact on student learning. This argument was consistent with prior research by Feryok (2009). In addition, another plausible explanation for Gamse et al.'s (2008) findings of little impact may have been that the literacy coaching's content may not have been aligned with expected learning outcomes, teachers' pedagogy, and students' knowledge and culture. This explanation was consistent with Game et al.'s (2008) finding that classroom instruction in Reading First Programs varied from year to year. Drawing from prior research by Hammerberg (2004), the literacy coaching content may not have relied on ways students draw on their prior knowledge and social context, may not have used

20

techniques for encouraging active thinking while reading, and may not have used ways of acknowledging the social and cultural contexts of students as important aspects of textual interpretation. Likewise, Hammerberg (2004) argued that culturally relevant teaching (a) structured the interactions during instruction, (b) modeled thinking about concepts, and (c) helped students understand themselves and others. Prior research by Hammerberg (2004) and Moje et al. (2004) posited that how well students' background knowledge and context work, depended upon how well the teacher set up instructional tasks and cognitive modeling where prior knowledge and social background can be used in potentially rich ways.

In another related study, Lockwood et al. (2010) examined the effects of literacy coaching in Florida's middle schools extending from the 2002-2003 School Year through 2005-2006 School Year. This study collected data from 987 schools of which 644 were schools with literacy coaches. Lockwood et al. (2010) found mixed results. They found positive, significant impacts on reading achievement for two of the four cohorts and found no relationship between literacy coaching and reading achievement with the other two cohorts. Also, they found that having a coach was shown to have statistically significant gains for the 2003 and 2005 student cohorts.

Looking more closely at the 2003 cohort, Lockwood et al. (2010) found a signed positive effect for three grades and a significant effect for Grades 7 and 8. For the 2005 cohort, Lockwood et al. (2010) found that the individualized, grade level effects were all positive and significant. Moreover, they found that for the 2004 cohort, the effect was at zero for each of the three grade levels. For the 2006 cohort, the researchers found that the average effect was not significant and the only grade with a significant positive effect

21

was eighth grade. According to Lockwood et al. (2010), the eighth grade results were positive and significant for three of the four cohorts. The researchers determined that eighth grade results were credible because the achievement data provided more pre-treatment data that established a trend dating back to 1998.

Hence, Lockwood et al. (2010) suggested that the effects of improvement resulting from literacy coaching occurred across years of implementation; therefore, a hybrid argument suggested that low-performing schools required longer periods of time to demonstrate improvement as defined by NCLB. In fact, Lockwood et al. (2010) suggested that coaching effectiveness depended on pre-coaching reading achievement and had a greater impact for the lowest performing schools implementing the coaching model over a number of years. Likewise, prior research by Bhabha's (1994) established that academic standards may not have accounted for the continuous processes of cultural changes occurring during the study. Further, Moje et al.'s (2004) offered a third space perspective. They suggested that negotiations in literacy practices needed to be more prevalent between school and home literacy discourses. Likewise, they suggested that teachers in low performing schools may need to implement more instruction using students' personal experiences in order to engage students in meaningful interpretations across disciplines.

In addition, prior research by Lee (1995, 2007) and Moll and Gonzales (1994) supported Lockwood et al.'s (2010) findings that coaching effectiveness depended on pre-coaching reading achievement and had a greater impact for the lowest performing schools implementing the coaching model over a number of years. These researchers argued for cultural spaces of knowledge that associated students' experiences outside of

school. Lee (2007) maintained that in order to impact student learning, teachers needed an understanding about how best to aid students' connection between the known and unknown. Lee (2007), in agreement with Borko (2004), contended that teachers must have detailed knowledge of the subject matter, as well as detailed knowledge of the practices in which student engage with their families and peers.

Quasi-Experimental Studies

Contrary to Gamse et al.'s (2008) findings that literacy coaching did not impact student achievement, Biancarosa, Bryk, and Dexter (2010) reported gains in student learning as the result of literacy coaching. They conducted 27,427 observations of 8,576 students and 287 teachers in 17 schools and examined the effects of literacy coaching on student learning over four years and with six different cohorts entering at different grades in different years. Literacy coaches participated in 40 hours of training that covered a full year of professional development. Additionally, Biancarosa et al. (2010) assessed the value-added effects of literacy collaborative professional development on student learning. They investigated the value-added effects of literacy coaching and determined the differences of the observed growth in reading comprehension and the expected outcomes of instruction. According to Biancarosa et al. (2010), value-added modeling assumed that each child had an individual latent growth path, which was the expected achievement growth if exposed to the average instructional conditions prevalent during the baseline period. Thus, value-added was the difference of the observed growth and expected outcomes. In contrast to Gamse et al. (2008), Biancarosa et al. (2010), reported gains in student learning resulting from literacy coaching with effect's magnitude becoming larger during subsequent years of implementation. Biancarosa et al. (2010)

23

reported findings from year two, three, and four. They found significant gains in student learning during the first year with the effect's magnitude becoming larger during subsequent years of implementation.

One plausible explanation for positive changes in student growth as the result of literacy coaching may have been the literacy coaching model. In the Biancarosa et al.'s study (2010), coaches were selected at the school level and during the first year of the program participated in intensive, graduate training while also teaching students. The literacy coaching framework was grounded in reading research and theory formation aimed to support teachers' deep understanding. For example, in the Biancarosa et al.'s (2010) model, the content of the literacy coaching training covered theory explaining how to teach students within the program's framework and how to develop other teachers' understanding through site-based professional development and coaching.

Another plausible explanation for a report of positive student growth in the Biancarosa et al.'s (2010) study may have been attributed to the program design in collecting student achievement data. In the Biancarosa et al.'s (2010) study, researchers collected baseline data prior to the treatment period. The data estimated the value-added effects of the literacy coaching intervention on student learning and created an expectant growth projection over time for each student as compared to observed growth under baseline conditions. Based on baseline trend data, each school or teacher had its unique value-added effect based on a comparison of times and situations. In effect, the research design allowed for variability of growth for each school and teacher and allowed for individual student growth over time. In contrast with other studies reporting no student growth (Gamse et al., 2008), the type of study and research design were vastly different.

In evaluation studies, such as Gamse et al. (2008), a research design was selected specifically for Reading First Program's evaluations. The design captured process measures, such as program objectives and only measured program's estimation of Reading First's impact on future growth at the school level.

Thus, the findings suggested that Gamse et al. (2008) may have used a different program design to tease out the effects of literary coaching on student learning. Upon comparison of research by Biancarosa et al. (2010), the data from the Gamse et al. (2008) study revealed that the findings of these two studies cannot be compared because expected outcome measures differed. The outcome measures for Reading First Programs were the impact of Reading First on future and expected growth of students nested within schools. However, in Biancarosa et al.'s (2010) research, the outcome measures were the growth over time for schools, teachers, and students. Even though both programs used literary coaching, the program objectives for literary coaching within the research studies and data collection methods did not allow appropriate comparison of research findings.

For example, Biancarosa et al. (2010) used a hierarchical, crossed-level, value-addedeffects modeling which allowed for tracking of individual achievement of students over time, as well as the tracking in which schools and teachers contributed to the student learning in each particular year of the study. In contrast, Reading First Programs used a regression discontinuity model, an estimation model, which estimated impact for the purpose of evaluating programs to allocate funds. The regression model measured what happened in Reading First Program after the program was launched compared to what would have happened without the Reading First Program. However, a comparison of methodology was beyond the scope of the present literature review.

On the other hand, both Gamse et al. (2008) and Biancarosa et al.'s (2010) findings were consistent with assumptions within critical literacy and activity theories. Using the lenses of critical literacy, both of the programs were results of global events originating elsewhere and later becoming local events with local outcome measures of placing literacy coaches within schools for the outcome measure, as defined in critical literacy as having expected growth in student achievement. Through the lenses of activity theory, the programs' intentions for student achievement were identical but the means in the Reading First Programs may not have been identical to the expected outcomes of student growth in reading comprehension. The means with the Reading First Framework emphasized phonics, vocabulary, and fluency but did not emphasize reading comprehension. Likewise, the training of coaches and teachers in the Reading First Programs emphasized phonics, vocabulary, and fluency but did not address comprehension. Thus, the evaluation of Reading First with literacy coaches did not find that Reading First Programs impacted student learning in reading comprehension.

Conversely, Sailors and Price's (2010) suggested that literacy coaching made a difference in student learning. Specifically, they examined two models of professional development: (a) a workshop professional development model only, and (b) a workshop and literacy coaching model. Sailors and Price (2010) tested the effects of two models on student learning scores. The treatment group participated in a full intervention model, which included a two-day workshop complemented by classroom based literacy coaching. The comparison group participated in partial intervention, which consisted of only the two day workshop.

The workshop professional development's content emphasized reading comprehension strategies as ways of improving teachers' instructional practices in reading comprehension. Sailors and Price (2010) examined two interactional variables: (a) opportunities to engage in comprehension strategies and (b) constructed explanations around intentional reading strategies. Through classroom observations, they investigated the quality of instructional interactions and the quantity of the interventions as measured by the number of minutes coaches spent engaged with participating teachers. In addition, they observed the opportunities that teachers provided students to engage in reading strategies and examined the coaches' visits as measured through time.

Sailors and Price (2010) reported that both groups implemented varying degrees of the professional development. However, they found significant differences in favor of the full intervention, which was workshop professional development combined with literacy coaching. Also, they found significant differences in favor of full intervention in uses of constructed explanations and coaches' visits as measured through time. In addition, Sailors and Price (2010) observed very large practical effects of coaching professional development on teachers' knowledge and changes in instructional practices, especially in the use of explicit instruction. They found an increase in teacher's knowledge and teachers' uses of explicit reading strategies as the result of literacy coaching. Sailors and Price (2010) found that the more opportunities teachers offered students, the more students engaged in constructed explanations about their thinking and reasoning.

Further, Sailors and Price's (2010) findings were consistent with prior research by Lee (1995), who argued that comprehension strategy instruction produced student

learning that was public, visible, and strategic. Lee (1995, 2007) offered cognitive modeling as an alternative explanation and to illustrate Bhabha's (1994) notion of splitting of discourse, culture, and consciousness. The notion of splitting of discourse illustrated that during classroom conversations students engaged in but then opposed the language of academic discourse as students struggled for self-identity. Likewise, through the lenses of activity theory, teachers' acts of internalization of activity may have prompted some teachers to hold a strong sense of self-identity and as a result adopted consistent literacy practices as an additional resource.

Similarly, through the lenses of activity theory, the literacy coaching that was offered may have better socialized teachers to become more able to influence classroom culture and discourses. Moje et al. (2004) suggested that any tool that minimized the binary struggles and demands of language empowered learners, whether teachers or students, to engage in constructed thinking and reasoning. This argument was consistent with prior research by Gutierrez et al. (2009) who contended that teachers intentionally searched for spaces and times in which to scaffold students' understanding. Gutierrez et al. (2009) argued that teachers scaffold their students' uses of personal experiences, funds of knowledge, and cultural practices in order to engage students in meaningful and multiple interpretations of literacy.

Hence, through cognitive modeling, teachers modeled for students, often verbally, the kind of thinking used to solve problems. Barton et al. (2008) indicated that teachers scaffold students' thinking and modeled ways of making, using, and communicating ideas through explaining, offering evidence, predicting, and classifying. Consistent with research findings by Barton et al. (2008) and Lee (1995, 2007), Sailors and Price (2010)

28

found that students benefitted from scaffolding of reasoning, brought their everyday experiences into the school, and participated in meaningful discussions and collaborative learning activities.

Likewise, reasons for positive findings related to student learning as the result of literacy coaching may have been attributed to cultural modeling. Cultural modeling may have structured the learning environment toward problem solving, drawing upon prior knowledge, creating opportunities for face-to-face interactions, and making strategies for problem solving explicit (Lee, 2007). In cultural modeling, Lee (2007) argued that teachers must become aware of moment-to-moment performance in the classroom and emergent understandings, as well as misconceptions about what students understand about content and kinds of problem solving being taught. In prior research, Lee (2007) argued that with cultural modeling, the first phase of instruction was to provide problems with the same demand of the academic task that teachers expected students to learn. Moreover, Lee (2007) asserted that these cultural data sets provided familiar anchors for new learning and connected the known to the unknown. Accordingly, Lee (2007), similarly to Sailors and Price (2010) suggested that making connections across schematic data sets enhanced the kinds of instructional tasks students can accomplish.

Experimental Studies

In contrast to previous studies reviewed, Matsumura, Garnier, Correnti, Junker, and Bickel (2010) investigated the effects of literacy coaching in schools that experienced high rates of teacher mobility. They conducted an experimental, longitudinal, content-focused coaching program with 371 teachers in year one and 73 teachers in year two in 29 elementary schools with a high number of low-income, minority, and English

Language Learners. The study randomly assigned 15 treatment schools and 14 comparison schools. Matsumura et al. (2010) collected student reading achievement data, teachers' surveys, and observations over a period of three years.

Matsumura et al. (2010) compared year two teachers to year one teachers participating in literacy coaching and randomly assigned treatment and comparison conditions. Cohort one teachers referred to teachers in the treatment group who remained in their school for the two years of the study. Cohort two teachers were teachers who had been hired to replace teachers who left the district after one year. Thus, Cohort two teachers were recruited into the study. Matsumura et al. (2010) found that Cohort one teachers did not impact student learning at the school level. However, the study found that after two years, Cohort one teachers improved their observed classroom text discussions.

One plausible reason that teachers in Cohort one did not impact student learning was the unexpected loss of half the sample. Teachers did not participate in literacy coaching at the level intended in the program design. The rate of participation for teachers in Cohort one was 48% and 23% for teachers in Cohort two. The lack of participation decreased teachers' opportunities in the development of professional learning communities with the schools. Thus, teachers' lack of participation and active engagement in literacy coaching suggested that some teachers in the study did not access multiple funds of knowledge about their pedagogy or students' cultural knowledge and may not haveinternalized effective comprehension strategies that impacted student learning. Teachers in the Matsumura et al.'s (2010) study may have lacked the resources for internalization of norms of practice needed to adopt consistent literacy practices. This

explanation was consistent with prior research by Moje et al. (2004) and Moll and Gonzales (1994) who offered third space as a space of cultural, social, and epistemological changes in which competing knowledge and discourses influenced literacy practices. Likewise, the explanation was consistent with theoretical propositions in activity theory.

Similarly, Garet et al. (2008) found that literacy coaching did not have a positive impact on student learning. Garet et al. (2008) conducted a large scale, randomized study with second graders investigating the effectiveness of two models of professional development within schools in urban, high poverty areas. The first treatment included only the eight-day series of content-based professional development based on the content of *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling*. In contrast, the second treatment provided for the same institute and seminar series and literacy coaches. Garet et al. (2008) examined three outcome measures: (a) teachers' knowledge about reading instruction and content, (b) teachers' use of research-based instructional practices, and (c) students' reading achievement. Each provided for eight days of content in reading and spelling, which included phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. In addition, the professional development provided elements for explicit classroom instruction, differentiation of instruction, and active participation linked to teachers' daily work of teaching reading comprehension. Garet et al. (2008) found no statistically significant impact on second grade reading. Likewise, they did not find a positive effect on student achievement of students from teachers participating in professional development institutes alone or from professional development in collaboration with literacy coaching.

Hence, Garet et al. (2008) argued the case that the professional development interventions were not substantial enough and therefore did not translate into a detectable impact on student achievement. However, another plausible explanation for not finding a positive change in the Garet et al.'s study (2008) may have been that students' literacy practices were not examined within a sociocultural context. In effect, teachers in the Garet et al. (2008) study may not have used students' multiple resources and may not have aligned instruction, or changed their practices enough to accommodate student learning. Prior research by Moje et al. (2004) established that students bring different instructional, home, and community knowledge bases and discourses into literacy instruction and suggested that life experiences from students' home, peer groups, other social systems and networks needed to be incorporated into teaching and learning.

Another plausible explanation may have been attributed to a misalignment of professional development, teachers' practices, and students' learning tasks. As related to cultural modeling, teachers may not have provided their students learning tasks with the same cognitive demand as the outcome tasks. Thus, students may not have known how to use instructional anchors for new learning in order to make connections to new learning. This explanation was consistent with prior research by Lee (2007). In fact, Lee (2007) asserted that making these connections across schematic data sets enhanced the range of the context and kinds of tasks students were able to accomplish.

Correlation Study

Furthermore, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) conducted a correlation study comprising of 20 literacy coaches, 121 teachers, and 3,029 students from a large, diverse school district over a five-month period during the third year of a Reading First grant.

The study investigated the relationship between various aspects of literacy coaching and gains in reading due to the teacher. Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) found that students at each grade level made significant gains. In addition, the study found that coaching hours were a predictor at the second grade level and approached significance at the Kindergarten level. These findings were consistent with prior research by Atteberry, Bryk, Walker, and Biancarosa (2008), who found that when teachers received more coaching, students made greater gains than students whose teachers received less coaching.

Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) found that the number of hours literacy coaches spent conferencing with a teacher was a significant predictor of student total gain at the Kindergarten and second-grade levels and approached significant at the first-grade level. However, Elish-Piper and L'Allier reported that only literacy coaching related to comprehension was a significant predictor of student gains at one grade level, which was the second grade. A plausible explanation may imply that second grade teachers in the study may have had more in-depth awareness of norms of practices, may have concentrated more attention on interpersonal characteristics of their students, and thus may have been more willing to make necessary changes within their instructional practices. The explanation of a positive finding only with second grade was consistent with prior research by Moje et al. (2004) who found that teachers searched to understand students' practices, concentrated attention on interpersonal characteristics, and made pedagogical and cultural changes within situated practice.

Summary of Literature Review

The literature review offered a collection of recent research studies on literacy coaching. In addition, the literature review in the present study offered a sociocultural perspective of related theories and provided a wide range of third space interpretations, arguments, and plausible explanations not documented in previous literacy coaching research related to student achievement in reading comprehension. All of the interpretations, arguments, and plausible explanations were derived from hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories emphasizing sociocultural perspectives. The literature review in the present study was uniquely applicable to qualitative aspects of research and sought to address a deeper understanding of research studies' findings and their relationships to student learning in reading comprehension literacy.

Thus, a review of the extant literature revealed that Gamse et al. (2008), Garet et al. (2008), and Matsumura et al. (2010) found that literacy coaching did not impact student learning in reading comprehension. However, Lockwood et al. (2010) found mixed results. They found positive, significant impacts on reading achievement for two of the four cohorts and found no relationship between literacy coaching and reading achievement with the other two cohorts.

Nonetheless, the review of the literature indicated that Biancarosa et al. (2010) found significant gains in student learning with the effects becoming larger during subsequent years of implementation. Likewise, Sailors and Price (2010) found that structured literacy coaching programs may be supportive of teachers in second through eighth grades in reading comprehension. In addition, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) in a correlation study investigated relationship between various aspects of literacy coaching

34

gains in reading due to the teacher. Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) found that when teachers received more coaching, students made greater gains than students whose teachers received less coaching. However, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) found that only coaching related to comprehension was a significant predictor of student gains at one grade level, which was the second grade.

In addition, Sailors and Price (2010) found an increase in teachers' knowledge and uses of explicit reading strategies as the result of literacy coaching. Likewise, Lockwood et al. (2010) suggested that when coaches worked with teachers within their practices, teachers gained new knowledge and skills, which in turn enhanced instruction and improved student learning. Similarly, Matsumurae al. (2010) and Sailors and Price (2010) revealed that literacy coaching supported internal structures of collaboration and coherence and norms of practices.

Along these lines, there were several explanations offered in the present literature review. One plausible explanation pointed to difficulties with the comparison of data using multiple research designs to measure the impact of literacy coaching and student achievement. The primary concern related to what activities were being studied in the extant research. For example, in the two impact studies, components within literacy coaching programs were the activities that were studied, not literacy coaching professional development. Other explanations cited concerns about the lack of professional development fidelity to train literacy coaches and teachers to implement scientifically-based strategies in reading comprehension.

Likewise, other explanations in the present literature review cited concerns about teachers' lack of participation and engagement. Teachers' acts of internalization of

activity may have prompted teachers to have had or not have had a strong sense of self-identity. This inconsistency may have caused teachers to have adopted or not have adopted consistent literacy practices that may have been used as additional resources in literacy. Similarly, literacy coaching as a part of teachers' training may have better socialized or not socialized teachers to become more able to influence classroom culture and discourses. This line of thought was consistent with prior research findings by Gutierrez et al. (2009), Moje et al. (2004), and Sailors and Price (2010).

