A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF THE FACTORS SUPPORTING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY OFA DEEPLY EMBEDDED COGNITIVE COACHING SCHOOL CULTURE

The undersigned, approved by the Department Chair of Graduate Studies in Education at Southwest Baptist University, have examined a dissertation entitled:

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF THE FACTORS SUPPORTING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY OF A DEEPLY EMBEDDED COGNITIVE COACHING SCHOOL CULTURE

Presented by Rachel L. Tennison a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Nancy Colbaugh, Advisor/Chair
Assistant Professor
Graduate Studies in Education
Southwest Baptist University

Dr. Allison Langford, Committee Member
University Provost
Southwest Baptist University

Dr. TC Wall, Committee Member
Assistant Superintendent
Bolivar R-1 Schools

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF THE FACTORS SUPPORTING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY OF A DEEPLY EMBEDDED COGNITIVE COACHING SCHOOL CULTURE

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate Education Department
Southwest Baptist University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

By
Rachel Tennison-B.S., M.S., Ed.Spec.
Dr. Nancy Colbuagh, Dissertation Advisor
December 2015

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The most important lesson that has been learned through the completion of this doctorate work and the writing of the dissertation is that no one person is successful on his own. It truly takes an entire community for success to be achieved. There are many cliché's around the importance of a team that are all well and true. My own personal new knowledge gained through the dissertation process is that my God is living and still resides amongst His people. He communicates to his people through how they show love to each other. No part of this journey would have been accomplished without the community He surrounded me with.

Thank you so much to the many professors at Southwest Baptist University who guided me through the completion of four degrees. Namely, gratitude goes to those who supported my path in the completion of the doctorate degree, Dr. Jim Truelove and Dr. Tammy Condren. Their wisdom paired me with Dr. Nancy Colbaugh as an advisor, and she has truly been a gift to me. She guided me through the dissertation process by using Cognitive Coaching as her default tool to support me. We had planning conversations, reflecting conversations, and problem-resolving conversations at every point of the juncture. Just when I was ready to quit, she was able to ask just the right walk-away question in order to sustain me for more work. She managed to use all support functions with me, which deepened my understanding of what support looks like.

My community of support started with my parents, Tom and Roberta Rasor, as well as my sister, Beka. Their constant prayers and support have always guided me as I attempted to tackle the next project. Not one project would have been completed without their reassurance on each step of the journey. I am also very grateful to my extended parents, Jack and Debbie Tennison, as the majority of the writing of this research took place in their home, while they took care of me and my family. My friends have also become like family. Many people offered their

home as a quiet place to write, or took care of my boys so I could have more time. The friends He shared with me during this season sustained my soul when I only wanted to give up.

A network of support has also been the staff of the Bolivar Primary School, and namely, the principal, Tracy Daniels. There were countless times she allowed me to leave before the busses to go have a few more minutes to write. More than providing time, she provided encouragement throughout the journey, forewarning me of what was to come in order to plan accordingly. She listened to cries and specifically stated "Keep going!" every time I was ready to quit. She also connected me with Lisa Doyle, the most wonderful editor ever, who also provided that encouragement when it was needed most.

Finally, and most importantly, not one piece of this entire puzzle would have been possible without the gracious love shown to me by my wonderful husband, Michael, and our two sons, Andrew and Ethan. Michael is the rock I rely on. I would not be a doctor without him. He made jokes while I cried, told me he believed in me, and would not let me quit. He took our boys on multiple outings simply so I could continue writing. He also took on both mom and dad parental roles in order to ensure our boys had all they needed through this time in our lives. For some crazy reason, we also decided to build our dream house during the writing of this dissertation. While I know this took an incredible toll on him, he never once showed it to me. He handled all of the chaos with courage and strength, and he helped me make it through. Every day I continue to learn what love truly looks like, and Michael is the example God has given me for this lesson.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

With a lack of reflection, distrust, and teacher isolation prevalent, principals rely on programs instead of eliciting deeply embedded practice (Fullan 2001; Reeves, 2009; Schmoker, 2004). What is needed is a deeply embedded practice of thinking, reflecting, collaborating, and self-directed learning. This study aimed to define what deeply embedded practice looks like in the elementary school setting through the lens of Cognitive Coaching. The study explored principals' perceptions of the implementation process and determined factors that facilitated and inhibited building-wide implementation. This study also considered the perceptions of teachers and staff members working within the school environment who embraced Cognitive Coaching as a means for professional growth. The problem in existence is that it is difficult to create a deeply embedded school reform initiative. This case study examined two school cultures and gained insight into what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like, according to principals' perceptions. A qualitative methodology of a case study was utilized as the design of this study.

The qualities of successful schools outlined in the review of literature and the interviews, observations, and documents collected through research all support the same five essential ingredients in creating a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture. In order for the tools of Cognitive Coaching to be effectively utilized, a school must (a) establish trusting relationships within the school, (b) create a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitate opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) produce self-directed persons, and (e) develop organizational learning to take place within the school.