In sum, prior research on literacy coaching and reading comprehension offered mixed evidence, which did not support literacy coaching's impact on student learning in reading comprehension. Thus, in the present study, it became important to utilize sociocultural principles to examine teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences, the role of teachers' knowledge while engaged in literacy coaching, and the making and re-making of power relations as teachers offered culturally responsive instruction in reading comprehension.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The present study was a case study examining teachers' sense-making about their literacy coaching experiences. Berg (2009, p. 319) defined sense-making as the manner in which people, groups, and organizations made sense of events in which they were confronted, how participants framed what they saw and heard, how participants perceived and interpreted information, and thus how participants interpreted their own actions and solved problems and interacted with others. Berg (2009) argued that case studies allowed for thick, descriptive explanations about data and thus guided the researcher to have a deep understanding about a phenomenon.

The present study was bound through sociocultural constructs of hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories.The unit of analysis in the present study was the sense-making experiences of five teachers after they participated in literacy coaching. Teachers' literacy coaching and instructional experiences were bound within the context of comprehension strategy instruction. In the present study, five participants described their views of reality about their literacy coaching experiences after they participated in literacy coaching and consequently allowed the researcher to obtain a deeper understanding of participants' actions and sense-making.

Hence, this chapter contained the conceptual framework and case procedures informing data collection, data analysis, and ways teachers and students negotiated within

third space in literacy. In addition, the chapter addressed biases and provided a discussion about trustworthiness, including credibility, dependability, and transferability of the research.

Likewise, in prior research, Stake (1995) and Yin (2003) described a case as embodied in social constructivism. They argued that truth was relative and was dependent on one's subjectivity. In addition, Searle (1995) described social constructivism through the construction of one's reality and argued that social constructivism occurred in collaboration among participants. Moreover, Searle (1995) offered a view that encompassed both subjectivity and objectivity within a natural setting. According to Searle (1995), social constructivism described how social realities were related to other things and existed within a larger environment or organized system. Along these lines, Searle (1995) argued that most of the world's view of reality depended upon the contrast between the subjective view and the objective view. Searle (1995) contended that subjective truths depended upon certain attitudes, feelings, and points of view; thus, for these reasons, objective truths were objective facts that existed independently of one's representation of them. However, in the present study, social constructivism was enacted through interactions between participants and researcher. The present study assumed associations among literacy coaching, teacher learning, and student learning. In addition, the study assumed theoretical propositions encompassing sociocultural views and multiple truths. The theoretical assumptions were thathybrid spacescreated new spaces for students' active engagement, reasoning, and student learning; hybrid spacessupported students' views and experiences and generated cultural knowledge through interactions; hybrid spaces created times and situations that supported

teachers' sense making about literacy coaching. Furthermore, the research assumptions across cases were that literacy coaching addressed teacher learning; teacher learning impacted instructional practices; instructional practices impacted student learning.

The present study employed a dual research design: the theory-before-research and research-before-theory. For example, the researcher employed a theory-before-research approach to establish boundaries in the research design and research questions. Thus, the researcher applied the theory of action that literacy coaching addressed teacher learning; teacher learning impacted instructional practices; instructional practices impacted student learning. After employing these theories of action and research assumptions, the researcher identified research questions, which allowed for the examination of literacy coaching within the social and cultural contexts of teachers' practices. At the same time, the researcher employed a research-before-theory approach. The researcher began with an interest in teachers' professional development, conducted a preliminary literature review on professional development, delimited literacy coaching as the topic, and redefined the research questions on literacy coaching research. For this reason, the researcher used theory to examine descriptions of occurrences and events and reinforced findings found in the literature. Hence, prior research in the extant literature allowed the researcher to test theoretical assumptions and expand plausible explanations and interpretations.

Research Rationale

The researcher examined the extant literature related to literacy coaching and student learning and determined what was already known. A review of the literature revealed mixed findings in support of literacy coaching. For example, Biancarosa et al.

(2010) found significant gains in student learning with the effects becoming larger during subsequent years of implementation. In addition, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) in a correlation study investigated whether students made statistical gains in reading due to the teacher. Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) found that when teachers received more coaching, students made greater gains than students whose teachers received less coaching. Moreover, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011)reported that only coaching related to comprehension was a significant predictor of student gains at one grade level, which was the second grade.

Moreover, Sailors and Price (2010) suggested that literacy coaching may be supportive of teachers in grades two through eighth in reading comprehension. However, Lockwood et al. (2010) found mixed results. Lockwood et al. (2010) found positive, significant impacts on reading achievement for two of the four cohorts and found no relationship between literacy coaching and reading achievement with the other two cohorts. In contrast, Gamse et al. (2008), Garet et al. (2008), and Matsumura et al. (2010) found that literacy coaching did not impact student learning in reading comprehension.

Nonetheless, Sailors and Price (2010) reported findings that employed qualitative constructs related to literacy coaching. For example, Sailors and Price (2010) found increases in teachers' knowledge and uses of explicit reading strategies as the result of literacy coaching. Also, Lockwood et al. (2010) suggested that when coaches positioned themselves to collaborate with teachers within their practices, teachers gained new knowledge and skills, which in turn enhanced instruction and improved student learning. Similarly, Matsumura et al. (2010) and Sailors and Price (2010) revealed that literacy

coaching supported internal structures of collaboration and coherence and norms of practices. Moreover, prior sociocultural research provided some evidence for the effectiveness of cognitive and cultural modeling, in which teachers scaffold students' reasoning and assisted students to use their own personal, everyday experiences, and funds of knowledge (Barton & Tan, 2008; Bhabha, 1994; Gutierrez et al.,2009;Hammerberg, 2004; Lee, 1995, 2007; Moje et al., 2004.)

However, after reviewing the literature related to literacy coaching and student learning in reading comprehension, the researcher in the present study found that (a) none of the studies contained in the literature review was a qualitative study, (b) None of the findings pointed toward what social identities were enacted through language uses, discourses, and actions during literacy coaching, and (c) none pointed toward the making and remaking of power relations as literacy tools. Thus, in the present study, a hybrid or third space viewpoint argued for an in-depth awareness of teachers' norms of practices and a sense-making perspective of literacy coaching and student learning in reading comprehension. Consistent with sociocultural theories, the theory of action in the present study emphasized that learning was situated in everyday, social contexts and involved changes in participation and activity. The unique features of the present study framed the research discussion about literacy coaching and student achievement in the theoretical context of hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories.

Research Questions

The extant literature called attention to gaps in research related to literacy coaching and teachers' sense-making while participating in literacy coaching. Sailors and Price (2010) indicated voids in qualitative research related to teachers' knowledge about

their literacy coaching experiences. Thus, the following research questions guided this research:

1. How did teachers create instructional spaces for students' active engagement and reasoning to foster student learning?

2. How did teachers support students' views and experiences to generate cultural knowledge through interactions?

3. How did teachers describe their sense-making about literacy coaching and student learning?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework addressed literacy coaching and teacher learning within a sociocultural framework, placing emphases on the social and cultural contexts in which literacy coaching was practiced. The framework allowed for the social and cultural identities of participating teachers and involved acts of sense-making of teachers' literacy coaching experiences. In the present study, the sociocultural framework described how teachers bridged knowledge learned from literacy coaching in order to change instructional practices. Moreover, the conceptual framework contained emerging themes, including some initial qualitative categories, such as literacy coaching, instructional practices, and student learning. Thus, the researcher examined qualitative categories and offered supporting evidence. For example, the researcher collected data from teachers after they participated in literacy coaching.

In the present study, theoretical assumptions were that teachers created situations and times that they aided students to connect knowledge to their own cultural backgrounds (Moje et al., 2004); teachers provided students multiple opportunities to

construct knowledge through their cultural lenses (Barton et al., 2008, Gee, 1999; Guterriez et al., 2009), and teachers' literacy practices varied from one context to another (Perry, 2012, Street, 2003). In addition, Moje et al. (2004) argued that students used multiple discourses to make sense of the world and text. Consequently, students were able to process competing forms of knowledge to generate new and different meanings, representations, and realities.

Likewise, Street (2003) offered another theoretical argument. He argued for a cultural view of literacy, a theoretical view embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles. Street (2003) contended that literacy was social acts based on ways in which teachers and students interacted. Street (2003) argued that interactions affected the literacy being learned, as well as students' ideas about literacy and that the impact of interactions was especially relevant for new learners and their position in relations of power.

Along these lines, Gee (1999) and Street (2003) found that becoming literate entailed the learning of specific social languages connected to specific activities and identities. Pointing to critical theory, Gee (1999) and Street (2003) found that specific language for specific activities or practices was linked to specific social situations, which connected to distinctive sorts of motivations, goals, and purposes. For example, Gee (1999) and Sailors and Price (2010) found that interacting through guided conversations has come to be an important aspect of school-based literacy. Gee (1999) identified three features: comprehensible input, comprehensible or *pushed* output and a focus on meta-reflection of language and thinking. He argued that comprehensible input created instructional situations in which the talk and instruction made every aspect clear and

redundant at or just beyond the current level of the student's expertise. In addition, Gee (1999) argued that comprehensible output created situations in which students had multiple opportunities to produce and revise talk based on direct or indirect feedback.

Moreover, Gee (1999) contended that these three aspects of social language occurred at different rates, at different times, and within different contexts. Gee (1999) asserted that learners needed to be scaffold into multiple literacy practices, each connecting to specific forms of language, activities, and identities. Accordingly, Gee (1999) contended that social language connected to schooling required outside cognitive and social support. Gee's (1999) research was consistent with findings in the extant literature, especially Sailors and Price (2010).

Context

Workshop Professional Development

In the spring 2011, five teachers participated in 14 hours of workshop professional development over a period of two days with a trainer contracted through a private educational consultant agency. The professional development workshop provided participants with an overview of the third and fourth grade Mississippi Language Arts Framework, Mississippi Department of Education [MDE], 2006. The workshop training reviewed the Language Arts Framework and provided strategies in comprehension literacy. The workshop's content in third grade included inferential knowledge about characters' actions, motives, traits, and emotions. In addition, the workshop's content in fourth grade included literary devices, such as imagery and exaggeration and story elements (setting, characters, character traits, events, resolutions, and point of view).

Literacy Coaching

Following the professional development workshop, teachers participated in literacy coaching. The participantsincluded five teachers in third and fourth grades at one elementary school located in rural Mississippi. The sample comprised of the greatest number of teachers who taught third and fourth grade students at one location. Moreover, the literacy coaching's content emphasized comprehension strategy instruction and included grade level reading objectives as described in the Mississippi Language Arts Framework (MDE, 2006). Specifically, the goal of the literacy coaching was to aid teachers' efforts to engage students in activitiesthrough interactions. For example, literacy coaching aided teachers to set up instructional tasks in order to guide students' understanding and interpretation of text. The literacy coach (a) aided teachers to scaffold students' reasoning and (b) assisted teachers to use students' prior knowledge, including students' cultural background knowledge. In the present study, the literacy coach scaffold teachers' uses of comprehension strategy instruction, which included think aloud strategies that supported students' understanding of inferences and interpretation of narrative text. Likewise, the literacy coach demonstrated teaching that required students to use prior knowledge and personal experiences to draw conclusions, make predictions, and justify predictions.

School Profile

According to the 2011-2012 school's report card, there were 175 students at the school enrolled in third and fourth grades. The report card showed that the entire school's population comprised of 513 students with 26 teachers and 20 other staff members, comprising also of paraprofessional with at least 48 hours of undergraduate college

credits. The school was located within a socioeconomic area, in which 100% of students

were eligible for free and reduced lunches. The racial configuration of the student

population was 99% African American and 1% other (MDE, 2011). Table 1 summarized

pertinent information contained in the Mississippi Report Card, 2011.

Table 1

School Profile

	2010-2011	2011-2012
Number of Certified Teachers	26	26
Number of Non-Certified Staff	20	20
Number of Students	490	513
Number Free/Reduced Lunch	490	513

The school's adequate yearly progress (AYP), as contained in the federal

requirements of NCLB, indicated that the school did not meet its growth expectations in

English language arts in third grade and fourth grade in 2010-2011 or in 2011-2012.

Likewise, the school did not meet growth expectation as defined through accountability

for Mississippi. The Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) was 139 in 2010-2011, the year

of the literacy coaching intervention but decreased to 133 the year after the intervention.

Thus, the school did not meet growth expectation using the federal or state model of

accountability.

Participants

The sample comprised of the greatest number of teachers who taught third and

fourth grade students at one location. All participants in the study were female. Four

participants were African American; one participant was Caucasian. All participants were

highly qualified under NCLB. Two participants had 9 years of teaching experience; two had 19 to 21 years of teaching experience, and one had 40 years of teaching experience. Four of the five participants had advanced degrees; three participants had a master degree in teaching. One had a specialist degree in educational leadership. Table 2 summarized pertinent information about the five participants. The names of the teacher participants provided were pseudonyms.

Table 2

Teacher Participants

	Grade	Gender	Race	Years Taught	Degree
Barbara	3	Female	African American	40	Masters
Kerrie	3	Female	Caucasian	9	Masters
Krystal	4	Female	African American	19	Specialist
Lee	4	Female	African American	21	Bachelor
Anita	4	Female	African American	9	Masters

In the present study, the researcher selected five participantswho taught third and fourth grade students at one location. Although Barbara and Lee had the most years of teaching experience, all of the teachers in the study had prior experience. All teachers, except Lee, had advanced degrees. Most teachers in the study were African American; Kerrie was Caucasian. Moreover, all participants had been a part of a larger group of 14 teachers who participated in a literacy workshop training that suggested instructional strategies that teachers used to implement reading objectives in the Mississippi Language Arts Framework. Nonetheless, none of the teachers that researcher was aware had prior literacy coaching experience with an emphasis in reading comprehension.

Researcher's Role

In the fall 2010, as a requirement of the Institutional Review Board at Mississippi State University, the researcher petitioned the local school board to conduct reading comprehension research. The researcher received informed consent from five teachers who taught third and fourth grade. Thereafter, the researcher met with the principal and teachers. The researcher conducted all except one of the interviews at the school or classroom level. During the first interview, the researcher explained that the researcher and teachers' comments would be recorded, and data obtained from interviews and teachers' observations would remain confidential.

At the start of first interview, the researcher previewed the interview topics without the recorder. The intent was to minimize anxieties and create a level of comfort between teachers and researcher. Prior to interviewing, the researcher started a natural conversation seeking to establish the teacher's presence as the expert in the conversation. This strategy was consistent with methodology used in prior research by Berg (2009) who argued that in qualitative research the interviewer was to consciously shape and create the desired relationship between researcher and participants.

Data Collection

To understand teachers' sense-making after they participated in literacy coaching, the researcher collected data over a period of two academic years beginning the fall and spring semesters of the 2011-2012 School Year. Data collection began during the fall 2011 in Qualitative Research II while the researcher was enrolled at Mississippi State University. In the present study, the researcher examined interview transcripts and classroom observations that included researcher's notes and reflections.

Interviews and Observations

In the present study, the researcher conducted two open-ended interviews and one classroom observation with each participant and one additional follow up observation with three participants. Interviews were conducted in the fall 2011, and classroom observations were conducted during the spring semester in 2012. The interviews and classroom observations lasted approximately 50 minutes each. Interviews were audio-taped with informed consent.

Table 3

Summaries of Interviews and Observations

	Interviews	Observations
Research Question 1: How did teachers create instructional spaces for students' active engagement and reasoning to foster student learning?		
	Self-reported	
Kerrie	Watched certain television programs	unable to observe
	Sustained discussions (whole group)	observed (low frequency)
	Prompted students to use their knowledge	observed
	Prompted students to state their understanding	observed
	Modeled thinking with life experiences	observed
	Used narrative symbols	not observed
	Prompted students to form inferences	observed
Krystal	Prompted students to collaborate to form inferences	not observed
	Sustained discussions (within small groups)	observed
	Used open-ended questioning	observed
	Prompted students to use their knowledge	observed
	Solicited active engagement	observed
Anita	Sustained discussions (whole group)	observed
	Offered multiple perspectives	observed
	Used open-ended questioning	observed
	Prompted students to use their knowledge	observed
	Prompted students to form inferences	observed
	Used narrative symbols	observed
Lee	Prompted students to summarize	observed
	Prompted students to use their prior knowledge	not observed
	Used evidence to confirm thinking	not observed
	Sustained discussion	not observed
	Solicited active engagement	not observed
Barbara	Used students' prior knowledge	observed
	Pressed for text-based evidence	not observed
	Press students to add or comment	observed (short statements)
	Solicited active engagement	not observed
	Sustained discussion	not observed

Table 3 Continued

Research Question 2: How did teachers support students' views and experiences to generate cultural knowledge through interactions?

Kerrie	Solicited interactions	observed (low frequency)
	Incorporated students' personal knowledge	observed
	Engaged students to express their thinking	observed
	Used examples from students' life experiences	not observed
	Linked self to text	observed
	Acquired cultural knowledge through media	unable to observed
Krystal	Solicited interactions	observed (high frequency)
	Incorporated students' personal knowledge	observed
	Engaged students to express their thinking	observed
	Used examples from students' life experiences	not observed
	Linked self to text	not observed

Research Question 3: How did teachers described their sense-making about literacy coaching and student learning?

Kerrie	Solicited interactions	observed (low frequency)
	Used interactions to inform practice	not observed
	Shared power during instruction	observed
	Used students' personal knowledge	observed
	Used examples from students' life experiences	not observed
	Used narrative symbol strategy	not observed
Krystal	Used more probing questioning	observed
	Scaffold interactions	observed
	Shared power during instruction	observed
Anita	Provided think aloud strategies	observed
	Provided multiple perspectives	observed
	Used narrative symbol strategy	not observed
Lee	Guided students to summarize text	observed
	Scaffold students to think aloud	not observed
	Guided students to pinpoint evidence	not observed
Barbara	Pressed students for text-based evidence	not observed
	Check students' knowledge	not observed

The researcher developed interview topics and an observational rubric (Appendix

C) in order to collect data related to teachers' instructional practices after teachers

participated in literacy coaching. The researcher asked questions related to teachers'

literacy coaching experiences. Teachers told how they held students accountable to

express knowledge. In addition, teachers gave specific examples or told of times that

students supported each other's knowledge about the text. Teachers gave specific

examples of times they would say "Where could we find more information?" How can

we know for sure? Where do you see that in the text?" "What evidence is there?"

Likewise, teachers gave specific examples or related specific times that literacy coaching

improved accountability during instruction and held students to accurate knowledge.

Teachers told how they pressed students to provide evidence and support their thinking

about the text.

Teachers in the study gave specific examples of times they explained and

modeled how students engaged in social interactions during instruction. Teachers

described times that they assisted students to build on prior knowledge about the text.

Also, teachers described specific examples and appropriate times that they asked students

to connect with what they did last week. Teachers described times that they asked

students to add a comment or to agree or disagree with what was being said about the

text. Likewise, teachers described what they did or said to get students to think aloud

about their reading and what they and their students did to build upon each other's ideas.

Moreover, during classroom observations, the researcher looked for instances to

support what teachers reported in their interviews. For example, the researcher looked for

ways teachers created alternative spaces for students' active engagement and reasoning

and supported students' views and experiences in order to scaffold participation and

interactions during literacy comprehension instruction. The researcher observed for

teachers' depth of questioning, students' expanded explanations, and the making or

shifting of social identities and power relations through interactions and role reversal

between teacher and students. In addition, the researcher observed how teachers asked

students toexplain their reasoning and understanding of the text and how teacher scaffold

students to engage in social interactions.

Data Management and NVivo9

Preliminary data was organized and placed into data analysis software, NVivo9,

during the spring semester of 2012 within Qualitative Research III at Mississippi State

University. In the initial stage, the researcher used the qualitative software NVivo9 to

organize data for transparency and improvement of reliability. The researcher imported

interview transcripts into NVivo9 and performed categorical aggregations for the

identification of recurring themes. The identification of recurring themes made clearer

the relationships in the data and thus the development of alternative, third space

interpretations of findings. The assumption in methodology was that themes cut across all

five of the cases and that synthesizing of the interpretations was applicable across cases.

The primary techniques used for data organizing were separating data sets of

common and unique meanings, looking for patterns and relationships in order to create

themes drawn across cases, linking the reduced data sets within themes to research

questions, and building explanations related to research questions. Thus, in order to build

a chain of evidence and evaluate reliability, the researcher checked recorded interviews

against transcripts, notes, nuances, and reflections. In addition, the researcher conducted

one classroom observation with each of the five teachers and conducted a second

observation with three teachers. Moreover, the researcher completed multiple readings of

teachers' transcripts and also manually checked transcripts to become sensitize to differences and similarities in each of the cases. Multiple readings of each case allowed the researcher to develop a deeper understanding of each case prior to proceeding to explanations based on cross-case analysis and theories within a sociocultural framework. Consistent with prior research by Miles and Hubermann (1994), Xu (2006), and Xu, Coats, and Davidson (2012), these procedures increased confidence in research findings.

The researcher employed a cross- case comparison strategy to explore commonalities across cases. The techniques used in cross-case comparisonseparated data to identify common and unique meanings, looked for patterns and relationships, created themes drawn across cases, and linked data within themes to research questions in order to construct plausible explanations related to research questions. The method of triangulation of data was consistent with the data collection strategies employed by Xu (2006) and Xu et al. (2012).