An unintended result emerged through this study, that the identity as a mediator of thinking is a crucial element in establishing a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. Information throughout the interviews and observations supported the thread of

identity as a Cognitive Coach being woven throughout the school sites. The realization emerged that every principal or teacher, everyone who has been trained in Cognitive Coaching has his or her own journey. The reason the identity was so strongly woven throughout was because each human being had a very significant journey in the process.

The realization of this research project is that all humans have their own journey in developing an identity as a Cognitive Coach.

Chapter One

A Qualitative Study of the Factors Supporting the Implementation of a Deeply Embedded Cognitive Coaching School Culture

Introduction

Comprehensive school reform plans have attempted to help educator professional learning, yet multiple approaches to school reform implementation have contributed to educator overload (Fullan, 2001; Schlosser, 1998; Schmoker, 2004). Principals have increasingly becoming frustrated as they attempt to follow large scale plans that strip teachers of time and abilities to be effective in the classroom (Reeves, 2009;Schmoker, 2004). Widespread implementation of school reform programs has led to fragmentation of curriculum, which has resulted in confusion for teacher planning, growth, and reflection on practice (Ellison & Hayes, 2003; Hatch, 2001; Saban, 2003). Many professional learning plans do not have input from teachers in the development of the plans. The plans have ignored the talents and abilities of teachers and have failed to develop self-direction and autonomy, qualities that promote overall teacher growth. In order to change the course, principals and teachers must see themselves not as passive and ineffective implementers but as active members of collaborative teams that work to solve the problems in today's schools.

Resources have dwindled and accountability has increased, causing schools to make use of more efficient and effective ways to support staff development and professional growth to keep up with the needs of an ever-changing society (Reeves, 2009; Joyce & Showers, 2002). With much to do and little time to accomplish all, teachers ultimately have operated in a mechanical style without achieving deep thinking (Fullan, 2001; Reeves, 2009).

Principals have also experienced a lack of trust among their co-workers as they have attempted to solve problems in isolation (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Schools in which faculty members have felt a collective responsibility for student learning have produced greater learning gains than schools in which teachers have worked in isolated practices (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996). Joyce and Showers (2002) research showed that only through peer coaching was there a long-lasting change in teacher practice and that coaching was part of the general school improvement process, which highlighted the thinking behind teaching and learning. Coaching takes time and needs to be valued as part of the school culture in order for reflective thinking, collaboration, trust among co-workers, and deep implementation to occur (Alsieke 1997; Costa & Garmston, 2002; Costa, Garmston, & Zimmerman, 2014; Garmston & Wellman, 1997; Knight, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Problem Statement

With a lack of reflection, distrust, and teacher isolation prevalent, principals rely on programs instead of eliciting deeply embedded practice (Fullan 2001; Reeves, 2009; Schmoker, 2004). What is needed is a deeply embedded practice of thinking, reflecting, collaborating, and self-directed learning. When priority is given to reflection, tacit thinking becomes visible and results in self-directed learners (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Senge, 1990). Collaboration exists when teachers use the structured conversations and tools of listening and rapport to develop trusting relationships (Garmston & Zimmerman, 2013; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). In order for any change to happen, the expertise, talent, and collaboration of the teachers who are implementing the reform need to be understood, practiced, and ultimately owned by those who will act on the knowledge (Costa, et al., 2014). Cognitive Coaching is a coaching style that offers tools for principals and teachers to plan, reflect, and resolve problems (Costa & Garmston,

2002). This study explored principals', teachers' and staff perceptions of Cognitive Coaching and what a deeply embedded practice of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-directed learning, and organizational learning looks like.

Purpose for the Study

This case study aimed to define what deeply embedded practice looks like in the elementary school setting through the lens of Cognitive Coaching. The study explored principals' perceptions of the implementation process and identified leadership factors that facilitated and inhibited building-wide implementation. This case study also took into account the perceptions of teachers and staff members working within the school environment who embraced Cognitive Coaching as a means for professional growth. This case study aspired to expand understanding and knowledge by focusing on perceptions of how Cognitive Coaching can be deeply embedded. The study was viewed through the eyes of ten school participants at two school sites.

Cognitive Coaching as defined throughout this study is a process developed by Costa and Garmston (2002) as a nonjudgmental, mediation process that involves planning, reflecting, and resolving problems that support collaborative teacher and principal interaction. The goal of Cognitive Coaching Seminars is to develop one's identity and capacity as a mediator of thinking. In order to best facilitate thinking in others, Cognitive Coaching suggests that self-directed learners are a key component of an institution (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

The researcher is interested in this study due to the impact Cognitive Coaching has made on her own personal growth. The purpose of this study was to explore the level of commitment to Cognitive Coaching by the school community as a factor in the level of implementation of the school itself. There have been numerous studies examining the general effects of implementing Cognitive Coaching in the school setting (Alseike, 1997; Arrington, 2010; Awakuni, 1995;

Bjerken, 2013; Eger, 2006; Henry, 2012; Rennick, 2010; Rinaldi, 2013; Schlosser, 1998; Slinger, 2004). These studies include teachers' perceptions, as well as viewpoints from support staff and students. The purpose of this study was to explore at a deeper level than previous studies the perceptions of how Cognitive Coaching can be deeply embedded school-wide.