In the first line of inquiry, the researcher created a provisional *start list* in order to code data across cases to research questions. For example, for Research Question 1, the start list of data pointed to how teachers assisted students to link their reading to prior knowledge or previous literacy lessons. The start list included coding of data related to how teachers assisted students to explain their reasoning and provided evidence to support positions and opinions. At the first stage of inquiry and throughout the analysis of the research, the researcher employed hybridity theory informed through prior research by Barton et al., (2008). Accordingly, the researcher organized data that displayed interrelationships among teachers' literacy coaching experiences, teachers' literacy practices, and student outcomes.

First, as part of the preliminary line of inquiry, the researcher created themes in five nodefolders:(a) building bridges, (b) multiple knowledge bases, (c) interactions, (d) social responsibility, and (e) third spaces for teaching and learning. Second, in order to align content with Sources in NVivo9, the researcher coded relevant content, exported related content into node folders, and hyperlinked relevant content to each node folder in NVivo9.Next, to explore repeating themes, the researcher conducted several text-search queries and created visual representations to identify related data within and among nodes. Further, the researcher examined data located in the theme nodes into three categories by assigning attributed values: (a) teachers' self-reported actions about pedagogy, (b) teachers' self-reported reasoning for their actions, and (c) teachers' creation of third spaces opportunities in literacy instruction.

Thus, the underlying assumptions of the start list were that teachers created alternative, third spaces to assist students to link their learning to what they know and consequently formed new knowledge about literacy. Framing a theoretical metaphor of third space, the conceptual first space referred to how teachers situated their knowledge, pedagogical skills, and experiences into their instructional practices. The second space referred to teachers' knowledge of students' cultural knowledge. Thus, the third space was an integration of spaces that generated new ideas in order to construct knowledge among students. For example, based on the start list, the researcher examined assumptions about three preliminary data sets: (a) teachers' knowledge of teaching, (b) students' cultural knowledge, and (c) teachers' sense making.Hence, in the second line of inquiry, the researcher used a variable-oriented approach as a pattern clarification strategy. The researcher evaluated how teachers talked about their literacy coaching

experiences. To explore further, the researcher created themes in the node folder: (a) building bridges for reasoning, (b) using multiple knowledge bases to generate participation and interactions, and (c) building social responsibility through teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences.

For further clarification, the researcher assumed that all of the themes described the process metaphorically as a melding together of two worlds, teachers' literacy coaching experiences and their existing norms of practices in literacy instruction.

Table 4

Patterns and Relationships

Teachers' Actions	Instructional Opportunities in Literacy Practices
Searching for instructional spaces	Giving power and responsibility to students
	Prompting students to use their own knowledge
	Creating multiple realities
	Using sense-making experiences
Making learning more visible	
	Encouraging active engagement and participation
	Engaging students in making meaning and problem solving
	Soliciting face-to-face interactions
Creating meaningful discussions	Drawing on students' experiences as resources
	Soliciting cultural background knowledge
Structuring the learning environment	Creating times and situations for interactions
	Providing familiar anchors for new learning
	Controlling cognitive demands of instructional tasks

Hence, the researcher conducted several text-search queries and searched for relationships within and between nodes. For instance, the researcher examined recurring themes and further sorted theme nodesinto three categories with attributed values: teachers' self-reported actions about pedagogy, teachers' self-reported reasoning for their actions, and teachers' creation of third space opportunities in literacy instruction. The

researcher looked at instances in the transcripts that teachers mentioned think aloud strategies and *interactional talk* as ways of guiding students. In addition, the researcher searched for times that teachers mentioned prior knowledge and personal experiences.Moreover, to explore repeating themes, the researcher conducted several text-search queries and created visual representations looking for unity within and between nodes. For example, in NVivo9, the researcher organized theme nodes into three categories of attributed values: teachers' self-reported actions about pedagogy, teachers' self-reported reasoning for their actions, and teachers' creation of third space opportunities in literacy instruction. Further, the researcher conducted preliminary coding using these attributed values and investigated emerging patterns and probe for interrelationships. Also, the researcher conducted a Node Summary Study that displayed attributed values. The researcher assigned building bridges and interactions as teachers' actions. Most initial coding occurred within the Building Bridge's Node. The second highest number of coding occurred within interaction node,which indicated frequencies of interactions. In addition, the researcher conducted observations to compare and contrast specific data in order to better understand the dynamics in each of the cases.

The last line of inquiry was to manually reexamine all case data looking for *outliers* or exceptions. The assumption was that unique experiences and realities of outliers were valid findings and therefore added confidence to research findings. For example, only one teacher in the study reported that she watched certain television programs in order to have a more diverse perspective as a teacher.

Trustworthiness

Consistent with prior research methodology by Merriam (1998), the present study defined internal validity as a matching of the research findings with the meanings of reality. Like Merriam (1998), the present study argued that reality was holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing and not a single, fixed phenomenon to be discovered, observed, and measured as was the case in quantitative research. Similar to Mathison (1988) and Merriam (1998), the present study employed triangulation methods to obtain a holistic understanding of teachers' literacy coaching experiences. Each of the teachers' literacy coaching experiences was essentially unique. Nevertheless, all of the case properties may have shared commonalities across all participants, shared commonalities among some of the participants, or shared commonalities with no other participants. Thus, the researcher addressed trustworthiness by providing a rich, thick description of cases that enabled readers to determine how closely their situations matched the actual research and therefore reasonably determine transferability of research findings. Also, the researcher addressed validity and reliability, as well as addressed credibility, dependability, and transferability. In order to achieve this goal, the researcher used three levels of triangulation: (a) triangulation of cases, (b) triangulation of data, and (c) triangulation of theory.

Triangulation of Cases

The assumption in the present study was that generalization about teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences lay in the situated practices of five teachers within one school. In the present study, teachers' sense-making formed generalizations, which recognized the similarities and differences of their literacy coaching experiences at

one school. This line of inquiry was consistent with prior research by Stake (1995) and

Merriam, (1998). Therefore, these five cases examined external validity referring to

generalization of findings. As a consequence, the multiple sampling of five cases

strengthened validity and added confidence to findings. This line of inquiry was

consistent with procedures employed by Merriam (1998), Miles and Hubermann (1994),

and Yin (1994, 2003).

Triangulation of Data

The researcher searched out findings by examining multiple instances from

different sources, using different methods, and then comparing the findings with other

findings. The method of triangulation of data was consistent with the data collection

strategies employed by Xu (2006) and Xu et al. (2012). For example, in the present study,

the researcher compared and contrasted data in order to identify patterns, addressed

credibility, dependability, and transferability. Thus, the researcher validated the findings

in each case by using multiple data sources that showed the findings as independent

measures as having not to agree with or contradict other findings. Each finding was valid

and was not dependent upon similar or different findings. All of the teachers constructed

their own meanings and reported their own realities about their literacy coaching

experiences.

Findings were shown to be independent measures having not to agree with or

contradict other findings in prior research. Consequently, even outliers were considered

valid findings. Outliers were shown to be active learners attempting to make sense of

their literacy coaching experiences. Their realities illustrated that meanings in literacy

interpretations were not singular, fixed phenomena. Consequently, the unique

experiences and realities of outliers added confidence to research findings. For example, in the present study, Kerrie was the only teacher who reported that she watched certain television programs in order to have a more diverse perspective as a teacher. She was the only teacher who self-reflected about how she met the needs of students through interactions with students.

As followed, there were events about teachers' literacy coaching experiences that the researcher discovered through interviews and observations that teachers may have already given prior meaning and interpretations. Thus, these prior meanings may have caused unfair advantages if all cases in the present study were expected to be identical. However, case data were expected to make sense, not suggest a cause. As a consequence, the analysis of the data involved associations, interpretations, and plausible explanations based on theoretical assumptions, not causes.

Accordingly, the present study was a local occurrence at one school that provided local events within classrooms with processes occurring across five cases. The five cases were shown to be fluidic; thus participants were not expected to have had identical experiences in literacy coaching. Nonetheless, methods used in the present study demonstrated reliability since the results made sense and made obvious that the same results were not necessary to be found time after time. Because the methods employed were systematic, the findings in the present study revealed the potential uses by subsequent researchers. Along these lines, this line of qualitative inquiry was consistent with research methodology reported by Berg (2009), Merriam (1998), and Miles and Hubermann (1994).

Triangulation of Theories

One assumption was that roles and relationships among teachers and their students changed and shifted as the result of teachers' literacy coaching experiences. The researcher generalized the present research findings from one case to the next case based on assumptions of underlying theories, not to a larger population. Thus, teachers' sense-making experiences were examined through human activities informed through sociocultural theories, placing emphases on the social and cultural contexts in which literacy was practiced. The researcher used hybridity theory to illustrate how teachers searched to understand students' practices, concentrated attention on interpersonal characteristics, and made pedagogical and cultural changes within situated practices. The theoretical assumptions were that teachers created hybrid spaces and times in which they scaffold students to connect knowledge to students' cultural backgrounds. This line of inquiry was consistent with prior research (Barton et al., 2008; Gee, 1999; Guterriez et al., 2009; Moje et al. 2004).

In addition, the researcher used activity theory to focus attention on the active roles of teachers as learners and to illustrate how teachers made sense of their own learning. Activity theory characterized learning as social acts and illustrated that language was related to thinking and concept formation. The theoretical assumptions were that teachers learned as the result of their literacy coaching experiences. This line of inquiry was consistent with prior research by Giest and Lompscher's (p.269, as cited in Kozulin et al., 2003) and Rogoff (1995).

Moreover, the researcher used critical literacy theory to examine how teachers relinquished power and distributed students' tasks, engaging students in activities that

61

required sharing of power through interactions and students' experiences. Critical literacy

theory described literacy practices as events, occasions, and outcomes that varied from

one case to another case in literacy. In critical literacy theory, literacy events were

occasions and outcomes, and literacy practices were means of focusing upon social

practices and conceptions of literacy. In addition, critical literacy theory emphasized

local-global encounters adapting to local circumstances among five teachers at one

elementary school. However, local literacy within one school may have been the

culminations of literacy practices originating globally from other levels of social

encounters, such as NCLB. This line of inquiry was consistent with prior research by

Barton and Hamilton (2005), Brandt and Clinton (2002), Feryok (2009),Moje et al.

(2004), and Street (2003).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The present study examined teachers' instructional practices after teachers

participated in literacy coaching. The findings were organized into three themes: (a)

bridging for understanding, (b) navigating for students' cultural knowledge in literacy,

and (c) understanding through sense-making of literacy coaching. In the present study, all

interview findings were strengthen or refuted through observations and sociocultural

theories.

Specifically, the present study focused on the following three research questions:

1. How did teachers create instructional spaces for students' active
   engagement and reasoning to foster student learning?

2. How did teachers support students' views and experiences to generate
   cultural knowledge and interactions?

3. How did teachers describe their sense-making about literacy coaching and
   student learning?

Research Question 1: Bridging Understanding

Literacy coaching, with an emphasis on comprehension strategy instruction, may

have destabilized power relations and shifted power to students in their reasoning and

thus may have reorganized literacy instruction. After teachers participated in literacy

coaching, they had multiple perspectives about how they sustained interactional talk and assisted students to support their claims, ideas, and opinions.   However, the study found that teachers conducted literacy instruction at the literal level of comprehension, a level guiding students to agree, disagree, and give surface-level summaries instead of adding meaning to the text. Nevertheless, the study found that some teachers demonstrated conceptual understanding of the instructional criteria required to offer instruction above literal comprehension. The findings suggested that teachers, some more than others, possessed an awareness of their instructional practices. Thus, teachers, some more than others, released responsibility of students' tasks and shifted power to students during literacy instruction.

In addition, the study revealed that teachers created hybrid spaces that supported students' active engagement and reasoning. Teachers shifted power to students by increasing their participation through comprehension strategy instruction. How much control teachers relinquished to students largely depended on the goal and purpose of the literacy activities and teachers' norm of practices; as a result, some teachers relinquished less control than others. Teachers released control of responsibility by providing students opportunities to use strategies, such as, (a) thinking aloud, (b) open-ended questioning, (c) citing text based evidence, and (d) summarizing. The study suggested that students may benefit from scaffolding of reasoning in reading comprehension.

Using Think Aloud Strategies

Teachers in the study offered multiple perspectives about how they guided students' thinking in reasoning. Teachers modeled thinking during discussions and guided students to think aloud about literacy. In fact, the study's findings supported that

Kerrie, Krystal, and Anita used diverse reading comprehension strategies that shifted power to students and at the same time assisted students to understand and connect with the text. As illustrated through activity and hybridity theories, Kerrie explained that reciprocal learning occurred between her and students, enabling her to better understand how to assist students to think aloud. She explained how her knowledge about students helped to better guide and prompt students to use their own knowledge to reason and think aloud.

> I've learned how to include students' knowledge because I watch certain televisionprograms in order to have generational and cultural perspectives. I engage students in grand think aloud conversations during classroom discussions. I like to see into the students' world. Learning about the students, their experiences, and about what is going on in their world helpsme guide students in their thinking. For example, I use students' life experiences when I modelthinking during discussions. It is easier for students to understand how I want them to think if I use examples that come from their knowledge and experiences.

> For instance, as illustrated through critical literacy theory, Kerrie acknowledged her awareness and explained how she shared power with her students. She stated,

> Students must be trained to take responsibility for their learning. I allow my students to express their thinking. I say, "Have you had that experience?" I encourage students to be comfortable to agree or disagree. I lead by prompting with certain words and comments, but I try to let go during the discussions and let students pull in their life experiences.

In addition, Kerrie recalled how she and her students constructed knowledge. Kerrie pressed students to engage in public thinking and use their collective thinking to add to the literacy content, to agree or disagree about each other's statements or conclusions, to give an opinion, or to provide evidence from the text about a claim.As noted through observation, Kerrie explained her thinking by modeling how she wanted students to think aloud about the text. For example, Kerrie thought out loud and prompted students to state their understanding of the text. The observation showed that students gave details relating their uses of prior knowledge about penguins and birds. Students gave a surface-level summary of the text that compared penguins to birds. As illustrated through observation, Kerrie directed a discussion with informational text that stated that penguins slide on their stomach but birds did not.The text stated:

> Penguins and birds are the same and different in several ways. They both have beaks. Also, they both have wings. Although they are alike, they are different. For example, penguins don't fly, while birds do. Another way they are different is penguins can walk with their eggs on their feet. My conclusion is that they are more different because penguins slide on their stomach, but birds don't.

Moreover, Kerrie added,

> Children love to talk, and the more they practice talking, the better they get. Rather than commenting, I guide students to share with the class. I try to give up power to students, which is very difficult. I ask students to add a comment, to agree or disagree with what is being said, to connect with what they know, or relate real life experiences to literacy texts.

66

In addition, Kerrie further explained that after participating in literacy coaching, she guided students to think through their reasoning by using narrative symbols, such as a star to represent the main character and an egg with a zig-zag to indicate the problem. She elaborated,

> We begin by talking about the title and then talking about the setting. Then, we identify a specific problem. As we read through the story, we use narrative symbols that represent these different things that we are talking about.By using the narrative symbols, students have a better understanding of what they are reading. We use stick persons for characters and a star for the main character. We do a house for the setting and a clock for the time. Also, we do a little egg that has a zig-zag in the middle, which shows the turning point in the story and the problem beingsolved. Then, we do an envelope for the message, which is what students think the author is teaching.

Kerrie continued. She stated,

> As the children read and discover the answers for different things, they use narrative symbols to discuss the lesson. Students discussed the similarities among the characters… Sometimes students give the reason that this character is the main character. We continue talking about the turning point and what message the story gives. During the discussion, students share with one another. They share especially the problem, turning point, and message. I will ask, "What message did you gain?" I always ask students what they are thinking and why they are thinking a certain way. I say, "What was it about the story that led you to think that?"

As illustrated during another observation, Kerrie read a story but did not distribute printed text. She mentioned narrative symbols but did not direct students to use symbols to summarize the story. Afterward, Kerrie assigned students within groups and directed students to look for changes in the story from the beginning to the ending of the story. At first, students were not talking in details about the text or involved in public thinking within the assigned groups. However, as noted through observation, students discussed the text more often after Kerrie passed out copies of the book and distributed each group a large, paper character.

Similarly, Krystal recalled another strategy that shifted power to students. She explained how she guided students through their reasoning. She asked *if questions* to scaffold reasoning and allowed students to compare themselves to characters in the text. She explained,

> Throughout the process of reading, we stop, discuss, and think aloud. I might pose a question. What if this was you? Or what would you do in this situation if you were the main character? I ask students to relate or even compare themselves to whatever the characters are encountering, or whatever is going on with the characters… I help students elaborate more about their answers. I say, "Can you tell me why?" Sometimes, we do focus sharing where students sit face to face, touch knee to knee. Students may share their favorite or least favorite part of the story by giving examples from the text.

As illustrated through observation, Krystal asked probing questions during discussion and guided students while they discussed inferences within assigned groups. However, the observation did not reveal that Krystal pressed students during whole group

discussion to think aloud when explaining or building knowledge. Nevertheless, the

observation may not have demonstrated Krystal's typical instructional practices.

Likewise, Anita stated, "After participating in literacy coaching, I provided students more

opportunities to share ideas. I encouraged students to give comments." She recalled,

> The story was about Michael Jordon's life. Some students thought Michael Jordan
>
> was a great basketball player, but some students didn't think Michael was that
>
> great of a basketball player. Some students said Colby Bryant was greater. So,
>
> some students agreed that Michael Jordan was greater, and some disagreed. And
>
> some thought someone else was greater. Some students get excited when it comes
>
> to voicing their opinions. And some get kind of upset; so I help students know
>
> that there is no right or wrong answer. Some would say, "My mama or my daddy
>
> told me so. I will say, "It is not a right or wrong answer. We are just talking about
>
> what we think."

Anita elaborated further. She explained,

> The questioning is what the literacy coaching emphasized…. asking students
>
> questions to build rigor. I think that students' giving of specific ideas and details
>
> aloud and being able to share, not just the teacher giving all the information,
>
> helped me understand students' thinking and build on what they already know.

As illustrated through observation, Anita sustained think aloud discussions

through students' sharing comments or stating that they agreed or disagreed. However,

data from the observation showed that Anita did not guide students to further add to the

meaning or extend reasoning further than summarizing. The data suggested that at times

Anita may not have consistently demonstrated a complete understanding about how to

guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension.On the other hand, as illustrated through the same observation, at other times, Anita demonstrated a more diverse understanding about how to guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension. She guided students to use the think aloud strategy by offering students opportunities to have multiple perspectives in literacy, such as the presenter, speaker, researcher, artist, illustrator, and the recorder. Afterward, students discussed these perspectives.

Open-ended Questioning

Similarly, teachers told how they guided students' uses of other comprehension strategies for reasoning, such as open-ended questioning, a strategy based on multiple truths and students' subjectivity. Specifically, Anita and Krystal, more than Kerrie, Barbara, and Lee, demonstrated how they guided students to add meaning to the text through self to text connections and associations. Hence, the study suggested that open-ended techniques may better enable students to infer meaning. To this point, Anita recalled how she directed students' thinking. She recalled how she used open-ended questioning to guide students' reasoning. She explained,

There was a problem presented in *Destiny's Gift*, a story that we are reading. Some students thought that Destiny was going to lose the store and have to close because she did not have enough money. And the text did mention that a little at the end of the story. The author left the ending open for students to make that decision… Students had to find details in the text that made them think that the store would stay open or close. So, students had to find evidence to support their claims.

70

Anita continued. She stated,

I tell students to "Show me; tell me more; tell me what page, sentence or

paragraph so other students can find these same texts." Afterward, we can discuss

whether students agree or disagree. Students looked at the text to determine if it

was relevant. They discussed what Ms. Wade may have been able to do to save

the store… They created posters and wrote action statements indicating how they

may have helped Ms. Wade keep the store open.

Moreover, Anita assisted students to use other open-ended strategies. For

instance, she guided students to construct new knowledge from multiple perspectives in

order to seek alternative solutions. Through the uses of open-ended strategies, Anita

guided students to identify alternate solutions or counter arguments through action

statements, discussions, posters, and students' presentations. The action statements, as

well as role playing, allowed students to give multiple perspectives, which suggested that

Anita guided students' thinking above literal comprehension.

Thus, Anita demonstrated conceptual understanding of the instructional criteria

required to guide students' understanding above literal comprehension. For example, in

Destiny's Gift, Anita guided students to link their contributions to the text. As illustrated

through observation, she directed students to construct additional meanings and

interpretations about the text by providing alternative solutions using multiple

perspectives and forms of media. For example, Anita directed the artist in each group to

create a *mind movie* to express thinking through action art with text captions. She

directed the recorder to retell the story, recreating the turning point with a change of

events and a different message.

Likewise, Krystal also guided students' reasoning through open-ended questioning that solicited students' open-ended responses to add meaning. She told how she assisted students to support claims, ideas, and opinions through inferences. She explained,

> I give students questions that are open-ended so students can elaborate and expand their answers. If there are no right and wrong answers, then students will feel more comfortable giving reasons about what they think. I have students to justify and explain their reasons. Students check for evidence in the text to support their reasons.

Moreover, Krystal asked probing questions that solicited open ended responses that allowed students to add meaning. For instance, Krystal explained that she used a personalizing strategy that aided students to connect the text to self in order to add meanings to text. Krystal stated,

> I make it personable in order to make it more relevant… Once students understand or have a full understanding of comparing and contrasting, I ask them to think about the story or even relate it to the text or to a text to text relationship. I say, "Can you compare this text, or do you remember another story that is similar to the one that we are reading now, or either think about the characters? Do these characters have any of the same qualities or characteristics"?

Furthermore, in order to direct students' uses of open-ended strategies and multiple interpretations in literacy, Krystal guided students to link prior knowledge by using what they know to look for clues in order to make predictions or inferences. Krystal stated, "I began the lesson by building background knowledge about the story and

72

establishing the purpose. I have students look for clues related to what they already know." In another example, Krystal gave an account of how she used open-ending approaches to guide students' reasoning. She stated,

> With the tsunami, a student brought up an example that this was a storm similar to the destruction of an earthquake. The student said a tsunami can destroy just like an earthquake can. Then the student gave some examples of other disasters in the world… In another story about tidal waves, the story was about seafaring and being an outcast… It also led to a discussion about a tsunami… Reading comprehension strategies always depend on what I am teaching. It depends on the typeof genre or the type of story… Whenever students give reasons, answer questions, or give opinions, I ask, "What made you say that?" I always ask students to explain. I say, "Can you tell me why?" I always come back with another question to help students elaborate.

Further, as illustrated through observation, Krystal guided students' thinking through lecturing and using questioning strategies while guiding students' uses of inference making. Krystal guided students to follow logical clues cited in the text. She directed students to use what they know and look for clues in the text to aid them to make predictions or form inferences.

Citing Text-Based Evidence

Likewise, teachers in the study,some more than others, guided students to support claims and opinions through texts that were explicitly stated. In addition to the uses of think aloud and open-ended techniques, all of the teachers reported how they guided students to cite text-based evidence. However, the study found that Barbara and Lee

guided students to locate straight-forwarded evidence as stated in the text; while Anita and Kerrie helped students organize thinking that enabled them to locate and interpret evidence stated and inferred. Nevertheless, although teachers had unique experiences and different teaching styles, they attempted to aid students' understanding and improve interpretations by (a) locating specific information in the text and (b) using text to make inferences.

Hence, findings related to reasoning through uses of cite based evidence, showed that two of the teachers directed students' searches to locate explicitly stated text to form summaries, opinions, and claims. Thus, the study drew on two unique experiences to illustrate that teachers demonstrated variant levels and degrees of understanding after they participated in literacy coaching. As reported during the interview, Lee mostly guided students to use the basal to summarize text using straight-forwarded and isolated information. This finding suggested that at times Lee may not have had an in-depth and complete understanding about how to guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension. Nevertheless, Lee stated,

> We read the story, *The Power of Wow*. In the story, there was a library on wheels that was about to be lost because of funding. Students had to tell about the fundraisers that were used to save the library. I asked about some of the things that children in the story did to raise money. The students said, "Car washes." Students had to go back and pinpoint that particular passage… They had to locate a specific page and a specific part of the story. Students use the basal to make a connection. They search the text, find evidence, and form opinions. They have to tell what they think… And tell why they think it is this way or that particular way.

In addition to locating cite based evidence, Lee told of another time she used a lesson from the basal reader. She explained,

Students have the questions found in the basal. I use the questions for guided reading. They have to use the basal. Students have to go to a specific page or a specific part of the story and find evidence in the text. I ask students more questions and have students to justify more… Students have to be able to go back and pinpoint evidence in the particular passage and make a comparison to show that they can answer the questions.

As illustrated through observation, Lee did not guide students to support their claims or confirm their thinking. The data from the observation revealed that students cited isolated evidence found in the text, which suggested that Lee guided students' reasoning at the literal level of comprehension. Likewise, after literacy coaching, Barbara also shared her unique experiences to aid students' understanding and interpretations. With the use of little text, Barbara guided students to add to each other's comments. The observation revealed that some students may have relied on prior knowledge, which may have led them to have specific comments about how bills were made within a democracy. Other students had few comments. None relied on written text to find evidence. This finding suggested that Barbara may have only had a partial understanding of how to set up the instructional task to guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension.

However, Barbara commented,

I press students to use text based evidence to justify why the answer is correct or incorrect. Students give justification with the uses of multiple choice statements. Students choose wrong choices first then justify by saying why the choices are

75

wrong. When students get to the correct answer, they say why the choice is correct. Students go back to the story and find the answer. I ask why this character does what he/she does, or what caused the character to do what he/she does.I will ask, "How was the problem solved?"

Thus, as illustrated through observation, Barbara had been transferred to social studies but was teaching reading during the time that the researcher conducted the interview. Nonetheless, during social studies instruction, she guided instruction by asking students to respond to isolated questions without the use of much text. For example during observation, Barbara guided students to compare and contrast a monarch with a democratic form of government. In order to further explain a democracy, Barbara wrote a Bill on the board. The Bill read: "Bullying should not be allowed in school." Barbara instructed students to vote agree or disagree. Barbara explained irregularities in voting and had students to check students' ballots for irregularities and then to tally all eligible votes. One by one, Barbara directed students to state *agree or disagree.*Students explained their opinions, mostly with short and superficial explanations without details or examples. Students only had printed text on the board.

To the contrary, some teachers aided students to make inferences in reading comprehension and helped students organize their thinking enabling students to locate and interpret evidence stated and inferred. The study found that some teachers in the study demonstrated conceptual understanding of the instructional criteria required to guide students' understanding above literal comprehension. For example, Kerrie told how she aided students to organize their thinking in order to know what evidence to look for in the text. She explained that she guided students not to just look for explicitly stated

answers but to look for logical choices using reasoning and locating specific evidence that supported educated guesses or inferences. Kerrie commented,

> By the time students reach third grade, they, more often than not, are not going to get a direct answer that is going to be embedded in the text. Students are going to have to read and think through educated guesses about what is the smartest answer. I teach students to stay on topic and think about what the author is talking about… I ask students to think about what the author is saying and, afterward, locate texts supporting the author's opinion.

Kerrie continued. She explained,

> I teach students to be able to explain what has already occurred in the story; to look for the problem, solution, and turning point; to identify similarities and differences and find ways to organize their thinking. Also, organization is how students learn best; so I have students to use organizing tools. It may be nothing more than folding a piece of paper in half to create a graphic organizer as a space to write certain text during reading. In this way, students will be aware of what evidence they are seeking.

> Moreover, Kerrie explained how she pressed students to cite evidence that infer meaning about the author's message. She explained that the message is what students get from the story, as well as what students think the author is trying to teach. Kerrie recalled,

> In small groups, students use narrative symbols, such as a star for the main character and an arrow in the middle of an egg to indicate the turning point. It is not difficult to recognize setting, character, and most of the time, the problem.

77

But, it becomes very interesting to watch the students discuss exactly when the turning point occurs. When does the conflict begin to be solved? And of course, the message: What do students learn? What do students take away from the story? I will ask, "Why did you choose that particular text as evidence to support your message?"

As illustrated through observation, Kerrie aided students to use cite-based evidence to compare and contrast penguins and birds. Students were guided to use the text to support why penguins slide on their stomach and birds don't. The observation indicated that Kerrie asked probing questions that prompted students to find evidence in the text. The finding revealed that Kerrie hadsome degree of understanding of task execution, which allowed her to conduct instruction right above literal comprehension.

Further, Anita recalled how she guided students to make an inference based on text based evidence. Anita guided students to locate and interpret evidence stated and inferred. The study found that Anita demonstrated conceptual understanding of the instructional criteria required to guide students' understanding above literal comprehension. She stated,

I prompt students to find evidence that justify their answers. I tell students to go back and read the passage. I will say, "Show me where you found this evidence. What line or what sentence did you locate the evidence?" Then other students look at the evidence and determine if they think it is relevant… I say, "Tell me more. Where did you find that? What did you say about that? Can you show me?" Sometime, if the responses do not sound quite right or relevant to the question, I

will say, "Tell me more. Why did you say that? Does it relate to the reading passage?"

So looking back to *Destiny's Gift*, the students had to make an inference at the end of the story. Anita stated,

Destiny gave Ms. Wade a gift. But at the end of the story, it really didn't tell us whether the store would stay open or close. The author left it open-ended for students to make that decision. So, in that way, students had to find details in the story that made them think that the store would stay open or close. Students had to show some evidence to support their answer… Also, the lesson at the end of the story may be different because each child may come up with something different at the end of the story. But, to support the author's message, students must show some stated or inferred evidence in the text.

As illustrated through observation, Anita demonstrated conceptual understanding of the instructional criteria required to guide students' understanding above literal comprehension. For example in *Destiny's Gift*, Anita guided students to make an inference about the ending of the story. As illustrated through observation, she directed students to construct additional meanings and interpretations about the text by citing evidence in support of an inference. Moreover, as illustrated through observation, Krystal also guided students to follow logical clues to form inferences. She directed students to use what they know and look for clues in the text to aid them to make predictions or form inferences.

Using Summarizing Strategies

In addition to the uses of think aloud strategies, open-ended questioning, and text-based evidence, teachers in the study used a summarizing strategy that was incorporated from literacy coaching. They guided students' thinking with uses of narrative symbols. Teachers used the narrative symbol strategy to guide students' understanding of story structures, such as, characters, setting, the problem, the turning point, and the message. The study found that some teachers guided students' reasoning to build a basic understanding or summary of the narrative text but may have only assisted students to offer interpretations at literal or right above the literal comprehension.

For instance, teachers guided students to summarize narrative text through the uses of narrative symbols representing characters, setting, the problem, the turning point, and the message. As students read, they used symbols that represented story elements. Kerrie recalled,

> When using narrative symbols to teach narrative comprehension, students better understand what they are reading. Students use stick persons for characters and a star for the main character. They have a house for the setting and a clock for the time. They have a little egg that has a zig-zag in the middle of it to indicate that there is a problem, a conflict. Then, students draw an arrow in the middle, which shows the turning point in the story and the problem that is being solved. They have a little envelope that indicates a message.

The observation revealed that Kerrie may have provided students with an understanding at literal comprehension. The finding from the observation suggested that students may not have understood how to perform the instructional task. This finding suggested that

Kerrie may not have provided students guided practice with a gradual release of responsibility or that Kerrie may have needed to have divided the assignment into parts. Nonetheless, Kerrie did not demonstrate a conceptual understanding of task execution. In this instance, Kerrie did not demonstrate understanding. Thus, she guided students' learning at the literal level of comprehension.

Likewise, as illustrated through observation, without the use of symbols, Kerrie read a book while students listened quietly and gave yes and no responses. Afterward, Kerrie guided students to summarize their understanding of the story. She directed students to look for changes in the characters from the beginning to ending of the story and tell what the characters looked like, said, thought, or felt. For example, Kerrie asked, "What characteristics did the character possess in the beginning of the story as opposed to the end? What happened that caused the character to change? When did the character change?"

Also, as illustrated through observation, students appeared to be confused. They were in groups but were not working. Students asked Kerrie to see the book. The observation indicated that after students looked at the illustrations and glanced through the text, some students participated more in the reading assignment, which was to discuss the story within their assigned groups and write their comments about the characters on a large, paper character. As illustrated through observation, the low participation rate indicated that students may not have understood how to begin the instructional task. Further, this finding suggested that students may have needed more guided practice with summarizing. As followed, the findings suggested that Kerrie may not have possessed a complete and conceptual understanding of task execution.

81

Interestingly, Anita used narrative symbols as a summarizing strategy to guide students' comprehension and assisted students to locate details about the text. Anita stated,

> Students write the symbols as they read… The message at the end of the story may be different because students come up with a different message or a different lesson that they learned. When student get to the hand, they know that the hand is for summarizing. They do *somebody wanted but so then. Somebody* is the main character; *wanted* is the wish; *but* is the problem *so* is the turning point.*Then* is the solution at the end of the story.

> For example, as illustrated through observation, Anita used the narrative symbol strategy to review students' understanding and prior knowledge of story elements. Furthermore, the observation indicated that Anita guided students to use Venn diagramming to summarize the text while reading. She recalled another time that she guided students to use the summarizing strategy. Anita stated,

> We discuss the words compare and contrast. We discuss that compare means alike. We identify what two things are being compared, whether it is a character or something else. Then, I show students how to use a Venn diagram. I show students where to place the things that are alike and where to placethe things that are different… If students are learning about a character, we talk about the things that are alike. We begin to post those things. And sometime before students post, I will have students discuss the things that are alike and different. Students share and see if they have the same comparisons.

Research Question 2: Navigating Spaces for Students' Cultural Knowledge in Literacy

Teachers in the study recalled how they guided students to rely on background knowledge to interpret text. Most teachers demonstrated an emergent understanding of how they guided students' uses of in-school knowledge in literacy comprehension. In fact, the study found that teachers, within varied degrees of implementation, made uses of students' in-school knowledge when forming questions about reasoning. However, the study found that in spite of culture and identities among most teachers and students being common, few teachers in the present study demonstrated an awareness of how to incorporate students' cultural background knowledge into their instructional practices. Along these lines, when guiding students' interpretations of unfamiliar literacy texts, few teachers in the study scaffold students' understanding of-out-of-school literacy. Few demonstrated a pedagogy emphasizing cultural differences in literacy.

In addition, the finding suggested that most teachers in the study were not familiar with students' cultural knowledge as valuable literacy tools. A plausible explanation may have been attributed to the design of the literacy coaching, which allowed mostly for cognitive modeling of reasoning found in state assessments, such as reasoning to draw conclusions and make inferences based on evidence in the text. In other words and as illustrated through critical literacy theory, the designer of the literacy coaching may have situated the literacy content in state assessments as having a privileged position in literacy coaching and thus may have caused teachers to have assigned a reducedvalue to students' cultural background knowledge. As informed through activity theory and through imitation of activity, another plausible explanation may suggest that the means, literacy coaching and teachers' practices, and the end activities, student outcomes in

literacy, were linked as related acts in literacy comprehension. Consequently, because the coaching emphasized cognitive reasoning, the outcomes were identical to what occurred during literacy coaching. These findings revealed that the content of teachers' literacy coaching may not have informed teachers' practices through students' sociocultural knowledge.

Nonetheless, two teachers in the study guided students to interpret the text through cultural and social background knowledge. The study found that during discussions, these teachers made use of students' personal views and guided students to expand their interpretations of text, incorporating their personal views. Along these lines, the study found that these teachers included students' prior background knowledge and personal viewpoints from which students may have drawn from their experiences formed within families and cultural communities.Moreover, the findings suggested that personal knowledge and cultural background knowledge may become identical activities with some young African American's readers with culturally different literacy experiences and most often may remain identical activities until such times in which teachers, family members, or someone within the students' communities introduced more dominant literacy practices to these young readers. Thus, as illustrated through activity theory, this finding demonstrated the processes of learning through activities, interactions, and experiences as natural occurrences and learning processes that encompassed in-school and out- of-school literacy.

Therefore, this finding suggested that students' retrieval of background knowledge may also be drawn from cultural events occurring within extended families and social institutions, such the church, social organizations, and even social media

seeking to target an audience from specific cultural backgrounds, such as television and Internet promoted to African American audiences. Thus, these findings suggested that young readers, who may had previously formed cultural and literacy knowledge different from the dominant culture, may combine personal knowledge of self, family, and friends, and at the same time, may retrieve their own cultural and literacy knowledge originating within social institutions, such as the church and social organizations to form a singular fund of knowledge used to interpret comprehension text. Along these lines, this finding suggested that young African American readers with limited knowledge of dominant literacy practices may form a cultural anchor to self and their cultural experiences to form a singular fund of knowledge used for text interpretations. Thus, the study's findings suggested that the content of students' interactions may have been based on cultural events drawn from students' personal, as well as, cultural events occurring within their communities. The findings suggested that young African American readers may first compare the text to self and thus use their funds of knowledge principally different when they interpret text that requires culturally dominant viewpoints.

Additionally, the study's findings revealed that the literacy coach may not have provided teachers with ample opportunities to perform literacy tasks from a learner's perspectivewhile collaborating with others. Likewise, the study showed that the literacy coach did not emphasize uses of students' cultural knowledge in literacy or provide for the execution of out-of-school literacy tasks. Thus, the findings suggested that given teachers in the study were not provided such assistance, enabling them to guide students' uses of out-of-school literacy, most teachers did not possess an awareness of their

cognitive power to guide students' uses of cultural knowledge when interpreting text having different or other culturally dominant viewpoints.

Moreover, the study's findings revealed that only two teachers integrated students' personal experiences, resulting from interactions and diverse interpretations. These same teachers enabled students to make meaning of the text through personal views and uses of everyday experiences. Only two teachers shifted power to students and released responsibility of students' tasks through uses of out-of-school, everyday experiences. Only two teachers relinquished control to students through (a) incorporating students' cultural knowledge and (b) modeling through students' experiences. The findings revealed that these teachers, more than others, possessed greater conceptual understanding of how to guide students to rely on their cultural background knowledge to interpret new text.

A plausible explanation may have been that Kerrie and Krystal assigned positive values to students' cultural background knowledge, choosing not to adopt deficit or culturally deprivation principles, which would have implied that something was missing in students' lives, homes, and communities. In this same way, both Kerrie and Krystal may have been more aware of the value of students' cultural knowledge about language and experiences and more able to transport cultural aspects from students' lives. They may have considered how students' cultural backgrounds were principally significant but different than the dominant culture. Thus, Kerrie and Krystal chose to use students' knowledge as strengths when guiding students in interpretations of unfamiliar literacy texts. However, none of the teachers in the study demonstrated a pedagogy that explicitly emphasized and pointed toward cultural differences in literacy. Although Kerrie and

Krystal demonstrated awareness of using cultural knowledge as strengths, they and others did not demonstrate a pedagogy that explicitly taught cultural differences possessing equal values and having unique qualities and characteristics.

Incorporating Students' Cultural Knowledge and Experiences

Although teachers empowered students to use reasoning to construct literacy content by agreeing or disagreeing about each other's statements or conclusions, giving opinions, providing evidence, or making inferences, few teachers incorporated students' cultural knowledge as valuable literacy tools. The study's findings showed that few teachers guided students to interpret literacy text by adding to the literacy content with the uses of students' personal views, and to a lesser degree, their personal experiences related to specific narratives about events that occurred in students' families and communities. This finding revealed that the content of the literacy coaching may not have directed teachers to assign value to or acknowledge the cultural narratives of students as important aspects of textual interpretation.

The study revealed that teachers in the study aided student to make connections at the literal level or right above literal comprehension in in-school literacy. However, the study found that only Kerrie and Krystal demonstrated an awareness of how to set up students' instructional tasks with the uses of personal and cultural background knowledge and how to aid students to make connections in literacy with the uses of students' out-of-school experiences. In this way, Kerrie and Krystal allowed students to rely on their cultural background knowledge to interpret text. Both, Kerrie and Krystal used the language and experiences of their students. In other words, they made uses of what they heard from their students. As informed through activity theory, Krystal explained how

she shaped the content of a literacy lesson and guided students to draw upon personal knowledge. She explained,

> I might pose a question. What if this was you? Or what would you do in this situation if you were the main character? I ask students to relate or even compare themselves to whatever the characters are encountering, or whatever is going on with the characters… I help students elaborate more about their answers. I say, "Can you tell me why?"

Case in point, in another literacy lesson, Krystal recalled that at the end of the story, the character died, a funeral was held, and the sailors in the story wept. Krystal explained that students compared the funeral in the story to funerals that they had experienced in their African American families. Krystal stated,

> In the story, *Storm Alone,* at the end, the character died; therefore, there was a funeral. The story told that the sailors wept; so at the end, we discussed how students related to situations that they lost a love one. Students gave examples and even compared the funeral that was given in *Storm Alone* to funerals that they had attended. So, it was relating to real life situations, as well as personal situations.

As illustrated through activity theory, the funeral in the story and the funerals occurring within families and communities were cultural events having identical means that guided students' interactions. The study suggested that Krystal's students' funds of knowledge mirrored into a singular fund of knowledge encompassing personal and cultural experiences. Along these lines, the study revealed that students' retrieval of personal experiences may have been drawn from interactions occurring within cultural and social events, extended families, and social institutions. Hence, the study's findings

suggested that the content of students' interactions may have been based on cultural events drawn from students' personal, as well as, cultural events occurring within their communities. In this way, Kerrie and Krystal's uses of students' personal knowledge assigned value to students' experiences, linked the text to students' lives, and anchored the instructional tasks in reading comprehension instruction.