Research Questions/Hypothesis

This study explored the perceptions of principals regarding a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. The overarching primary research questions were as follows:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?
2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

These questions were designed as a tool to guide the study and to construct meaning of how to deeply embed Cognitive Coaching.

Theoretical Framework

Coaching another person's thinking through the tools of Cognitive Coaching is a complex process that has been the subject of many studies (Alsieke, 1997; Awakuni, 1995; Bjerken, 2013; Costa & Garmston, 2002; Edwards, 2013). A driving force behind this study is the need to explore what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like. The researcher accepts that most participants of Cognitive Coaching could describe the necessary components to implement an environment conducive to coaching, however, less is known in regard to how to

deeply embed the underlying structural qualities necessary for true coaching to take place. The information presented in Cognitive Coaching Foundational Training espouses the idea that 20% of the training is knowledge that will be learned in training, while 80% of the knowledge comes from practicing the skills outside of the training sessions. True learning of Cognitive Coaching comes from what is implemented outside of the actual learning of the content. This qualitative study will focus on identifying the factors that facilitate and inhibit implementation of Cognitive Coaching (Merriam, 1998).

Teachers perform at more optimal levels when trust, collaboration, reflection, self-directed learning, and organizational learning are pervasive throughout the school environment (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Costa & Garmston, 2002; Garmston & Wellman, 1997; Senge, 1990). Trust is a critical component to establishing a trusting relationship among co-workers in a school culture (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy & Tarter, 2003; Reeves, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). In a working environment that experiences a deeply embedded culture, trust is an essential element. The impact of trust among colleagues cannot be over-rated. Collaborative teams of educators working together are crucial in schools that learn together (Calabrese, 2002; Corregan, 2001; Garmston & Wellman, 1997; Garmston, 2012; Garmston & Zimmerman, 2013). Teachers who collaborate have a greater working relationship in the sharing of ideas with each other, which translates into more ways to help students succeed. Without collaboration in education, true learning will not happen for all the stakeholders within the school. Reflection of current practice by teachers opens the door to new learning which, in turn, leads to improved teaching (Argyis & Schon, 1974; Berliner, 1998; Glickman, 1985; Hattie, 2009; Heath & Heath, 2010). Deep thinking and learning will not take place without embracing reflection. Self-directed learning is the driving force behind the confidence involved in seeking

out ways to grow as teaching professionals (Bandura, 1977; Costa & Garmston, 2013; Fullan, 2014; Garmston, 2002; Koestler, 1972). The difference between an individual needing to be told how to do something, and figuring out how to complete the task on their own is self-direction. Organizational learning is the catalyst that moves an entire organization forward (Collins, 2001; Mourshed, Chijoke, & Barber, 2010; Reeves, 2008; Senge, 1990). An organization that does not learn together will at best, grow in segments and not as an entire body. Trust, collaboration, reflection, self-directed learning, and organizational learning are the key components in developing a deeply embedded, high-performing professional culture.

Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom (2004) analyzed the findings from educational research on what creates successful schools. The premise included a core set of structural qualities that are necessary for leaders implementing a deep-seeded culture within a school. The same group of researchers followed up on their original research, and came to similar conclusions (Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Whalstrom, & Anderson, 2010). Similar research findings, studied under the lens of successful school systems also supports the five components of successful schools (Mourshed et al., 2010). The research behind Cognitive Coaching is in line with this same body of research on successful schools. It is the belief of the researcher that the critical components of successful schools according to Leithwood et al., (2004) are also the components of Cognitive Coaching practice. Therefore a school that is implementing Cognitive Coaching at a deep level could be considered a successful school. The purpose of this topic is to determine whether that belief is substantiated.

The theoretical framework for this study consists of the following five critical components gleaned from the comprehensive review of literature: (a) establishing trusting relationships within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating

opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (e) developing organizational learning to take place within the school. These five components form the basis of the interview guide and serve as the structure for exploring how principals develop a deeply embedded and high-performing professional culture.

Limitations and Assumptions

Perception was a factor that limited this study. The study looked through the vantage point of the principals' eye, taking into account their perceptions and perspectives. This study was limited geographically to principals who have attended Cognitive Coaching's Advanced Training Seminar on using Cognitive Coaching in selected school districts located in the southwest region of the state of Missouri.

This study made the assumption that those who answered the study were able to answer openly and honestly, as well as to accurately assess the practices of their teachers. This researcher made the assumption that the use of triangulation, member checking, and peer review would provide opportunities for clarification and deeper understanding. Stake (2010) stated that "Triangulation substantiated an interpretation or clarified different meanings with the interviewee" (p. 173). Transcripts were repeatedly reviewed for clarification of specific points. Transcript review provided instances to triangulate information among interviewees and with observational data. Member checks required that interpretations be given back to the participants with a confirmation of those results (Merriam, 1998). Peer debriefing was utilized through contact with colleagues familiar with qualitative case study methodology and Cognitive Coaching. These three components of qualitative research supported the fidelity of the study and provided opportunities to substantiate and clarify meaning.