Kerrie stated,

Students will want to tell you about what happened at home. I will say, "Let's stop and talk about this for a moment. Why did you want to share this with us today? How does this relate to what we are talking about, or how is it different from what we discussed? What made you think about wanting to share?"

Kerrie continued. She explained,

I allow my students to express their thinking. I say, "Have you had that experience?" I encourage students to be comfortable to agree or disagree. I lead by prompting with certain words and comments, but I try to let go during the discussions and let the students bring in their life experiences.I pretty well try to turn over and let students discuss times that they have had the same experiences happened to them. I try to let students bring in their life experiences. That makes them think more about the characters, how they feel, and why they may display the actions that they do. Also, can students put themselves in another's position, what are the expectations, and why does that matters?

Furthermore, the study found that even the bases from which Kerrie interacted with her class of all African American students were derived from social media, such as television programs. As illustrated through Kerrie's second observations, Kerrie

89

generated social interactions during literacy instruction on four occasions. The observation revealed that Kerrie provided opportunities for teacher-student interactions, as well as student-student interactions. Kerrie stated,

> I use examples that come from students' knowledge and experiences… I watch certain television programs to have generational and cultural perspectives… I like to see into the students' world. Learning about the students, their experiences, and about what is going on in their world helps me to guide students in their thinking.

Thus, Kerrie continued. She explained,

> I let students bring in life experiences to express their thinking. I ask students to connect with what they know or relate real life experiences to literacy texts. I lead by prompting with certain words and comments. I ask students to add a comment or agree or disagree with what isbeing said. I try to give power to students. This is very difficult.

Accordingly, the underlying assumptions were that interactions were drawn from students' first-handed accounts of their personal and cultural experiences as youths within African Americans communities, in addition to Kerrie's accounts taken from students' cultural backgrounds. As illustrated through activity and hybridity theories, Kerrie explained that reciprocal learning occurred between her and students, which enabled her to understand how students learned to connect with the text. The findings in the study may suggest that student with different, non-dominant literacy knowledge about text will use personal knowledge about self, family, and friends, and cultural knowledge derived through students' participation in social institutions, such as the school, the church, and even social organizations to form a singular fund of knowledge to interpret

text. This finding may suggest that young African American readers' personal and cultural knowledge may become identical, cognitive functions, coming together into a singular cultural data set and serving as the foundation from which these young readers interpret text.

Thus, as illustrated through critical literacy theory, students' knowledge of in-school and out-of school literacy was remade and produced into something new. As illustrated through activity theory, the processes of learning through activities, interactions, and experiences were natural occurrences in literacy. Moreover, the study showed that few teachers used students' cultural knowledge explicitly grounded in social experiences related to specific narratives. For example, Krystal recalled how she guided students to interpret text. She used a personalizing strategy that encouraged students to connect the text to self, thus enabling students to improve understanding of text. Krystal explained how she had students to rely on their personal knowledge. She stated,

> I make it personable. To make it more relevant, I have student to think about what they already know… Whenever students give reasons, answer questions, or give opinions, I ask, "What made you say that?" I always ask students to explain. I say, "Can you tell me why?" I ask students to think. "What if this was you? What would you do in this situation?" I ask students to compare themselves to whatever the characters are experiencing.

As supported through critical literacy theory, Krystal recalled an account from which literacy was shaped based on students' personal knowledge and students' enactment of power used to construct multiple interpretations about exaggeration and hyperbole. Krystal recalled,

91

One of the boys mentioned that his uncle loved fishing. He told how the uncle would go fishing and come back and say that he caught so many fish and actually he didn't. So he said that his uncle loves to…. his word at first was not exaggerated, but once he finished explaining, then we came to the conclusion; then okay, that's exaggeration. He may have caught two fish, but he came home and told he had caught about 10, but he threw the other ones back.

Moreover, Krystal described the uses of students' personal knowledge that shaped the literacy lesson and shifted role identities. She explained,

Students are always eager to add. Even one student said I know that in the story called *Paul Bunyan*, there's a blue cow or ox and the student said that's exaggeration because we know that there is no blue ox. So, students said that's exaggeration. Students were saying how Paul Bunyan was said to have chopped down so many trees; so students said that was also an exaggeration.

As illustrated through observation, Krystal created small groups and assigned students to read selected passages and answered questions on inference making. She attempted to guide student-to-student interactions within groups, which would have aided students to share their collective understanding and prior knowledge on inference making. However, the observation did not indicate that Krystal asked probing questions or prompted students to collaborate with each other about the assignment on forming inferences. Likewise, the observation did not reveal that Krystal had students to share their collective knowledge through discussion. However, the observation may not have demonstrated Krystal's typical instructional practices.

Modeling through Students' Experiences

Few teachers in the study used students' personal, everyday experiences to determine the content of modeling in reading comprehension. Thus, few teachers constructed examples and modeled thinking in situated practices. The study revealed that few teachers purposely modeled with concrete examples that encompassed students' knowledge derived through interactions, narratives, and other media, such as television. A plausible explanation may have been that the content of literacy coaching did not inform teachers' practices through students' sociocultural knowledge.

However, Kerrie stated that she watched certain television programs in order to acquire cultural knowledge about students. Although Kerrie did not recall specific television programs, she stated that she relied on her knowledge about students' backgrounds to guide the subject's content from which to draw examples and create thinking models during reading instruction. Kerrie explained that she was proactive in getting to know, understand, and appreciate students' backgrounds. She elaborated,

> I use students' life experiences when I model thinking during discussions. It is easier for students to understand how I want them to think if I use examples that come from their knowledge and experiences. I like to see into the students' world. Learning about the students, their experiences and about what is going on in their world helps me guide students in their thinking.
>
> I love to use the example of football players. The majority of my students love to play some type of sports. Of course, they already know about football and basketball. As I talk about the differentreading strategies, I relate the uses of these strategies to life experiences, such as football players warming up before a game.

93

I give the example that football players will warm up before a game. They don't

just run out on the field and start playing… I talk to students about the importance

of   thinking about the title and illustrations in the story as warming up

activities before reading.

Kerrie continued. She stated,

Students can relate to football players doing lay ups before they begin the game. I

say, "When you are thinking about the words in the title and the illustrations, you

are warming up your brain. You are getting yourself focus and ready for reading."

Furthermore, Kerrie explained how she derived the content from which to model

thinking. Kerrie explained,

Students are individuals that come to school with their own knowledge, skills,

feelings, and experiences. If I model with examples that come from their

knowledge and experiences, it is easier for students to understand… I let the

students discuss times that they have had the same experience happened to them. I

let students bring their life experiences. That makes them think more about the

characters, how they feel, and why characters may display the actions that they

do. Also, can students put themselves in another's position; what are the

expectations, and why does it matter?

Kerrie recalled a similar account of how she modeled with uses of students'

personal and familiar experiences. She stated,

I love sharing the example of football players. With using life experiences, I have

to learn about what is going on in their world. In my teaching, the more I can

model and relate to things that students are experiencing, the more likely that they

94

will understand and make concrete connections between their environment and their learning… I compare the warming up for the game to thinking about the title of a story and looking at the illustrations before students begin to read the text. I tell students they are warming up their brain and getting a focus to read.

As illustrated through observation, Kerrie modeled what thinking looked like and used relevant examples reflecting students' identities and aided students' connections between everyday experiences and in-school knowledge about literacy. Thus, Kerrie provided for teacher-student interactions that expanded literacy interpretations through the lenses of students' experiences. Along these lines, students' interactions may have been based on cultural events drawn from students' personal, as well as cultural experiences occurring within their communities, not on the content of literacy coaching. In fact, the study revealed that literacy coaching may not have provided teachers with content enabling teachers' uses of sociocultural experiences.

Thus, few teachers exhibited a readiness to incorporate students' out-of-school experiences into theirs and their students' literacy practices. However, the study suggested that modeling of task in cognitive reasoning during literacy coaching may have prompted some teachers, more than others, to imitate the modeling as compared to what some teachers produced prior to literacy coaching. The study found that modeling of tasks may have accounted for teachers' similarities, as well as dissimilarities, in the execution of literacy tasks. Therefore, the findings suggested that some teachers may not have fully understood all the steps or prerequisite steps involved in task execution presented during literacy coaching. A plausible explanation may have been that the literacy coach placed emphasis on modeling of tasks and did not provide teachers with

ample opportunities to perform tasks in collaboration with other teachers, or include out-of-school literacy experiences. In other words, teachers in the study may not have experienced the execution of out-of-school literacy tasks; therefore, they may not have developed the cognitive power to discern the literacy tasks from a learner's perspective.

Research Question 3: Teachers' Understanding through Sense-Making of Literacy Coaching

After teachers participated in literacy coaching, teachers in the study exhibited a readiness toward establishing norms of practices for change. The study found that literacy coaching may improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of reasoning in reading comprehension. However, the finding suggested that how and to what degree teachers benefitted from literacy coaching depended largely on their capability and power to execute literacy tasks incorporated from literacy coaching. This finding suggested that teachers must possess awareness of their own learning and have conceptual understanding of how to guide students to execute instructional tasks above literal comprehension. In the present study, the most compelling evidence of teachers' willingness to change their practices was teachers' shared understanding of comprehension literacy after they participated in literacy coaching.

The findings suggested that teachers claimed responsibility that shaped their unique experiences through participation and interactions with their students during literacy coaching. Teachers offered multiple perspectives about how they created meaningful interpretations of their literacy coaching experiences, especially related to how they guided interactions during literacy instruction. Teachers recalled how literacy coaching supported their understanding, which enabled teachers to engage their students

96

in activities that required sharing of power through interactions and students'
experiences. Teachers recalled how they used their literacy coaching experiences and
established improved norms of practices through (a) exhibiting a readiness for change in
norms of practices, and (b) misunderstanding of goals and means in literacy practices.

Exhibiting a Readiness for Change in Norms of Practices

Teachers offered diverse perspectives about how their practices changed as the
result of literacy coaching. The study found that literacy coaching placed emphasis
mostly on modeling of task execution related to cognitive reasoning. The study revealed
that teachers provided structural changes in instruction, such as changes in social
identities and power enactments between teachers and students. However, the present
study revealed that few teachers exhibited a readiness to incorporate students' out-of-
school experiences into their students' literacy practices. A plausible explanation may
have been that literacy coaching placed emphasis mostly on modeling of tasks and did
not provide teachers with ample opportunities to perform tasks in collaboration with
others or include out-of-school literacy experiences. In other words, teachers in the study
may not have experienced the execution of out-of-school literacy tasks; therefore, they
may not have developed the cognitive power to discern the literacy tasks from a learner's
perspective.

Nonetheless, the study found that most teachers demonstrated an emergent
understanding of how they guided students' uses of in-school knowledge in literacy
comprehension. Teachers emphasized diverse comprehension strategies that shifted
power to students, especially in the scaffolding of reasoning in reading comprehension.
Along these lines, within varied degrees, after teachers participated in literacy coaching,

they exhibited a readiness toward establishing norms of practices for change. All of the teachers guided students to practice reading comprehension strategies that allowed students to add meanings to the text or give opinions about the text. For example, after literacy coaching, the study revealed that Krystal relied more on a personalizing strategy. Kerrie and Anita used student-centered conversations. Anita and Krystal used more open-ended questioning technique. In fact, Anita reported that as the result of her participation in literacy coaching, she provided students more opportunities to share their ideas aloud.

Thus, as illustrated through critical literacy theory, the interactions between the literacy coach and the teacher participants caused teachers to make meaning of their experiences on their own terms, and as a result, produce diverse meanings derived from teachers' literacy coaching experiences. Moreover, as illustrated through activity theory, how the literacy content was executed after teachers participated in literacy coaching depended upon ways in which teachers' identities shifted or changed as the result of literacy coaching. In other words, how and to what degree teachers benefitted from literacy coaching depended largely on their capability and power to execute literacy tasks incorporated from literacy coaching. Thus, the study found that teachers must possess awareness of their own learning and possess conceptual understanding of how to guide students to execute instructional tasks above literal comprehension.

Moreover, Kerrie reported that interactions between the coach and her students informed her instructional practice. A plausible explanation for Kerrie's success was that she assigned positive values to students' cultural backgrounds. Kerrie chose not to work within a deficit theoretical framework, which would have implied that something was missing in the students' homes and communities. She stated that observing ways that the

literacy coach interacted with her students and the manner in which students responded to the different strategies made her more aware of the possibilities of interactions occurring between students and her during instruction. Kerrie stated that observing students' interactions helped her to see ways that students interacted and what areas of their learning sustained students' interest. For example, Kerrie recalled an account of how literacy coaching informed her instructional practice. She explained,

> The literacy coach reminded me that students learned differently… The most valuable modeling lesson that the literacy coach presented was the interactions between the coach and my students. The literacy coach showed interactions among students and reminded me how students respondeddifferently to different strategies. I gained a better understanding of ways students interactedbest. Since literacy coaching, I can tell if the strategies I am using are effective. I may have thought they were effective, but now I can tell when students are not really responding. The reason is that students may already know that knowledge, and it is not something that I need to spend time teaching.

Kerrie continued with the following account about her teaching after literacy coaching.

> She explained,
>
> I pretty well try to turn over and let the students discuss times that they have had the same experience happened to them. I try to let them bring in their life experiences. That makes them think more about the characters, how they feel, and why they may display the actions that they do. Also, can students put themselves in another's position and what expectations, and why does that matters?
>
> Kerrie commented,

Students must be trained to take responsibility for their learning. I allow my students to express their thinking. I say, "Have you had that experience?" I encourage students to be comfortable to agree or disagree. I lead by prompting with certain words and comments, but I try to let go during the discussions and let the students bring in their life experiences.

As illustrated through observations, after literacy coaching, Kerrie had ongoing conversations that allowed her to guide social interactions with students during literacy instruction. On four occasions, Kerrie provided opportunities for students to interact with the teacher and interact with other students within small groups. She pressed students to use prior knowledge, provide evidence from the text, explain ideas and opinions, and summarize the key points in the text. Furthermore, the observations revealed that Kerrie guided students to engage in think aloud strategies. She pressed students to provide accurate evidence from the text, give examples, and explain their reasoning.

As further illustrated through observations, Kerrie placed students in small groups and guided students to summarize what they learned about crocodiles and alligators. Each student completed his or her activity sheet. At the end of the lesson, Kerrie related the lesson to state assessments. Throughout the activity, Kerrie used probing questions to summarize the lesson. The observation revealed that Kerrie guided students to explain their reasoning and relate their understanding by providing evidence that supported opinions and claims.Likewise, Krystal recalled how literacy coaching changed her practice. She elaborated,

I started holding students more accountable based on my observations from literacy coaching… The literacy coach solicited lots of interactions. The coach

even pointed out that one group went beyond what was asked… Sometimes students made it sort of competitive where one group tried to give better explanations. Students pointed to other skills, like making inferences and making predictions… I knew that if students performed and did this for the literacy coach, then they would perform for me. So, right afterward, I started expecting and telling my students that they can do this, and they can't say I don't know.

As illustrated and in agreement with Kerrie's comments about interactions during literacy instruction, Krystal reported that she solicited more interactions after literacy coaching. Nevertheless, the observation did not support Krystal's stated claim that she solicited interactions as the results of literacy coaching. On the other hand, the findings in relations to Krystal's change of practices, suggested that after literacy coaching, Krystal may have held students more accountable for making connections in literacy between in-school and out-of-school learning.

Furthermore, Anita stated that after participating in literacy coaching, she provided students more opportunities to share their ideas aloud. Anita stated that having students think aloud helped her assist them to build on what they knew. According to Anita, the literacy coach demonstrated the use of questioning techniques. Thus, Anita explained that it was the questioning that she learned from literacy coaching that seemed to improve her instruction the most. Anita added,

> The questioning is what the literacy coach really emphasized. Asking students questions to build rigor. "Tell me more. Where did you find that?" The literacy coach kept asking students questions and having students to answer those questions helped students to comprehend the reading text… I try to make the

student more accountable for learning rather than the teacher lecturing the entire time. I try to get students to interact more with each other. And that's what I learned from coaching. I allow students to show ownership of their learning as well… I think that students giving their specific ideas and details aloud and being able to share and not just the teacher giving all the information helped me understand students 'thinking to build on what students already know.

Anita stated that through questioning, she guided students to link their contributions to the text. Anita indicated that having her students to think aloud helped her better assist students to build on what they know. Anita stated, "I tell students to "Show me; tell me more; tell me what page, sentence or paragraph so other students can find these same texts." Afterward, we discuss whether students agree or disagree.

As illustrated through observation, after literacy coaching, Anita directed students to construct additional meanings and interpretations about the text by providing alternative solutions using multiple perspectives and forms of media. Through the uses of open-ended strategies, Anita guided students to identify alternative solutions or counter arguments through action statements, discussions, posters, and students' presentations. The action statements, as well as role playing, provided students with multiple perspectives, which revealed that Anita guided students' thinking above literal comprehension.

Moreover, some teachers in the study showed that they constructed *third spaces* within their instructional practices. The study found that after literacy coaching teachers encouraged students to use story structures. However, the study found that some teachers relinquished less control of the structure of the literacy lesson and literacy content. The

findings in the study revealed that for the most part how much control teachers relinquished to students depended on the goal and purpose of the literacy activities and the motives of teachers. For example, Anita reported that she used the narrative strategy to teach students to find details about the characters, setting, the problem, the turning point, and the story's message. According to Anita, as students read, they draw symbols and locate beside details in the text. Anita explained,

Students draw the symbols. They remember what they are. They draw them. I tell the students to write all the characters. This is what the coach model. But students know to put a star beside the main character and then students go to the next. When students find the information, the problem may have already come up at the beginning of the story. When students figure out the problem, they write it beside the symbol. The message at the end of the story may be different. Students may come up with something different at the end of the story because they may come up with a different message or a lesson that they learned. Then students go to the hand. They know that the hand is for summarizing. They do *somebody wanted but so then. Somebody* is the main character; *wanted* is the wish; *but* is the problem *so* is the turning point. *Then* is the solution at the end of the story.

Kerrie agreed and recalled a similar strategy that the literacy coach modeled. For example, Kerrie echoed this view about the narrative symbol strategy. She explained,

A specific strategy that I liked was the use of the narrative symbol strategy. After the coach read the comprehension passage, she modeled the uses of different narrative symbols…. The coach talked aloud as if she was a student. As students

thought about the story, the coach said, "I wonder. Why is this character the main

character? What made this character to be chosen as the main character?"

The coach talked as if she was the student that was thinking out loud. I

think this is the best way, to model first and then do the activity together

with students before asking students to do the activity on their own. The

coach read another passage. But this time, the coach asked students to talk

aloud, telling what they thought and stopping along the way to discuss and

tell why… It was an ongoing strategy that started at the beginning of the

text and followed to the end of the story.

Kerrie stated,

Students stopped, talked, and gave answers as they read the story. This made

students think more about what they were reading… Students had to stop and say

"Who is the main character?" They had to place a star by the main character. As

students read, they had to think, "When am I going to find that word, phrase, or

sentence to support the setting of the story, the time?"

Then students had to think about the problem, the conflict. They had to

decide the turning point in the story. I really liked how this made readers

think about what they were reading, rather than just trying to answer

questions at the end of the story after they read.

Kerrie commented,

I did not start using this strategy until the literacy coach demonstrated the

effectiveness of students' understanding in reading comprehension. Before I

participated in literacy coaching, after students read, I used the *what, when,*

where, and how summarizing strategy, which was a good strategy except that it occurred at the end of the story after students read.

Misunderstanding of Goals and Means in Literacy Practices

The study suggested that modeling of task during literacy coaching may have prompted some teachers, more than others, to imitate modeling as compared to what some teachers produced prior to literacy coaching. The study found that modeling of tasks may have accounted for teachers' similarities, as well as dissimilarities, in the execution of literacy tasks. Therefore, the findings suggested that some teachers may not have fully understood the steps or prerequisite steps involved in task execution presented during literacy coaching. Hence, the present study suggested that how and to what degree teachers in the study benefitted from their literacy coaching experiences depended largely on teachers' abilities to form complete images of the literacy tasks and have a complete and conscious understanding of means to achieve expected outcomes in literacy. A plausible explanation may have been that teachers in the study may not have had a complete image or concept of tasks required to scaffold student's depth of knowledge as defined through state curriculum and assessments. In addition, the duration of the literacy coaching may not have been long enough to have sustained teachers' deep understanding of how to scaffold students' tasks above literal comprehension.

Moreover, another consideration may have been the design of the literacy coaching. In the present study, the evidence pointed to teachers' partial understanding of task criteria and task conditions necessary to teach reading above the literal level of comprehension. A plausible explanation may have been that the design of the literacy coaching may have placed emphasis mostly on modeling of tasks, not teachers having

opportunities to perform tasks. The designer of the literacy coaching may have overlooked the inclusion of task criteria that would have aided teachers during planning and implementation to improve task execution.

Thus, the study found that some teachers may have (a) imitated and negotiated incomplete tasks in reasoning after they participated in literacy coaching and (b) demonstrated lack of knowledge of influences of student's cultural knowledge. A plausible explanation may have been that the literacy coach placed emphasis mostly on modeling of tasks; therefore, teachers did not have ample opportunities to perform literacy tasks in collaboration with others. This suggested that teachers in the study may not have experienced the execution of literacy tasks as learners; therefore, they may not have developed the cognitive power to discern the literacy tasks from the learner's perspective. Thus, this finding may have accounted for teachers not modifying literacy instructions when students' activities and actions did not stimulate the students to learn.

For example, in the present study, teachers mostly scaffold reasoning at the literal level or right above the literal level of comprehension. This finding suggested that teachers may have had only a partial understanding of task criteria required to guide students' reasoning above the literal level of comprehension, and even less awareness of the influences of students' cultural background knowledge in reading comprehension. Case in point, as illustrated through observation, Anita sustained think aloud discussions during times that students shared their comments or stated that they agreed or disagreed. However, data from the observation showed that Anita did not guide students to further add to the meaning or extend their reasoning beyond summarizing. This finding

suggested that at times Anita may not have had a conceptual understanding about how to guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension.

Hence, findings, related to reasoning through uses of cite-based evidence, revealed that two of the teachers directed students' searches to locate explicitly stated text to form summaries, opinions, and claims. Along these lines, the study drew on two unique experiences that illustrated teachers having varied levels and degrees of understanding after they participated in literacy coaching. For example, Lee mostly guided students to use the basal to summarize text using straight-forwarded and isolated information. This finding suggested that at times Lee may not have had an in -depth and complete understanding of tasks required to guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension. Lee explained,

> Students have the questions found in the basal. I use the questions for guided
> reading. Students have to use the basal… They have to go to a specific page or a
> specific part of the story and find evidence in the text. I ask students more
> questions and have students to justify more… Students have to be able to go back
> and pinpoint evidence in the particular passage and make a comparison to show
> that they can answer the questions.

As illustrated through observation, Lee did not guide students to support claims or confirm their thinking. The data from the observation revealed that students cited isolated evidence found in the text, which suggested that Lee guided students' reasoning at the literal level of comprehension. Likewise, after Barbara participated in literacy coaching, she shared her experiences to aid students' understanding and interpretations. Thus, as

107

illustrated through observation, Barbara guided students with isolated questions with the use of little text. She commented,

> I press students to use text-based evidence to justify why the answer is correct or incorrect. Students give justification with the use of multiple choice statements. Students choose wrong choices first then justify by saying why the choices are wrong. When students get to the correct answer, they say why the choice is correct. Students go back to the story and find the answer. I ask why this character does what he/she does, or what caused the character to do what he/she does? I will ask, "How was the problem solved?"

Further, Barbara recalled times she thought it was appropriate to ask students to explain their reasoning. She stated,

> Once we are fully discussing items, and I think the class understands it; then this is the time that I ask students questions about whatever the objectives I have gone over… When I have gone over it fully, and I have discussed it; once they have been placed in groups, and they have completed several skills on that particular item. Then that is the time I think it is appropriate to ask questions.
>
> At the end, after I have fully discussed it, I have placed students in groups. After students have gone over several activities, and after these steps, then that's time I will do my questioning. Also, I will usually do my questioning just before and an exam.

As illustrated through hybridity and critical literacy theories, the study revealed that Barbara did not create hybrid spaces that supported students' active engagement and reasoning; nor did she shift power to students by increasing their participation through

108

comprehension strategy instruction. These findings showed that Barbara was still developing an understanding of task execution. A plausible explanation may have been that Barbara lacked conceptual understanding of tasks necessary to achieve expected outcomes. Another plausible explanation may rest in the content of the literacy coaching, which placed emphasis mostly on the coach's modeling of instructional tasks, not teachers having opportunities to perform instructional tasks.

In the present study Anita, Barbara, and Lee didnot demonstrate awareness of the instructional uses of student's cultural background knowledge in literacy. Only Kerrie and Krystal demonstrated awareness of the integration of students' personal experiences. The study found that Kerrie and Krystal enabled students to make meaning of the text through personal views and uses of everyday, out-of-school experiences, such as fishing experiences, attending funerals, and thinking and talking about storms and sport events. A plausible explanation may have been that Kerrie and Krystal assigned positive values to students' cultural backgrounds. They may have chosen not to work within a deficit theoretical framework, which would have implied that something was missing in the students' homes and communities. For example, Kerrie and Krystal may have judged against their own personal knowledge about self, the dominant culture, and students' background knowledge to form an emergent understanding of how to use students' culture knowledge to improve literacy practices.

Another plausible explanation revealed that Barbara, Lee, and to a lesser degree Anita, may have had only a partial awareness of how students' cultural background knowledge impacted reading comprehension. On the other hand andas illustrated through activity theory, the study found that Barbara and Lee were still developing an

understanding of task execution. The study revealed that although culture and identities among most teachers and students were common, only Kerrie and Krystal incorporated students' cultural background knowledge into their instructional practices. Thus, the findings suggested that Anita, Barbara, and Lee were not familiar with students' cultural knowledge as valuable literacy tools in reading comprehension. As informed through activity theory, another plausible explanation may be related to imitation of activity, suggesting that the means, literacy coaching and teachers' practices, and the end activities, student outcomes in literacy, were related acts. Consequently, literacy coaching emphasized cognitive reasoning, and the outcomes were related to what had been emphasized during literacy coaching. These findings revealed that literacy coaching may not have emphasized students' cultural background knowledge.

The study found that the literacy coaching model may have caused teachers in the study to have assigned a reduced value to students' cultural background knowledge as useful literacy tools. A plausible explanation may have been that teachersmay have lacked conceptual understanding of instructional tasks to achieve expected outcomes. Another plausible explanation may rest in the content of the literacy coaching, which placed emphasis on the literacy coach's modeling of tasks, not teachers having opportunities to perform tasks from the learner's perspective. The findings suggested that most teachers in the study were not familiar with students' cultural knowledge as valuable literacy tools in reading comprehension. Although culture and identities among most teachers and students were common, the study found that Barbara, Lee, and to a lesser degree Anita, showed only a partial awareness of how students' cultural background knowledge influenced comprehension in literacy.

110

As followed, the study showed that only Kerrie and Krystal demonstrated an awareness of how to integrate students' personal experiences to achieve more meaningful interpretations. Kerrie and Krystal incorporated students' cultural background knowledge into their instructional practices. They enabled students to make meaning of the text through personal views and uses of everyday, out-of-school experiences. The study found that Kerrie and Krystal shifted power to students and released responsibility of students' tasks through uses of out-of school, everyday experiences. A plausible explanation may have been that Kerrie and Krystal may have assigned positive values to students' cultural backgrounds. They chose not to work within a deficit theoretical framework, which would have implied that something was missing in the students' homes and communities. Hence, Kerrie and Krystal may have judged against their own personal knowledge about self, the dominant culture, and students' background knowledge to form an emergent understanding of how to guide students' literacy practices.As informed through activity theory, another plausible explanation may be related to imitation of activity, suggesting that the means, literacy coaching and teachers' practices, and the end activities, student outcomes in literacy, were related acts. Consequently, literacy coaching emphasized cognitive reasoning, and the outcomes emphasized what occurred during literacy coaching. These findings revealed that the content of literacy coaching may not have informed teachers' practices through students' sociocultural knowledge.

As illustrated through critical literacy theory, the designer of the literacy coaching may have situated the literacy content in state assessments as having a privileged position in the coaching model and may have caused teachers in the study to have assigned lesser value to students' cultural background knowledge as useful literacy tools. Therefore, the

111

advantaged position may have influenced how teachers participated in literacy coaching and subsequently how they may have aligned cognitive instruction with state assessments. Thus, the findings suggested that teachers, some more than others, may have had an awareness of the literacy assessed through state assessments.

As followed, student achievement data were aggregated in language arts the year prior to the intervention and during the year of the literacy coaching's intervention. The data revealed that most student growth in fourth grade occurred within the Advanced, Proficient, and Basic categories during the year of the literacy coaching intervention. Although fourth grade students showed small achievement gains among individual students moving from third grade to fourth grade, the present study did not find that literacy coaching conclusively impacted literacy scores.

In the present study, the researcher collected baseline student achievement data the year prior to the intervention and achievement data during the year of the literacy coaching's intervention. The findings may suggest that state assessments may have had a privileged or advantaged position of power that influenced how teachers participated in literacy coaching and subsequently how they taught literacy instruction. Thus, the study found that some teachers possessed degrees of awareness about student learning as described in state assessments and demonstrated a partial understanding of what literacy means or tasks were to be appropriated to sustain learning required for state assessments.

Table 5

Test Scores

Percentage from Third Grade Cohorts to Fourth Grade Cohorts

	2009-2010	2010-2011
	(Prior to Literacy Coaching Intervention)	(During Literacy Coach Intervention)
Advanced	11	14
Proficient	29	41
Basic	44	31
Minimum	17	14

During the year in which teachers participated in literacy coaching, the student achievement data indicated marginal achievement growth among fourth graders, an increase of 3% in the advanced category, an increase of 12% in the proficient category, a decrease of 13% in the Basic category, and a decrease of 3% in the minimum category. Third grade data presented baseline growth data for identical groups of students enrolled in third grade in 2009-2010 who had been taught by participating teachers prior to literacy coaching and students enrolled in fourth grade in 2010-2011 who were taught by participating teachers during the year that literacy coaching was offered.

Hence, the findings have implications of practice and policy. The findings showed small gains from third grade to fourth grade during the year of the intervention and may suggest that some students within the basic category, as well as the minimal category, may benefit from having teachers who participate in literacy coaching over a period of more than one school year. Given that the researcher collected baseline data prior to intervention, the findings of small achievement gains during the year of the intervention may suggestan expectant growth projection over time, in line with observed growth

during the year of the intervention. Thus, based on the baseline data, the findings suggested that the impact of teachers' literacy coaching may occur in subsequent years for all students, including students scoring at the minimum category of achievement. In other words, the findings suggested that literacy coaching may support teachers' understanding over time to scaffold learning in reading comprehension for students scoring within minimum and basic levels on state assessments.

Moreover, the findings in the present study addressed units of analyses that emerged from interviews, classroom observations, and sociocultural theories. These findings shared commonalities and uniqueness across all cases. Data obtained through interviews, observations, and theoretical propositions, which were supported through achievement data, offered evidence and were reviewed systematically. Throughout the study, theoretical propositions of hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories were shown to be consistent and continuous. These differences and similarities among five teachers were authenticated within the context of situated practices and offered sense-making of teachers' literacy coaching experiences. Thus, these similarities and differences were presented to suggest influences, associations, and connections related to how teachers used literacy coaching to influence teachers' practices in literacy instruction. In the same way, the differences and similarities among teachers were further authenticated through their sense making and reflections of student achievement related to teachers' literacy coaching experiences. Thus, all findings possessed the possibility of being reproduced by subsequent researchers and generalized through theoretical applications.

114

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study was a qualitative study that examined teachers' sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences after they participated in literacy coaching. During literacy coaching, the coach demonstrated reading comprehension strategies designed to support teachers' knowledge especially related to how teachers facilitated interactions, aided students' reasoning through discussions, guided students' uses of cultural knowledge, and created meaningful interpretations of their own learning.

Summary of Findings

The present study found that literacy coaching may improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of cognitive reasoning but may require additional efforts to improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of students' cultural background knowledge. Moreover, the present study revealed that literacy coaching may increase teachers' knowledge and thus change teachers' instructional practices. The data further showed that all teachers in the study aided students in their cognitive reasoning; yet, few teachers demonstrated an awareness of how to incorporate students' cultural background knowledge into their instructional practices. These findings revealed that teachers had variant levels and degrees of understanding, even after they participated in literacy coaching. Thus, teachers in the study, with variant levels of implementation, shifted

power to students by increasing their participation in the uses of comprehension strategy instruction. The data suggested that the degree in which teachers may have relinquished control to students depended largely on the goal and purpose of the literacy activities and motives of teachers. For example, some teachers in the study relinquished less control of the structure of the literacy lesson and literacy content. Teachers in the study released control of responsibility and provided students opportunities in their uses of comprehension strategies, such as, (a) thinking aloud, (b) open-ended techniques, (c) citing text-based evidence, and (d) summarizing. Few teachers relinquished control to students through (a) incorporating students' cultural knowledge and (b) modeling through students' experiences.

Accordingly, the present study revealed that literacy coaching may not have emphasized uses of students' cultural knowledge in literacy, and as a result, most teachers in the study may not have recognized students' cultural narratives as important aspects of textual interpretation. For example, the study found that only two teachers demonstrated an awareness of how to set up students' instructional tasks using personal and cultural background knowledge and thus aiding students to make connections in literacy with the uses of students' out-of-school experiences. A plausible explanation may have been that Kerrie and Krystal sought to know more about students' lives outside of the classroom, may have been more aware of the importance of cultural knowledge in literacy, and may have known how to set up instructional tasks that used cultural aspects from students' homes and communities.

Moreover, the findings suggested that literacy coaching may not have provided the steps or prerequisite steps involved in task execution to infuse students' cultural

116

knowledge. Likewise, the findings suggested that given teachers in the study may not have been provided such assistance that enabled them to guide students' uses of out-of-school literacy, most teachers in the study did not possess an awareness of their cognitive power to guide students' uses of cultural knowledge when interpreting text having different or other culturally dominant viewpoints. As a result, the present study found that few teachers directed students to make meaning of the text through students' personal views and uses of everyday experiences. A plausible explanation may have been that teachers in the study may not have had a complete image or conceptual understanding of the instructional tasks required to scaffold student's depth of knowledge as defined through the curriculum and assessments, or the duration of the literacy coaching may not have been long enough to sustain deep understanding of how to scaffold students' instructional tasks above literal comprehension. Another plausible explanation may have been that the literacy coaching's content mostly emphasized the scaffolding of cognitive modeling.

Nevertheless, the present study revealed that two of the teachers assigned positive values to students' cultural background knowledge and infused students' cultural knowledge into their teaching. They choose not to work within a deficit theoretical framework, which would have implied that something was missing in students' homes and communities. In fact, these two teachers may have judged against their personal knowledge about self, the dominant culture, and students' background knowledge to form an emergent understanding of how to navigate students' learning in literacy. Moreover, these teachers empowered students to use their own cultural backgrounds to construct multiple narratives and interpretations during literacy instruction.

In the present study, literacy coaching emphasized mostly modeling of task execution. As a consequence, modeling of instructional tasks in literacy coaching may have accounted for teachers' similarities and dissimilarities in the execution of instructional tasks. This finding suggested that modeling of instructional tasks in literacy coaching may have prompted some teachers, more than others, to imitate the modeling from literacy coaching or imitate what some teachers may have produced prior to literacy coaching. As a result, how and to what degree teachers benefitted from literacy coaching depended largely on their capability and power to execute instructional tasks in literacy incorporated from literacy coaching. For example, the study found that teachers shifted power to students, especially in the scaffolding of reasoning but provided literacy instruction at or right above literal comprehension. Similarly, this finding may suggest that literacy coaching may not have provided teachers enough time and opportunities to have developed an in-depth and complete understanding of task criteria required to guide students' reasoning above literal comprehension.

In addition, the study found that the literacy coaching emphasized mostly modeling of in-school literacy and not students' out-of-school experiences. This finding suggested that teachers in the study may not have experienced the execution of out-of-school literacy tasks; therefore, teachers may not have developed the cognitive power to discern out-of-school literacy tasks from a learner's perspective. The findings in the present study suggested that modeling of instructional tasks during literacy coaching may have prompted some teachers, more than others, to imitate the modeling from literacy coaching. Along these lines, the study suggested that teachers' lack of understanding of

task execution in literacy may have accounted for teachers not modifying literacy instructions when students' activities and actions did not stimulate students to learn.

Furthermore, the study found that teachers' norms of practices may have been aligned with state assessments. This finding revealed that teachers had an emergent understanding of what literacy means needed to be appropriated to sustain learning required for state assessments. This finding suggested that state assessments may have had a privileged or favorable position that influenced how teachers participated in literacy coaching and thus how they taught literacy instruction. The study showed small achievement gains in reading comprehension in fourth grade within the Advanced, Proficient, and Basic categories during the year in which teachers participated in literacy coaching. Student achievement among fourth graders showed an increase of 3% in the advanced category, an increase of 12% in the proficient category, a decrease of 13% in the Basic category, and a decrease of 3% in the minimum category.

As followed, the findings may suggest that some students within the basic category, as well as the minimal category, may benefit from having teachers who participate in literacy coaching over a period of more than one school year. Given that the researcher collected baseline data prior to intervention, the findings of small achievement gains during the year that the intervention may suggest an expectant growth projection over time in line with observed growth during the year of the intervention. Thus, based on the baseline data, the findings suggested that the impact of teachers' literacy coaching may occur in subsequent years for all students, including students scoring at the minimum category of achievement. Likewise, the findings suggested that literacy coaching may support teachers' understanding over time to scaffold learning in reading

comprehension for students scoring within minimum on state assessments. The findings

suggested that literacy coaching may support teachers' practices and expand literacy

content to be aligned with state assessment standards. Thus, the finding suggested that

literacy coaching may influence how teachers set up instructional tasks to effect student

achievement for all students, especially for students scoring at the minimum category of

achievement. In the present study, however, most student growth in fourth grade occurred

within the Advanced, Proficient, and Basic categories during the year of the literacy

coaching intervention. Although fourth grade students showed achievement gains among

individual students moving from third grade to fourth grade, the present study did not

conclusively find that literacy coaching impacted these marginal gains in literacy

achievement.

Discussion

The present study suggested that literacy coaching may support teachers' efforts

to understand their own learning. The study examined the perspectives of five teachers

after they participated in literacy coaching with an emphasis on reading comprehension.

The findings in the present study called attention to the sociocultural aspects of teaching,

especially the uses of cognitive reasoning and students' cultural background knowledge.

Interestingly, the findings suggested that students' personal knowledge and cultural

knowledge acquired through extended persons and places may be formed through

identical means, especially in young African American readers. The present study

provided new insights and found that literacy coaching may improve teachers' norms of

practices in scaffolding of cognitive reasoning but may require additional efforts to

improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of students' cultural background

knowledge. These findings suggested that literacy coaching may increase teachers' knowledge and thus change teachers' instructional practices.

Closely grounded in the data, the present study corresponded with Sailors and Price's (2010) research findings and likewise provided evidence that literacy coaching may support teachers' efforts to understand their own learning. Similar to Sailors and Price (2010), the present study found that literacy coaching may improve teachers' norms of practices in the scaffolding of cognitive reasoning. On the other hand, the present study differed from Sailors and Price (2010) in that the present study found that few teachers had an awareness of how to scaffold uses of students' cultural background knowledge. The findings in the present study revealed that few teachers incorporated students' cultural background knowledge into their instructional practices. These findings added new insights in literacy coaching research and suggested that in the present study literacy coaching may not have provided teachers with literacy practices that validated the uses of cultural knowledge in reading comprehension, especially inferences. Accordingly, the findings suggested that literacy coaching that emphasized cultural knowledge may need to include more scripted, cultural language prompts so that teachers will know how to set up instructional tasks that incorporate students' cultural background knowledge.

Furthermore, the findings in the present study revealed that teachers' ethnicity was not sufficient in and by itself to determine teachers' awareness of cultural knowledge in literacy and consequently did not prompt most of the African American teachers in the study to exhibit the cognitive capacity to set up students' instructional tasks using students' cultural background knowledge. Interestingly, the findings

suggested that teachers' cognitive capabilities to scaffold students' cultural knowledge in literacy depended more on the literacy coaching's content rather than the ethnicity of teachers. Moreover, even though teachers may have come from diverse backgrounds (e.g., by race and ethnicity), this did not constitute the practice of incorporating students' cultural funds of knowledge. A plausible explanation may have been that African American teachers in the study received similar teacher training and certification as other teachers in the dominant culture, and as a result, may have become influenced through cultural assimilations and educational experiences to cultivate literacy practices that focused on deficit discourses and perspectives, which may have assigned reductive values to literacy practices formed within non-dominant communities. This hypothesis was, to some extent, substantiated by deficit notions outlined in Gutierrez et al. (2009), who argued against notions of reductive practices at every level of education. Gutierrez et al. (2009) advocated for the rethinking of how notions of difference were negotiated, not to be framed through deficit assumptions as having unequal values and associated with exclusion of values taken from non-dominant cultures.