Design Controls

A qualitative research approach was utilized in this study. Interviews were conducted at selected school districts. Participants in this study were defined as having a minimum of ten years' experience and having had time to practice, internalize, and master the numerous Cognitive Coaching skills (Alsieke, 1997). The definition of an experienced Cognitive Coach for this study was similar to that of Alsieke (1997) in that coaches attended the eight-day Cognitive Coaching Foundation Seminar, as well as the Advanced Training Seminar and may also be Agency Trainers or Training Associates who lead training within their own district.

Definition of Key Terms

The terms listed below are key words of Cognitive Coaching, as well as terms that will be used throughout this study.

Coachee: The person receiving Cognitive Coaching training in order to grow professionally.

Cognitive Coach: The person utilizing the elements of Cognitive Coaching to coach another person.

Cognitive Coaching: "A nonjudgmental, interactive strategy focused on developing and utilizing cognitive processes, liberating internal resources, and accessing the five states of mind as a means of more effectively achieving goals while enhancing self-directed learning" (Costa & Garmston, 2002, pp. 401-402).

Efficacy: "The belief that one's work will make a difference and is related to being optimistic, confident, and knowledgeable" (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 402).

Identity: "An autobiographical sense of self in this time and space constructed from the meanings we make of our interactions with others and how we perceive that others see us" (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 403).

Interdependence: "The inclination to become one with the larger system and community" (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 403).

Mediator: One who places himself or herself in the middle between a person and some event or situation and who intervenes to enhance self-directed learning (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

Self-directed Learning: "The capacity for self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying" (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 404). Self-directed learning is the term used throughout Cognitive Coaching instead of the noun self-direction. For purposes of this study, self-directed learning will be utilized when referring to components of Cognitive Coaching.

Self-direction: Directed or guided by oneself.

Trust: A belief that someone is good, reliable, honest, and effective.

Summary

Comprehensive implementation plans and school reform efforts have contributed to educator overload and initiative fatigue. Educator overload contributes to isolation, which breaks down trust and collaboration. Initiative fatigue has led to principals recommending teachers follow a textbook instead of the freedom to be self-directed in their professions (Fullan, 2001; Reeves, 2009; Schmoker, 2004). The intent of this study was to examine principals' perceptions of Cognitive Coaching. By using the tools of Cognitive Coaching, trusting relationships between adults can be built in the school setting and collaboration can drive the decisions made in schools. Built-in-time for reflection of professional practice can lead to self-direction for teachers, which leads to system reform (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

Chapter Two contains the Review of Literature, in which the major themes of trust, collaboration, self-direction, and reflection will be explored. Chapter Three is a description of

the methodology involved in the study. Chapter Four contains the presentation of the findings, and Chapter Five is a summary and implications.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Introduction

Schools are increasingly building coaching as a relationship-based professional development strategy to improve the skills and performance of teachers and principals (Knight, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). Researchers have found the school reform implementation process to be complex regardless of the human and financial resources spent (Leithwood et al, 2004; Mourshed et. al, 2010). According to Ellison and Hayes (2003), leaders of the future need to develop a culture of collaboration, where stakeholders in the school as a whole are producing together, learning together, developing new approaches, and gaining greater collective knowledge from individual achievements. When skillfully applied, coaching can provide productive learning environments for educators, particularly when it relates to a larger reform agenda and is embedded in actual work settings (Showers & Joyce, 2002). Coaching is a process of reflective practice and enhanced learning for all members of an organization. Peer coaching within an education setting was developed to support leaders and colleagues in professional development leading to self-direction, collaboration, trust, and deeper reflective thought, which can truly impact the entire culture of an organization (Ellison & Hayes, 2003; Garmston & Hayes, 2003; Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Research on types of educational leadership has continued to evolve through the decades (Argyris, 1960; McGregor, 1960; Likert, 1964; Yukl, 2009). The use of teamwork, group decisions, and coaching help to balance the leader between task-oriented leadership and person-oriented leadership (Yukl, 2009). Benefits of coaching include personalized professional learning for staff, self-directed professional learning, a learning center mode of professional

dialogue, and a process that builds capacity for leadership. "A good coach communicates a belief in people's potentials and an expectation that they can do their best. The tacit message is 'I believe in you, and I expect your best efforts.' As a result, people sense that the leader cares" (Goleman 2000, p.62). Clutterback (2014) argued that leaders who get the most out of their staff spend a high proportion of their time and energy coaching others. A coaching climate exists when people welcome and actively seek feedback; people are able to engage in constructive confrontation; time for reflection is valued; and personal growth, team development, and organizational learning are integrated (Clutterback, 2014; Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Knight, 2009; Rock, 2009).

This review of literature investigates the central themes of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning as components that are central to developing a deeply embedded coaching environment. A summary of various coaching methods, including Cognitive Coaching, is also presented.