In the same way, the present study suggested that students being assessed through state assessments, with scores within the lowest percentile levels, may benefit from having teachers who participated in literacy coaching for more than one year. As grounded in the data, the present study, in line with Lockwood et al. (2010), suggested that the effects of improvement resulting from literacy coaching may occur in subsequent years of implementation; therefore, the present study, in agreement with Lockwood et al. (2010), offered a hybrid argument that suggested that literacy coaching may support teachers' understanding over time to scaffold learning in reading comprehension for

122

students scoring within minimum and basic levels on state assessments. Along these lines, this finding suggested that, as the result of literacy coaching, student learning may be demonstrated in subsequent years for all students, but especially for students scoring in minimum and basic levels on state assessments in reading comprehension.

Moreover, the present study showed important practical implications for school districts seeking a trajectory to determine the effectiveness of professional development interventions. Based on achievement data, fourth grade students of teachers in the present study showed small achievement gains in reading among student cohorts moving from third grade to fourth grade. The present study collected baseline student cohort data prior to the literacy coaching and compared the baseline data to student cohort data during the year of the intervention. Accordingly, the present study, similar to Biancarosa et al. (2010), reported gains in student learning. However, Biancarosa et al. (2010) reported gains resulting from literacy coaching with effect's magnitude becoming larger during subsequent years of implementation. In the present study, it would have been beneficial had the research design allowed for variability of growth for each teacher and followed individual student growth over time after the intervention. Nonetheless, even without the benefit of an identical research design, the findings suggested practical implications in effective professional development practices.

Unlike the present study, Gamse et al. (2008), Garet et al. (2008), and Matsumura et al. (2010) found that literacy coaching did not impact student learning in reading comprehension. Gamse et al. (2008) did not find an association related to reading comprehension and student achievement as related to literacy coaching. In fact, Gamse et al.'s findings provided support that the focal point of the literacy coaching may have been

directed to phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary, not comprehension literacy comprehension. Similarly to the present study, Gamse et al.'s findings suggested a misalignment of the literacy coaching with expected learning outcomes.

Additionally, Garet et al. (2008) found that literacy coaching did not have a positive impact on student learning. Garet et al. (2008) found no statistically impact on second grade reading. In fact, Garet et al. (2008) suggested that the professional development interventions were not substantial enough and therefore did not translate into a detectable impact on student achievement. The Garet et al.'s findings raised important questions about theoretical assumptions in research designs. Thus, one plausible explanation for not finding a positive change in the Garet et al.'s study (2008) may have been that students' literacy practices were not examined through the uses of sociocultural principles. In effect, Garet et al. (2008), an experimental study, did not capture the complexity of qualitative data as described in the present study and thus did not authenticate students' cognitive reasoning and cultural background knowledge as important literacy tools to aid students to make meaning of the text. Along these lines, Garet et al. (2008) may not have aligned the content of literacy coaching with expected outcomes, and similar to the present study, may not have aligned the cognitive demands of expected outcomes in reading comprehension to the point of teachers changing their practices enough to accommodate student learning beyond literal comprehension.

The present study, similar to Garet et al. (2008), raised questions about teachers' norms of practices. The findings in the present study suggested that the literacy coaching's content needed to emphasize more qualitative features, such as scaffolding teachers' in-depth knowledge of their subject matter, aiding teachers to be knowledgeable

124

of prerequisite steps involved in task execution in literacy instruction, and most importantly, guiding teachers to set up appropriate instructional tasks in comprehension literacy that take account of cognitive reasoning and student's background knowledge. Prior sociocultural research (Barton et al., 2008; Bhabha, 1994; Gutierrez et al., 2009; Hammerberg, 2004; Lee, 1995, 2007; Moje et al., 2004) examined how teachers guided students' reasoning and uses of students' funds of knowledge. As followed, the present study demonstrated the importance of examining teachers' sense making of literacy coaching experiences. Although these same prior sociocultural research studies (Barton et al., 2008; Bhabha, 1994; Gutierrez et al., 2009; Hammerberg, 2004; Lee, 1995, 2007; Moje et al., 2004) pointed toward the making and remaking of power relations as literacy tools, none of the sociocultural studies that the researcher was aware of specifically addressed literacy coaching and student achievement in reading comprehension.

Accordingly, teachers' sense-making of literacy coaching experiences employed in the present study added to prior literacy coaching research through the examination of teachers' instructional practices that created hybrid spacesin literacy coaching. For this reason, the qualitative data described in the present study provided a distinctive agenda in the research discussion about literacy coaching, teachers' instructional practices, and student achievement in reading comprehension and may further authenticate teachers' uses of cognitive reasoning and students' cultural backgrounds as important literacy tools to give support to students' literacy practices. Thus, it was important that the present research looked at how teachers made sense of their own learning after they participated in literacy coaching, considered how teachers guided students to engage in cognitive

reasoning, and explored how teachers aided students to use cultural background knowledge as literacy tools.

Along these lines, the processes of learning through activities, interactions, and experiences extended the previous literacy coaching research in reading comprehension and offered hybrid or third space viewpoints, which argued for an in-depth awareness of teachers' norms of practices and a sense-making perspective of comprehension strategy instruction.

Table 6

Instructional Strategies and literacy Coaching Experiences

Research Question 1

Anita	Assisting students to share ideas
	Offering multiple perspectives and alternative solutions
	Scaffolding understanding and uses of narrative symbols
	Using Venn diagramming to summarize text
Barbara	Using students' prior knowledge to add meaning
	Citing text based evidence
Kerrie	Offering modeling examples that come from students' knowledge and experiences
	Promoting collective thinking in order to add literacy content
	Using narrative symbols to guide students' understanding of story elements
	Soliciting inferences based on logical choices and clues
	Soliciting inferences through the author's message while creating a new message
	Presenting similarities and differences to organize thinking
Krystal	Using *if questioning* to interpret text
	Elaborating and expanding students' knowledge through association of self and prior knowledge
	Offering lecturing to guide inference making
Lee	Using straight-forwarded text in the basal reader

Research Question 2

Kerrie	Promoting meaning through students' personal views and life experiences
	Using examples derived from students' knowledge and experiences
	Soliciting students to express their thinking
	Drawing from students' cultural backgrounds

127

Table 6 Continued

Krystal	Promoting meaning through students' personal knowledge and everyday experiences
	Encouraging students to compare self to characters' experiences and actions
	Constructing multiple meanings through exaggeration and hyperbole

Research Question 3

Anita	Sustaining discussions through student-centered conversations and questioning
	Promoting student accountability and ownership through students' collective thinking and seeking of alternative solutions
	Using narrative symbols to construct and add meaning to the text

| Barbara | Using isolated text to located explicitly stated evidence |
| | Offering several activities prior to checking for students' understanding |

Kerrie	Promoting social interactions to sustain student-centered conversations
	Soliciting interactions to inform instructional practice
	Encouraging students to take responsibility for learning
	Soliciting students personal views and life experiences

Krystal	Promoting a personalizing strategy and questioning to enhance literacy
	Soliciting students' uses of personal views and everyday experiences
	Informing and expecting students to perform
	Using a narrative symbol strategy while thinking aloud

| Lee | Using basal reader to locate explicitly stated evidence in text |

Closely grounded as described in the data in the table, the present study revealed that literacy coaching may improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of cognitive reasoning; on the other hand, literacy coaching may require additional efforts to improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of students' cultural background knowledge. Hence, the findings in the present study may suggest the complexity of scaffolding of cultural background knowledge and may have provided new insights about the role of knowledge of teachers' metacognition while engaged in literacy coaching. No other studies in prior research on literacy coaching in reading comprehension that the researcher was aware of examined teachers' metacognition of literacy coaching experiences with an emphasis in reading comprehension. None of the findings in prior research on literacy coaching pointed toward what social identities were enacted through language uses, discourses, and actions during literacy coaching, and none pointed toward the making and remaking of power relations as literacy tools.

In this way, the study extended previous research on literacy coaching and, as a result, provided a line of inquiry in qualitative research describing how teachers' experiences assisted their cognitive functions with sense-making of literacy coaching and assisted understanding of how literacy coaching may influence student achievement. While other qualitative studies on literacy coaching described roles, responsibilities, and relationships between literacy coaches and teachers (Ippolito, 2010; Marsh et al., 2008; Matsumura et al., 2009; Neumerski, 2013), no other studies that the researcher was aware of on literacy coaching focused on teachers' acts of making sense of literacy coaching and student achievement in reading comprehension.

129

Given that previous quantitative and correlation studies on literacy coaching focused on literacy coaching and student achievement (Biancarosa et al., 2010; Elisha-Piper & L'Allier, 2011; Garet et al., 2008; Gamse et al., 2008; Matsumura et al., 2010; Sailors & Price, 2010), likewise, the present study extended prior research with a focus on teachers' literacy coaching experiences within a sociocultural framework, incorporating hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories.

Thus, the present study extended previous research on literacy coaching in reading comprehension in several important ways. First, the present study focused attention on the active roles of teachers as learners attempting to make sense of their literacy coaching experiences. The study described literacy coaching through a sociocultural perspective, a third space viewpoint that argued for an in-depth awareness of teachers' norms of practices and sense-making of their literacy coaching experiences. In line with sociocultural principles, learning was situated in instructional practices and involved changes in participation. The roles and relationships among teachers and students shifted and changed as the result of literacy events occurring during literacy instruction; thus, sharing of power through interactions and students' funds of knowledge became important literacy means and expected outcomes (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Feryok, 2009; Perry, 2012; Rogoff, 1995; Street, 2003).

As followed, in the present study, teachers offered diverse perspectives about how they created meaningful interpretations of their literacy coaching experiences, especially related to how they guided interactions during literacy instruction. Teachers in the study modeled thinking during discussions and guided students to think aloud about literacy. Likewise, some teachers guided students to interpret the text through cultural and social

background knowledge. Teachers engaged students in activities that required sharing of power through interactions and students' experiences. Hence, based on sociocultural principles, teachers established improved norms of practices.

Second, the study examined comprehension literacy through the lenses of teachers who may not have fully understood the importance and uses of African American students' backgrounds in literacy practices. Previous research in reading comprehension (Hammerberg, 2004; Lee, 1995, 2007) argued that teachers did not understand the influences of students' cultural backgrounds upon students learning; consequently, they did not implement comprehension strategies that were informed through students' sociocultural knowledge. Interestingly, the findings in the present study revealed that teachers in the study, who were majority African Americans, may have mirrored the instructional practices of other teachers within the dominant culture, thus demonstrating a lack of understanding of the influences of students' culture backgrounds upon student learning in literacy comprehension. The findings in the present study suggested that African American teachers, similar to other teachers, may have been strongly influenced in their thinking and practices by deficit assumptions of cultural deprivations described by Gutierrez et al.(2009). Furthermore, the study revealed that even though teachers may have come from diverse backgrounds, (e.g., by race and ethnicity), this may not have constituted the practice of incorporating students' cultural funds of knowledge into teachers' instructional practices.

Hence, in the present study, few teachers demonstrated the cognitive capacity to scaffold students' cultural background knowledge during literacy instruction. In this regards, this finding suggested that literacy coaching may not have consistently focused

on task execution connecting the uses of students' culture backgrounds. Furthermore, this finding suggested that had literacy coaching emphasized students' cultural background knowledge, teachers in the study may have had more cognitive capacity to overcome deficit assumptions of cultural deprivations of African American students, whose prior background knowledge mostly formed through influences within their African American families and communities. Along these lines, the present study showed that teachers' ethnicity was not sufficient in and by itself to determine teachers' awareness of how to use students' cultural backgrounds in literacy comprehension. Instead, literacy coaching in the present study may have scaffold skillful uses of students' cognitive reasoning and only minor uses of cultural knowledge in literacy comprehension to anchor students' connections and sense-making of texts. This line of inquiry of the influences and uses of students' cultural background was consistent with prior research of Lee (1995, 2007) and Gutierrez et al. (2009).

Third, the present study offered new insights about young African American readers. The findings from the present study may suggest that cultural funds of knowledge of young African American readers may reflect into a singular fund of knowledge, encompassing personal and cultural experiences. Moreover, this finding may suggest that young African American readers, who have different literacy experiences than the dominant culture, may blend uses of personal knowledge and sociocultural knowledge to form a singular fund of knowledge when interpreting text. The finding suggested that personal knowledge and students' sociocultural knowledge may come together into indistinguishable forms with young African American's readers having different literacy experiences other than the dominant culture. Thus, as illustrated through

sociocultural principles, not previously noted in prior research in literacy coaching, the finding about young African American readers may suggest that young students' retrieval of personal experiences may be drawn from events occurring with students' extended families and social institutions, such as churches and social clubs within African American communities and even culturally specific media, e.g., television and Internet. Moreover, the study revealed that when positive values were assigned to students' views, it provided an anchor transporting learning from the students' viewpoint to another's point of view or standardized, more culturally accepted way of thinking, which may cause students to produce multiple interpretations and understandings of texts.

Fourth, the research on literacy coaching from a sociocultural point of view highlighted the importance of examining teachers' sense-making of literacy coaching, which described how teachers offered instruction in reading comprehension after they participated in literacy coaching. Consistent with this line of scholarship, findings from this study suggested that how and to what degree teachers benefitted from literacy coaching depended largely on their capability and power to execute literacy tasks incorporated from literacy coaching. Specifically, in line with prior research (Feryok, 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2009; Moje et al., 2004; Sailors & Price, 2010), the present study supported findings that literacy coaching may better socialized teachers to influence classroom culture and discourses that supported internal structures of norms of practices. As a consequence, findings from the present study suggested implication for changes in teachers' instructional practices and changes in school district's professional development policies.

Toward a Theory of Concept Building and Future Studies

       As the present study examined the research data and research questions, the data began to point to a grounded theory of how to promote literacy coaching that better enabled teachers to understand how to guide students learning in literacy comprehension. Given that the present research study was the first to examine literacy coaching and reading comprehension from a sociocultural perspective after teachers participated in literacy coaching, future research may need to investigate concept building of literacy coaching with an emphasis in explicit reading comprehension strategies that support students to become active readers drawing on prior knowledge, including students' cultural background knowledge (Gutierrez et al., 2009; Lee, 2007). Consistent with prior sociocultural research in literacy, the present study argued that a theory of concept building in literacy coaching with an emphasis on reading comprehension included three propositions.

       First, literacy coaching must offer content that promote deep, conceptual knowledge of literacy comprehension across disciplines (Borko, 2004; Lee, 2007). Second, literacy coaching must also offer teachers opportunities to construct knowledge through efforts (Lee, 2007; Feryok, 2009) by engaging teachers in face-to-face interactions with other teachers as they set up instructional tasks based on students' cultural backgrounds and interest (Hammerberg 2004; Lee, 2007; Xu et al., 2012). Third, literacy coaching must scaffold teachers to have an in-depth understanding of task criteria necessary for task execution in literacy comprehension (Feryok, 2009), and at the same time, must allow for the creation of new, hybrid spaces (Barton et al., 2008) in which teachers promote uses of students' cultural background knowledge in combination with

other viewpoints to interpret literacy (Feryok, 2009; Lee, 2007). Accordingly, even though teachers may come from diverse backgrounds (e.g., by race and ethnicity), this may not constitute the practice of incorporating students' cultural funds of knowledge. Along these lines, these three propositions were shown to be consistent with hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories and may provide a culturally responsive literacy coaching model having important practical implications within teachers' practices in the delivery of literacy coaching in reading comprehension.

Conclusions

Literacy coaching may improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of cognitive reasoning but may require additional efforts in literacy coaching to improve teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of students' cultural background knowledge. Moreover, the findings suggested that more, in-depth learning of subject matter content, task execution and an increase of duration in literacy coaching may be required before teachers can implement literacy instruction above literal comprehension. Thus, the study concluded that the impact of literary coaching on teachers' instructional practices may depend largely upon teachers' conceptual understanding of task executions in reading comprehension. As a result, how and to what degree teachers benefitted from literacy coachingmay depend largely on their capability and power to execute literacy tasks incorporated from literacy coaching.

Furthermore, the findings in the present study suggested that African American teachers, like other teachers, may have been strongly influenced in their thinking and practices by deficit assumptions of cultural deprivations (Gutierrez et al., 2009). Thus, the findings in the present study revealed that few teachers may have understood the

influences of students' cultural backgrounds upon students learning. Along these lines, the findings in the present study suggested that teachers' ethnicity was not sufficient in and by itself to determine teachers' awareness of how to use students' cultural backgrounds in literacy comprehension.

Implications

Literacy coaching may support teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of cognitive reasoning, including cognitive modeling that expand literacy content aligned with state assessment standards. However, additional efforts and duration in literacy may be needed to support teachers' norms of practices in scaffolding of students' cultural background knowledge. How and to what degree teachers benefit from literacy coaching may depend largely on their capability and power to execute instructional tasks incorporated from literacy coaching. Thus, this finding suggested that literacy coaching may influence how teachers set up students' instructional tasks to effect student achievement for students scoring at the minimum and basic categories on state assessments.

Consequently, the findings may have implications for state education agencies and school districts seeking to change teachers' norms of practices and connecting out-of-school learning to students' in-school literacy practices. Moreover, the findings in the present study of small achievement gains in state assessment scores during the year in which literacy coaching was implemented supported claims that the impact of literary coaching on teachers' practices may depend largely upon teachers' conceptual understanding of task execution in reading comprehension. Thus, there were instructional

implications for literacy coaching as an intervention used to impact state assessment scores through the alignment of state assessments and reading frameworks.

Hence, these findings have K-12 education policy implications within State's education agencies, such as MDE and may suggest needed changes in professional development policies. As described by NCLB, through the reauthorization of ESEA, the States receiving federal funds were mandated to meet strict outcome measures of obtaining 100% proficiency by 2013-2014 in reading in third through eighth grades and also meet AYP for demographic subgroups, (Shelly, 2011). Mississippi, like other states throughout the United States, did not meet the expected outcome measures of 100% proficiency; subsequently in 2012 Mississippi sought other satisfying conditions through the recently awarded ESEA Flexibility Waiver of 2012 to opt out the NCLB requirements in exchange for implementing its own accountability standards (Mississippi ESEA Flexibility Waiver, 2012). Mississippi's new accountability model awarded growth in three areas: (a) the percentage of all students moving into proficiency, the percentage of students moving from proficient to advanced, or percent maintaining proficient and advanced; (b) percentage of growth for all students; (c) percent of growth of lowest 25 percentile as identified through the most recent administration of state assessments, which consisted of tracking the growth of lowest 25 percentile students who grew within the minimum category or grew from minimum to basic, or students who grew within the basic category or grew from basic into proficiency (Mississippi Office of Accreditation and Accountability, MDE, 2014).

Accordingly, new accountability standards involved the academic growth of all students within all achievement categories, especially growth of students scoring within

the lowest 25 percentile range. Thus, Mississippi's new accountability standards will likely produce changes in how school district implement its reform strategies and may result in the creation of a pathway going forward to change underlying assumptions of cultural deprivation, thus resulting in the improvement of all professional development, including literacy coaching in reading comprehension. As the result of Mississippi's new accountability model, school districts will not be awarded a higher accountability rating to implement instructional practices that benefit the academic performance of students within its top 25 percentile, while not accounting for the academic performance of all students, including students scoring in the lowest 25 percentile. In contrast, the new accountability model encourages a growth trajectory for each student and has become an important and significant change in direction in accountability policy within local school districts in Mississippi. Thus, Mississippi's new accountability model, as the result of the NCLB Flexibility Waiver of 2012,may impact how school districts in Mississippi may implement literacy coaching and other professional development. This includes educational policies that encourage school districts to provide professional development that promotes conceptual understanding of literacy as identified through Common Core State Standards.

Limitations and Delimitations

In the present study, the researcher conducted two interviews and one observation with each of the five participants and one follow-up observation with three of the participants. The self-reported descriptions may have contained misrepresentations of participants' instructional practices. During the interview, participants may have self-reported how well they carried out their learning from their literacy coaching experiences

rather than reporting what occurred in situated practices after they participated in literacy coaching. Conversely, to counteract this limitation in the research design, the researcher employed open-ended interview questions with behavioral constructs instead of evaluative constructs. In this way, the behavioral constructs informed what participants did after they participated in literacy coaching, not how well they did it. Participants in the study described how they assisted students to think aloud, how they guided students' uses of cultural background knowledge, and how they made meaning of their literacy coaching experiences. In sum, participants reported how they constructed their own meanings and reported their own realities about their literacy coaching experiences. In the present study, all findings of participants' sense-making were unique; nonetheless, the findings possessed the possibility of being reproduced by subsequent researchers and generalized through theoretical applications of hybridity, activity, and critical literacy theories.

Recommendations

The present study consisted of limited teachers' observations; therefore, future qualitative research on literacy coaching may consider more in-depth observations over an extended period of time. Along these lines, the most important recommendation, as a result of the findings in the present study, may offer additional research on how literacy coaching may scaffold teachers' deep, conceptual understanding of reading comprehension across multiple disciplines, beginning in Kindergarten. Thus, future research, similar to the present study, may provide additional insights in literacy comprehension, and as a result, may have an effect on dialogue in educational policy occurring at local, state, and federal levels. In addition, a closer examination of literacy

coaching focusing on teachers' understanding of task execution related to in-school and out-of-school literacy in reading comprehension may enhance the findings of the present study and provide even more insights related to the role of knowledge of teachers' metacognition while engaged in literacy coaching.

Furthermore, the findings in the present study called attention to the importance of students' voices in literacy research. As followed, the researcher of the present study recommend future research in literacy coaching with an emphasis in reading comprehension drawn from interviews and observations of students and their families. Such future research, interviewing and observing of students and families, potentially may change how teachers engage students and scaffold students' metacognition of their literacy practices. Along these lines, research focusing on students and families may assist literacy coaches to understand how to scaffold teachers' efforts to set up instructional tasks in literacy that linked students' out-of-school literacy practices to students' in-school literacy practices.

Finally, future research studies may offer a more nuanced look at how African American teachers may have been influenced in their thinking and practices by deficit assumptions of cultural deprivations (Gutierrez et al., 2009). Along these lines, the findings in the present study suggested that teachers' ethnicity was not sufficient in and by itself to determine teachers' awareness of how to use students' cultural backgrounds in literacy comprehension. Thus, future research may provide additional insights of the influences of students' culture background knowledge in reading comprehension.

REFERENCES

Atterberry, A., & Bryk, A. S. (2011). Analyzing participation in literacy coaching activities. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(2), 356-382.

Atteberry, A., Bryk, A., Walker, L., & Biancarosa, G. (2008, April). *Variations in the amounts of coaching in Literacy Collaborative schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Conference, New York. http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/forums/study.html

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2005). Literacy reification and the dynamics of social interactions: In Barton, D. & Tusting, K. (Ed.) *Beyond communities of practice, language, power, and social context.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Barton, C. A., & Tan, E. (2008). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46*(1), 50-73.

Barton, A. C., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. *American Educational Research Journal. 45*(1), 68-103.

Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A., & Dexter, E. R. (2010). Assessing the value-added effects of literacy collaborative professional development on student learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 7-34.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*, 3-15.

Brandt, D., & Clinton, K. (2002). Limits of the local: Expanding perspectives on literacy as a Social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*(3), 337-356.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In Kozulin et al. (Ed.) *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (3rd Ed.). *What research has to say about reading instruction, 205-242*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Elish-Piper, L., & L'Allier, S. K. (2011). Examining the relationship between literacy coaching and student reading gains in grades k-3. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(1), 63-106.

Feryok, A. (2009). Activity theory, imitation and their role in teacher development. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(3), 279-299.

Gallucci, C. (2008). Districtwide instructional reform: Using sociocultural theory to link professional learning to organizational support. *American Journal of Education, 114*(4), 541-581.

142

Gamse, B. C., Jacob, R. T., Horst, M., Boulay, B., & Unlu, F. (2008). *Reading First impact study: Final Report* (NCEE 2009-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Garet, M. S., Cronen, S., Eaton, M., Kurki, A., Ludwig, M., Jones… Sztejnberg, L. (2008). *The impact of two professional development interventions on early reading instruction and achievement.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Gee, J. P. (1999). Critical issues: reading and the new literacy studies: reframing the national academy of sciences report on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research, 31*(3), 356-374.

Giest, H., & Lompscher, J. (2003). Formation of learning activity and theoretical thinking in science teaching. In Kozulin et al. (Ed.) *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gutierrez, P., Morales, Z., & Martinez, D. C. (2009). Re-mediating literacy: culture, difference, and learning for students from non-dominant communities. *Review of Research in Education, 33*, 212-245.

Hammerberg, D. D. (2004). Comprehension instruction for socioculturally diverse classrooms: *A review of what we know.* The Reading Teacher, *57*(3), April, 648-658.

Handfield, L. J., & Jimenez, R .T. (2009). Cognition and misrecognition: A Bourdieuian analysis of cognitive strategy instruction in linguistically and culturally diverse classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*, 151-195.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory

    and research. *Review of Educational Research,* 71(4), 575-611.

Ippolitol, J. (2010). Three ways that literacy coaches balance responsive and directive

    relationships with teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 164-190.

Lee, C. D. (1995). A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching African

    American high school students skills in literacy interpretation. *Reading Research*

    Quarterly, 30(4), 608-630.

Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy,and learning: taking bloom in the midst of the*

    whirlwind. New York: Teacher College Press.

Lockwood, J. R., McCombs, J. S., & Marsh, J. (2010). Linking reading coaches and

    student achievement: Evidence from Florida middle schools. *Educational*

    Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 32(3), 372-388.

Marsh, J. A., McComb, J. S., Lockwood, J. R., Martorell, F., Gershwin, D., Naftel, S.

    …Crego, A. (2008). *Supporting literacy across the sunshine state: A study of*

    Florida middle school reading coaches. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, MG-762-CC.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher,* March, 13-17.

Matsumura, L. C., Crosson, A., Wolf, M. K., Levison, A., & Resnick, L. (2006).

    Overview of the instructional quality assessment, Report 671. *Center of the Study*

    of Evaluation National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and

    Student Testing, Los Angeles, CA: University of California.

Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H. E., Correnti, R., Bickel, D. D., & Junker, B. (2010).

    Investigating the effectiveness of a comprehensive literacy coaching program in

    schools with high teacher mobility. *Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 35-62.

Matsumura, L. C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D. B., & Garnier, H. E. (2009). Leadership for
     literacy coaching: The principal's role in launching a new coaching program.
     Educational Administration Quarterly, 45(5), 655-694.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.*
     San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* (2nded.). Thousand
     Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mississippi Department of Education. (2014). *Mississippi Office of Accreditation and
     Accountability. Retrieved from* www.mde.K12.ms.us/public-notices/apa-process

Mississippi Department of Education. (2012). *Mississippi ESEA Flexibility Waiver*.
     Retrieved from www.mde.k12.ms.us/federal-programs/the-esea-flexxibility-
     waiver

Mississippi Department of Education. (2006). *Mississippi Language Arts Framework*
     Retrieved from http://districtacess.mde.k12.ms.us/curriculumandinstruction/
     MississippiCurriculumFrameworks

Mississippi Department of Education. (2011). *Mississippi Report Card, Noxubee County
     Schools,* Retrieved from www.msreport.com

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T.
     (2004).Working toward third space in content literacy: An examination of
     everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*(1),
     38-70.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for

   teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory*

   Into Practice. 31(2), 132-141.

Moll, L. C. & Gonzalez, N. (1994). Critical issues: Lessons from research with language

   minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *26*, 439-456.

Moll, L. C. & Gonzalez, N. (2004). Engaging life: A fund-of-knowledge approach to

   multicultural education. *Handbook of research on multicultural education*, 2*, 699-*

   715.

Neumerski, C.M. (2013). Rethinking instructional leadership, a review: what do we know

   about principal, teacher and coach instructional leadership, and where should we

   go from here. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 310-347.

No Child Left Behind Act, 20 U. S. C.§ 6319 (2001).

Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering

   and monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1,* 117-175.

Perry, K. H. (2012). What is literacy? A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives.

   Journal of Language & Literacy Education, 8(1), 51-71.

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory

   appropriations, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. Wertsch, P. Rio, &

   A. Alvarez (Eds.). *Sociocultural studies of the mind*, 139-164, Cambridge, UK:

   Cambridge University Press.

Sailors, M., & Price, L. (2010). Professional development that supports the teaching of

   cognitive reading strategy instruction. *Th*e *Elementary School Journal*, *110*, 301-

   322.

Searle, J. R., (1995). *The construction of social reality.* New York, NY*:* Simon & Schuster.

Shelly, B. (2011) Flexible response: executive federalism and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Educational Policy, 26*(1), 117-135.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education.* London: Longman.

Street, B. V. (2001). Literacy events and literacy practices. Theory and practice in the New Literacy Studies. In K. Jones & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.). *Multilingual literacies: Comparatives perspectives on research and practices.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Street, B. (2003). What's new in new literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, Teachers College, Columbia University,* 5(2), 77-91.

Xu, J. (2006). Worldview of one black family in a middle school inclusion program: An ethnographic study. *Teacher College Record, 108,* 1496-1530.

Xu, J., Coats, L. & Davidson, M. (2012). Making science homework work: The perspectives of exemplary African American science teachers. *Teacher College Record*, *114*, 1-32.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research:Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research*: *Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A

LITERACY COACHING CURRICULUM ADAPTED FROM THE MISSISSIPPI

LANGUAGE ARTS FRAMEWORK

Third grade reading teachers will learn how to assist students to use intentional comprehension strategies to analyze texts in order to identify, understand, infer, or synthesize information. (1) discuss and generate questions about purposes for reading; (2) create, analyze, and discuss literal and inferential questions about main characters, setting, plot, and theme; then think aloud about how students can be guided to use intentional comprehension strategies to improve comprehension; (3) think aloud and model how to guide students to think about literal and inferences questions about characters' actions, motives, traits, and emotions; (4) explain how students can be guided to synthesize information stated in the text with prior knowledge and experience to draw a conclusion; specifically give examples of how the teacher can guide students with limited prior experiences to use the text to draw a conclusion; (5) create a thinking map to help students predict an outcome based on information stated in the text and confirm or revise the prediction based upon subsequent text; (6) use key words in the text to justify predictions.

Fourth grade reading teachers will learn how to guide students to use intentional reading strategies to identify, understand, infer, or synthesize information and also guide students to interpret literary text. (1) discuss how teachers guide students to identify differences between the main ideas and supporting details in a reading text; (2) think aloud and demonstrate how teachers can encourage students to use intentionalcomprehension strategies to improve understanding of story elements (setting, characters, character traits, events, resolutions, and point of view); (3) think aloud and discuss intentional comprehension instruction to guide students to understand and use literary devices (imagery, exaggeration, dialogue) and sound devices (rhythm,

149

alliteration,onomatopoeia, assonance); (4) demonstrate how students can be guided during instruction to synthesize information stated in the text with prior knowledge and experience to draw a conclusion; specifically give examples of how teachers guide students with limited prior experiences to use the text to draw a conclusion; (5) create a thinking map to help students think aloud and be able to predict an outcome based on information stated in the text and confirm or revise the prediction based upon subsequent text; (6) use key words in the text to justify predictions.

APPENDIX B

RESPONSIVE INTERVIEW TOPICS IN READING COMPREHENSION

STRATEGY INSTRUCTION

1. Explain how you begin a learning activity in the use of reading comprehension strategies.

2. Tell me how you begin a lesson using concrete objects or specific details to link the lesson to previous readings.

3. You mentioned that… Tell me step by step what happens when you begin a learning activity on comparing and contrasting using two reading texts or two characters.

4. Tell me about how you explain your expectations to your students.

5. You mentioned that… Describe what you do or say to get your students to think aloud about their reading.

6. You mentioned that… Give an example of what a student is doing when the student is asked to provide evidence to support positions/opinions about a specific reading assignment.

7. Give specific examples about how you explain and model expectations for social interactions during your reading.

8. Tell me about how you press students for accuracy and ask for more information about the reading text.

9. Tell me when it is appropriate to ask students to explain their reasoning.

10. Describe the interactions between you and the students when you are pressing students for more rigorous thinking.

11. You mentioned how you hold students accountable by pressing for reasoning during reading instruction. Give specific examples when you say, "What made you say that? Why do you think that? Can you explain that? Why do you disagree?"

12. Tell me about how you press students to provide evidence to support their thinking about the reading text.

13. You mentioned how you hold students accountable to express knowledge. Give specific examples when you say, "Where could we find more information? How can we know for sure? Where do you see that in the text? What evidence is there?"

14. Tell me a little more about….

15. Explain how you assist students to build on prior knowledge about the reading text.

16. You mentioned that… Give specific examples and indicate appropriate times when you ask students to connect with what they did last week.

17. Continue please with… Recall when you asked students to remember when they read a similar story.

18. Describe a time that you ask students to add a comment or to agree or disagree with what was being said.

19. Describe the social interactions that occurred when students related to one another's ideas.

20. Tell me more about social interactions among students during reading instruction.

21. You mentioned that… Give specific examples or think of a story about how your students support each other's knowledge about the lesson.

22. Tell me about how literacy coaching in reading strategies may have improved your teaching of reading comprehension.

23. Tell me more… Tell me about how literacy coaching may have helped sustain social interactions in which you and students build on each other ideas.

24. Tell me more… Give specific examples or relate specific times that literacy coaching may have improved your accountability to hold students to accurate knowledge and more rigorous thinking during reading comprehension lessons.

25. Tell me more specific details about your use of learning strategies to improve reading comprehension instruction.

APPENDIX C

OBSERVATION FORM USING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIESADAPTED

FROM MATSUMURA, L.C., CROSSON, A., WOLF, M.K., LEVISON,

A., & RESNICK, L. (2006)

Teacher　　　　　　Date　　　　　Location　　　　　Interviewer

1.　At the start of the lesson, the teacher provides objectives and teacher'sexpectations for student learning. *Rigor of Expectation*

Expectations	Observations
The teacher uses details or concrete objects to explain the objectives in Competency 2 of the Mississippi Language Arts Framework and assists students to link the lesson to prior knowledge; throughout the lesson, the teacher reiterates lesson objectives and provides students with the purpose of the lesson.	
The teacher uses details or concrete objects to explain the lesson's objectives in Competency 2 of the Mississippi Language Arts Framework and assists students to link the lesson to prior knowledge.	
The teacher states or writes the lesson's objectives in Competency 2 of the Mississippi Language Arts Framework.	
The teacher does not state the lesson's objective (s).	

2.   At the start of the learning activity, the teacher provides details explaining and demonstrating what the teacher wants students to do. *Rigor of Expectation of Instructional Task*

Expectations	Observations
At least one of the teacher's expectations focuses on analyzing and interpreting the text (inferring major themes, analyzing character's motives; comparing and contrasting two texts or characters); at least one expectation focuses on providing evidence to support position.	
At least one of the teacher's expectations focuses on analyzing and interpreting the text (inferring major themes, analyzing character's motives; comparing and contrasting two texts or characters).	
The teacher's expectation focuses on building a basic understanding of the text (summarizing).	
The teacher's expectation does not focus on reading comprehension. Instead, the direction focuses on procedures or content not related directly to reading comprehension.	

3.   The teacher explains to students why and how they are expected to think aloud
        and models the thinking processes during the reading comprehension lesson.
        Rigorous Thinking

Expectations	Observations
The teacher models thinking aloud with the students. There are three or more efforts of probing questions to ask students to explain their reasoning and understanding of the text.	
The teacher models thinking aloud with the students. There are 1-2 efforts of probing questions to ask students to explain their reasoning and understanding of the text.	
There is at least one superficial effort to ask students to explain their reasoning and understanding of the text.	
There are no efforts to ask students to explain their thinking.	

4.   The teacher explains expectations of interactions and maintains ongoing
        interactions during the reading lesson.

Expectations	Observations
During the lesson, the teacher explains and models expectations for social interactions. There are at least four opportunities during classroom discussion that teacher scaffolds students to engage in social interactions with the teacher or with students. Teacher sustains the discussion through probing questioning and solicitation of discussion through the use of concrete artifacts related to the reading text.	
During the lesson, the teacher explains and models expectations for social interactions. There are at least 1-2 opportunities during classroom discussion that teacher scaffolds students to engage in social interactions with the teacher or with students.	
There is at least one observed opportunity during classroom discussion that teacher scaffolds students to engage in social interactions with the teacher or with students.	

5. The teacher encourages student to engage in active use of knowledge during classroom discussions. *Academic Rigor*

Expectations	Observations
The teacher guides student to engage with the underlying meanings or literary characteristics of the text. Students analyze and interpret the reading text using extensive and detail evidence from the text to support their ideas or opinions.	
The teacher guides students to engage with some underlying meanings or literacy characteristics of the text. Students provide limited evidence from the text to support their ideas or opinions.	
The teacher guides students to provide a surface-level or literal summary of the reading based on straight-forwarded information found in the text. Students use little evidence to support their ideas or opinions.	
The teacher guides students to recall fragmented, isolated facts from the reading text, or the teacher guides students to discuss a topic not directly related to the reading text.	

6.   Teacher links student contributions to link and build on other students' comments.

Expectations	Observations
At three points during the discussion, the teacher or student explicitly connects speaker's contributions and shows how ideas/positions shared during the discussion relate to each other.	
At 1-2 points during the discussion, the teacher or student links speaker's contributions to each other and shows how ideas and positions relate to each other.	
At one or more points during the discussion, the teacher or student links speaker's contributions to each other, but does not show how ideas and positions relate to each other.	
Teacher or student does not make any effort to link speaker's contributions.	

7. Describe the frequency in which teacher presses students to engage with ideas and concepts of reading comprehension using intentional comprehension strategies.

Teacher Solicits Interactions and Shared Learning

Expectations	Observations
At three points during the discussion, the teacher or student explicitly connects speaker's contributions and shows how ideas and positions shared during the discussion relate to each other.	
At 1-2 points during the discussion, the teacher or student links speaker's contributions to each other and shows how ideas and positions relate to each other.	
At one or more points during the discussion, the teacher or student links speaker's contributions to each other, but does not show how ideas and positions relate to each other.	
Teacher or student does not make any effort to link speaker's contributions.	

8.　　Describe the frequency in which teacher presses student to explain their thinking.
　　Building Knowledge

Expectations	Observations
At least at 3 points during the reading lesson, the teacher presses students to think aloud and provides accurate evidence from the text to confirm their thinking for their claims, including reference to prior classroom experience relating to the reading text.	
At 1-2 points during the reading lesson, the teacher presses students to think aloud and provides accurate evidence from the text to confirm their thinking for their claims, including reference to prior classroom experience relating to the reading text.	
The teacher provides little effort to press students to think aloud. The student provides inaccurate and vague evidence to confirm their thinking for their claims.	
The teacher provides little effort to press students to think aloud. The student provides inaccurate and vague evidence to confirm their thinking for their claims.	
The teacher does not press students to think aloud. Students do not back up claim (s) to confirm thinking.	

9.   Describe the frequency in which students make their reasoning and thinking
        public and accessible to other students in the classroom.
                        Students Think Aloud and Think Together

Expectations	Observations
There are three or more examples of students explaining their thinking, using reasoning in ways appropriate to grade level reading comprehension lesson.	
There are 1-2 examples of students explaining their thinking, using reasoning appropriate to grade level reading comprehension lesson.	
In general, what little attempt to explain reasoning is vague or inappropriate for grade level reading comprehension lesson. Students do not explain the reasoning behind their claims.	

10.   There is wide-spread participation among learners.

Expectations	Observations
Over 50% of students participate consistently in the lesson.	
Over 50% of students participate consistently in the lesson.	
25%-50% participate minimally in the lesson; e.g., they contribute only once.	
Over 50% of students participate consistently in the lesson.	
25%-50% participate minimally in the lesson; e.g., they contribute only once.)	

Summaries and Nuances

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION

IN RESEARCH

Mississippi State University
Informed Consent Form for Participation in Research

Title of Research Study: Professional Development in Comprehension Strategies in Elementary Reading Instruction

Study Site: Noxubee County School District
Researchers: Peggie Liddell, Mississippi State University

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to examine two models of professional development. One model is based on the traditional workshop; the second model is based on class-room based coaching in addition to the traditional workshop. This study seeks to determine if classroom-based literacy coaching in reading comprehension is more effective than the traditional workshop model of professional development as measured by changes in student learning scores and teacher's instructional practice.

Procedures

If teachers participate in this research study, a researcher at Mississippi State University will interview teachers and collect pertinent data about instructional practices and student learning.

Risks or Discomforts

There are no foreseeable risks or loss of privacy that might affect teachers as research participants.

Benefits

Teachers will contribute to knowledge about reading comprehension strategies and gain knowledge about how students learn to understand what they read.

Confidentiality

Teachers' information will be maintained at the Noxubee County's Office of Federal Programs. However, research information may be shared with Mississippi State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).

Questions
If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact Peggie Liddell at 662-361-1144 or the research advisors, Dr. Jianzhong Xu at 662-325-2186 and Dr. Dwight Hare at 662-325-7110.

For questions regarding your rights as a research participant, or to express concerns or complaints, please feel free to contact the MSU Regulatory Compliance Office by phone at 662-325-3994, by e-mail at irb@research.msstate.edu, or on the web at http://orc.msstate.edu/participant/.

Voluntary Participation

Please understand that your **participation is voluntary**. Your **refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss** of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

Please take all the time you need to read through this document and decide whether you would like to participate in this research study.

If you agree to participate in this research study, please sign below. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

_____   _____
Participant Signature   Date

_____   _____
Investigator Signature   Date