Trust

The heart of coaching relies on the relationship of individuals. Relationships are based on trust (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Leaders must create relationships with others; therefore, school leaders must exhibit relational trust in order to create high achieving schools (Bryk & Schnieder, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 1998). Teachers' trust in their principals and colleagues has been linked to the effectiveness of schools (Hoy & Tarter, 2003; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). Trust within schools can be fostered or diminished by the behavior of the leader. Schools that cultivate trust can reap the benefits of greater adaptability and innovation as well as reduced costs (Mishra, 1996; Solomon & Flores, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). The climate of the school can be one that cultivates trust or one that makes trust difficult

to foster. Openness in the climate of a school and healthy interpersonal relationships tend to foster a climate of trust (Hoy & Tarter, 2003; Tarter et al., 1995). Critical elements in creating trust in schools include the importance of establishing trustworthy relationships, defining facets of trust, and building trust within the organization.

Establishing Trustworthy Relationships

To be productive and to accomplish organizational goals, schools need cohesive and cooperative relationships, and trust is essential in fostering relationships (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Coaching necessitates the navigation of trust, communication, and inevitable differences of opinion (Boatright, Gallucci, Swanson, Van Lare, & Yoon, 2008). Honesty is a key component of trust. Another factor in developing trust is engaging in empathetic listening rather than listening to solve problems (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Most significantly, trust is always a matter of human effort. According to DeSteno (2014), one reason trust is difficult to measure is because integrity can vary from person to person. To be productive and to accomplish organizational goals, schools need cohesive and cooperative relationships (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Solomon and Flores (2001) noted that trust is cultivated through speech, conversation, commitments, and action. Leaders cannot fully engage others in collaboration and inquiry without establishing trusting relationships (Rock, 2006).

"The core competencies of a trustworthy leader include personal presence, active listening, powerful questioning, creation of awareness, planning and goal setting, design of actions, as well as management of progress and accountability" (Tschannen-Moran, 2004, p. 25). Principals establish respect and personal regard for others when they acknowledge their own vulnerabilities and actively listen to concerns, which allows for an environment conducive to trust (Bryk & Schnieder, 2002). A trustworthy principal taking on the role of a coach acts in a

way that preserves the person's dignity (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). In cultivating a professional learning community committed to professional inquiry, to data-based decision making, and best practice, as well as helping teachers learn to adapt to new standards of accountability, trustworthy principals can move their schools to higher levels of productivity and success. A principal who wants to change the culture of a school needs to unleash creativity as teachers and administrators alike find new solutions to old problems.

Defining Facets of Trust

The effective coach works to create, monitor, and maintain a cooperative environment designed to enhance trust. Tschannen-Moran (2004) and Bryk and Schneider (2002) studied trust within school settings and found several key facets in developing trusting relationships. Great coaches epitomize the five facets of trust in their dealings with people: benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability, and competence (Mishra, 1996; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Trust is defined as one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent. Successful principals balance a concern for tasks with a concern for relationships (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Bryk and Schneider (2002) indicated that staffs trust principals when competence, consistency, evenhanded behavior, and integrity are demonstrated. The nature of the interdependence between principals, coaches, teachers, students, and parents is such that each of these facets has been shown to make a significant contribution to judgments of trust (Tschannen-Moran, 2000). Greater collaboration then holds the possibility of fostering greater trust as partners have shared experiences with one another over time and opportunities to witness these facets of trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Bryk and Schenider's (2002) studies in Chicago Public Schools distinguished different levels of trust among various performing schools. High levels of teacher-principal trust were dominant in the top quartile of high performing schools. Teacher-principal trust was low in the bottom quartile of low performing schools. Teachers in the high performing schools described an atmosphere of respect among colleagues and they reported those colleagues trusted in, confided in, and cared about one other. Teachers in the bottom quartiles of schools claimed minimal to no level of trust for each other. As a result, the teachers in the low trust schools worked more in isolation. In the high performing schools, the principal, as well as the coach, possessed the ability to form and sustain learning relationships. In order to achieve learning relationships, the principal established high levels of trust, exhibited consistency over time, offered genuine respect, displayed openness and honesty for each other, and also accessed higher levels of thinking for the other person without doing so in an evaluative manner (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Calabrese, 2002; Creasy & Paterson, 2005; Hoy & Tarter, 2003).

Building Trust Within the Organization

Teachers and principals are interdependent in their shared project of educating students. As such, each participant in the principal-teacher relationship is vulnerable to each other (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). When principals exchange thoughts and ideas freely with teachers, it not only enhances perceptions of trust, but it also leads to greater openness on the part of teachers (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Teachers see principals as trustworthy when their communication is both accurate and forthcoming (Bryk & Schnieder, 2002). Members trust the leader when they see the leader's words and actions are consistent (Calabrese, 2002). Principals at schools with high teacher ratings for instructional climate outrank other principals in developing an atmosphere of caring and trust (Mourshed et. al, 2010). Principals who help build

collaborative cultures do so by establishing conditions for non-judgmentalism and transparency (Fullan, 2014). Kirtman (2013) said principals who invest in leadership capital have proven themselves to be trustworthy and competent. School leaders need to build trust with teachers; although governance structures such as collaborative decision-making and site-based management can bring the insights of more people in solving the complex problems of schooling, the success of the process ultimately depends upon trust (Fullan, 2001; Hoy & Tarter, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Teacher-principal trust is primarily revealed through the principal's actions to develop supportive ties that relieve teachers' senses of vulnerability. There is a history of positive academic achievement at a school when there is high teacher-principal trust (Bryk & Schnieder, 2002). Trust does not directly affect student achievement. Rather, trust fosters a set of organizational conditions that make it more conducive for individuals to initiate and sustain the kinds of activities necessary to affect productivity and improvements (Bryk & Schnieder, 2002). The principal sets the tone for a school. The principal's behavior has a significant influence on the culture of the school, and it is the principal's responsibility to build and sustain trusting relationships (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy & Tarter, 2003, Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Effective school leaders not only know how to "talk the talk" of trust, but also know how to "walk the talk" (Tschannen-Moran, 2004, p. 62). Skillful principals often earn the trust of their faculties by leading quietly. They combine personal humility, restraint, and modesty with tenacity and the professional will to see that the task is accomplished and accomplished well (Collins, 2001; Fullan, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Teacher-to-teacher trust is just as critical for the principal to support and help build within the school walls. Teachers' level of trust for one another can have a significant impact on

the climate and effectiveness of a school. A collegial atmosphere, authentic relationships, and the level of involvement of teachers in decision-making all play major roles in developing faculty trust in colleagues (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Trust in colleagues has been found to have a significant impact on student achievement in elementary schools (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk, 2000). There are many advantages of a high level of faculty trust including greater collaboration, a more robust collective sense among teachers that they can make a difference, and more productive conflict resolution strategies (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). For example, the principal can foster openness by encouraging teachers to be in one another's classrooms. Establishing an effective peer observation program, one where safety and trust is present, takes planning and training (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). When trust is high and, teachers feel affirmed by their principal, and they are much more willing to make themselves vulnerable through teamwork and sharing with other teachers (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). When teachers trust each other, it is more likely that they will develop greater confidence in their collective ability to be successful at meeting their goals (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

A climate of trust bestows a variety of benefits to the organizations that works to foster trusting relationships. Trust contributes to organizational effectiveness in a variety of ways. The quality of communication has been linked to effectiveness of an organization, and trust is necessary for open communication in that organization (Tschannen-Moran, 2000). People with a high degree of trust are likely to disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about problems, as well as their thoughts, feelings, or ideas. In addition, organizational citizenship, which is the willingness of employees to go beyond the minimum requirements of their job descriptions, has been linked to trust in the leader (Tschannen-Moran, 2000). In organizations with a high level of trust, participants are more comfortable and are able to invest their energies

in contributing to organizational goals rather than focusing on self-protection. Trust is essential because members who do not trust will refuse to name existing theories-in-use, therefore refusing to change (Calabrese, 2002).

Collaboration

Staff and students are more successfully productive in schools where a culture of collaborative decision-making is supported, especially through the use of teams (Sousa, 2003). No longer can educators work in isolation. Teachers and principals alike must work at communicating for students' best interests. "Teachers and administrators have begun to shed their isolationist ways and routinely work in teams to solve their student achievement challenges" (Allison, et al., 2011, p. 58). Principals need content-specific skills and skills for working with others. Leaders are beginning to embrace the notion that to do well in their careers, they not only need strong capabilities in instructional practice, but also the capacity and confidence to engage with others in productive collaborations (Blagg, 2009).

Professional dialogue, collaboration, and reflective practice are necessary pieces for effective professional learning (Eger, 2006). Saphier (1993) stated that in good schools, people have common goals, and they work toward those goals. Mourshed et al., (2010) discovered principals who were rated highly for the strength of their actions to improve instruction were also more apt to encourage the staff to work collaboratively. Systems that have sustained continuous improvement have collaborative practices in place along with leadership continuity (Leithwood, et al., 2004). Many school leaders strive to create a community of educators who embrace collaborative reflection and who improve their practice with the principal's support (Nidus & Sadder, 2011).

High-performing schools spend time collaborating and organizing people to take advantage of each other's knowledge and skills so that, "the whole is far greater than the sum of the parts" (Darling-Hammond, 2013, p. 60). The best path to self-efficacy lies in teachers spending time with others on personal and collaborative reflection about what effects their teaching has on student learning in a continuous spiral of inquiry (Costa et al., 2014). When teachers feel a collective responsibility for student learning, school-wide gains occur (Mourshed et al., 2013). Enlightened leaders develop the skills that help transform all interactions into forums for reflective thought and action that build collective, cumulative knowledge (Costa et al., 2014). Goddard (2001) found that teachers experiencing mastery within various components of their job were a strong predictor of teachers' perceptions of collective efficacy. Themes central to collaboration within schools include developing a collaborative culture, building team mentality skills, and embracing the importance of dialogue.

Collaborative Culture

Corregan (2001) explained how individuals and groups cooperate and coordinate on an individual basis without actually changing any overall group procedures. In collaboration, however, the expectation is that the entity produces something that individuals and organizations could not produce alone. Collaboration is a long process and cannot be developed overnight. It involves building trust and confidence, and that takes time (Corregan, 2001; Creighton, 2005; Garmston, 2012). True collaboration allows participants to develop thinking in a way that contributes to the creative energy of the entire group. Collaboration really means looking deeper below the surface at the aspects of cooperating and coordinating. Collaborative practice involves simultaneous review and renewal on all individuals' parts. Implementing collaboration is time consuming, difficult, complex, expensive, necessary, fun, and challenging (Corregan, 2001;

Creighton, 2005). Collaboration implies that members want to make a difference or a change and that they truly realize that they need the help of others to meet the challenges of educating students (Garmston, 1997; Creighton, 2005; Higgins, 2005).

Leaders can find the answers to their toughest challenges through collaboration. Teamwork skills are essential in interactions where educators need to exercise influence without having formal authority. Higgins (2005) stated "being an expert in something might not be as effective as being able to listen and learn from another person's point of view or to question one's own assumptions" (p. 118). An important contributor to effective teams is the availability of coaching. Most principals are trained to critique and to instantly have an answer. Administrators need to create environments that are psychologically safe for creativity, experimentation, and risk-taking (Fullan, 2014). Ideal schools need an environment where staff members can put forth new ideas, ask for help, and question the status quo, while still being accountable for reaching challenging goals (Higgins, 2005).

Collaboration takes place in a community of learners, a place where students, teachers, parents, and administrators share the opportunities and responsibilities for making decisions (Barth, 1990). It is the group with shared purpose and skills that gets things done (Fullan, 2010). One has to use the power of the group to change the group (Fullan, 2014). "Time devoted to building the capacity of teachers to work in teams is far better spent than time devoted to observing individual teachers" (DuFour & Marzano, 2009). An organization functions and grows through conversations and the quality of those conversations determines how smart an organization is, which has been called collective intellect (Perkins, 2002; Rock, 2009, Wiseman, 2010).

Team Mentality Skills

Expert principals know how to construct processes in which important decisions are made through collaboration. Building-level principals know it takes a team to accomplish system reform. Reeves (2009) said "the complexities of change leadership require not the perfect composite of every trait, but rather a team that exhibits leadership traits and exercises leadership responsibilities in a way that no individual leader possibly could" (p. 54). Huckman and Staats (2013) claim team performance improves when team members work together over time. In most cases, the less team turnover, the better the results.

Teachers are increasingly being admonished to move away from traditional norms of isolation and autonomy and move toward greater collaboration (Tschannen-Moran, 2000). And yet, for all of the talk of its virtues, progress has been painfully slow in changing the structure and culture of schools to support collaboration (Tschannen-Moran, 2000). Although trust and collaboration are difficult concepts to fully implement, educators have learned they are necessary in order to advance student achievement. In work teams, personal reflection followed by mediated conversation with group members has led to improvements in overall group effectiveness (Garmston, 2012). Productive group members spend time self-assessing to improve self-management. Productive groups routinely schedule time and plan structures for members to self-reflect. Self-reflection is most valuable if done regularly, allowing group members to develop, refine, and make their skills of self-observation and analysis habitual (Garmston, 2012).

To effectively employ collaborative skills requires developing specific capabilities. Capabilities are the invisible skills needed to effectively use skills, behaviors, or activities. Principals can support teachers in developing the capabilities of collaboration so they are performed instinctively as a natural response. Collaboration should be continuously taught and

honed until collaboration becomes automatic for all group members. Being effective collaborators requires being aware of feelings, intentions, behaviors, and the influence these are having on others (Garmston, 1997; Garmston, 2012; Garmston & Wellman, 1997).

Collaboration has fundamental components that must be taught to working teams. For committees and school improvement teams to work without first teaching the basics of working collaboratively is to invite disaster (Corregan, 2001; Garmston, 1997; Garmston & Zimmerman, 2013). These fundamentals include communication skills, structures for inquiring, deciding, and problem solving, resolution of differences, and capacities for assertion, integration, metacognition, and self-control (Garmston, 1997; Corregan, 2001). In order to truly collaborate, participants must see each other as having different resources, such as information, cognitive styles, cultures, and decision-making authority (Garmston, 1997). The group must have knowledge and skills about the content that is the focus of their collaborative effort as well as the processes of working together. Garmston and Wellman (1997) assert that the basics to the collaborative process include the seven norms of collaboration: pausing, paraphrasing, putting inquiry at the center, posing questions for specificity, placing ideas on the table, paying attention to self and others, and presuming positive intentions. Other important attributes collaborative groups showcase include distinguishing dialogue from discussion, managing the meeting environment to best support productivity, and planning a variety of structures and problem-solving models (Garmston, 2012; Garmston & Wellman, 1997).

The exchange of knowledge happens only in organizations with a collaborative culture (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Knowledge creation puts demands on organizational relationships, and in order to share, individuals must rely on others to listen and react to ideas (Garmston, 1997; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). To truly collaborate requires certain skills, behaviors, and

activities. The skills required include thinking skills, such as stating one's ideas clearly and listening skills, such as paraphrasing. Collaboration can generate co-cognition, or thinking together. When knowledge of content and process, thinking environments, and mastery of fundamentals lead to problem solving, then co-cognition, or thinking together, is present. Co-cognition requires working directly with the assumptions, generalizations, and images that influence group members' understanding of how things work and what actions they should take (Garmston, 1997; Calabrese, 2002). In true collaboration, thinking belongs to the group. "Ideas become ours, not yours or mine" (Garmston &Wellman, 1997, p.47). Ideas are presented, elaborated by others, and accepted as group formulations.

Importance of Dialogue

Dialogue is at the heart of trust and collaboration (Achinstein, 2002; Calabrese, 2002; Garmston, 2012). Leaders create dialogue opportunities when the focus is on process and not the outcome. Dialogue is open, honest, and free of attack and requires members to commit to seeking mutual understanding. The active, continuous process of the sharing of ideas is difficult because people identify and connect with the issue being talked about, and it forces the members of the organization to discuss what is uncomfortable (Calabrese, 2002; Creasy & Patterson, 2005; Garmston &Wellman, 1997). Dialogue in collaboration allows teachers to develop new understandings about the purpose of their work, how to accomplish that purpose, and how to connect with others (Sousa, 2003; Garmston, 2012).

The purpose of dialogue is to understand and to learn from one another (Garmston, 1997). In working with individuals, groups, or teams, it is helpful to operate within a mindset of dialogue rather than debate. Dialogue as a sustained, learnable, and collaborative inquiry will create school change. When collaborative teams engage in dialogue, they search for underlying

assumptions (Calabrese, 2002; Creasy & Paterson, 2005; Garmston, 1997). Dialogue is only possible when members value the opinions of others in the group (Knight, 2011). Dialogue involves transparency, displaying gaps within their thinking for others to see. "True learning cannot hide behind the dishonest veneer of expertise" (Knight, 2011, p. 20).

Achinstein (2002) notes "collaboration and attempts at consensus actually generate tension and conflict" (as cited in Garmston, 2012, p.106). Conflict can be reframed as constructive when the right tools are used (Achenstein, 2002; Garmston, 1997). Work by Amason (1995) classifies two types of conflict in groups. The first type is affective conflict where personalities become involved, feelings run high, and differences in view become personal. The second is cognitive conflict, and it pertains to the differences regarding ideas, concepts, and approaches. The "most effective groups engage in cognitive conflict but avoid affective conflict" (Garmston, 2012, p.107). Teams that use tools and strategies to talk about difficult topics successfully engage in cognitive disagreements without personalizing them.

Successful schools are schools that collaborate (Leithwood et al., 2004). Collaboration is built within an organization through the implementing of team mentality skills, placing an importance on professional dialogue, and therefore, working to create a collaborative culture.

Reflection

Reflection involves "making visible the invisible decisions made in classrooms" (Scherer, 2011, page 7). The aim of coaching is to encourage educators to reflect and improve on their theories and practices. Trustworthy leaders view reflection as a required part of their daily and weekly routines (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Introspection is shown to be a hallmark of an effective leader (Heath & Heath, 2010). Hattie (2009) stated that frequently examining the effects of teaching and encouraging metacognition helps increase student achievement. At the

core of change is reflection. It is a tool that effective leaders use to examine beliefs, theories of actions, and organizational purpose (Calabrese, 2002). Caine and Caine (1997) surmised that what keeps schools stuck in old ways of doing things is deep and unexamined assumptions and generalizations about how learning occurs. The power of reflection helps teachers make in-the-moment instructional decisions (Tamer, 2014).

Reflection is an important component in developing thought processes. Cogan and Goldhammer (1969) developed the clinical supervision model, which included the element of teacher reflection. Reflective conversations shift the focus from the overt teaching behaviors to the inner thought processes of the teacher. Berliner (1998) found that competence is achieved as a result not so much of experience but of reflection on experience. Glickman (1985) concluded that successful teachers are thoughtful teachers who stimulate their students to be thoughtful as well. In order for teachers to grow in their knowledge of teaching, they must reflect, which requires someone else to facilitate that reflective conversation. Teachers who reflect on how and why they teach as they do benefit the students they teach. "Changing the overt behaviors of instruction requires the alteration and rearrangement of inner, invisible cognitive behaviors" (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 9). Themes central to establishing reflection as a cultural norm in schools include exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit, examining mental models, and integrating double-loop learning.

Tacit to Explicit Knowledge

Learning conversations should be integrated throughout the school system, which makes tacit knowledge explicit and engages staff in open and honest feedback (Creasy & Paterson, 2005). Tacit knowledge lies beneath the surface, and it contributes to how an individual thinks and behaves. Explicit knowledge is knowledge that can be explained in words. It is the job of

the leader and the coach to help facilitate conversations that bring tacit thinking to the forefront. Modeling excellent communication opens the opportunity to make a deep understanding more conscious and explicit (Costa et al., 2014). Reflective conversations "give teachers time and support to think metacognitively about their work in a safe atmosphere with plenty of support" (Barkley, 2005, p. 17).

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) made the crucial distinction between explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge by defining tacit knowledge as below the level of awareness. Subjective insights, intuitions, and hunches fall into this category of learning. Tacit knowledge is deeply embedded in an individual's action and experience, as well as in the ideas, values, and emotions that are embraced. The sharing of tacit knowledge among multiple individuals becomes the critical step for the creation of organizational knowledge to take place. The individual's emotions, feelings, and mental models have to be shared to build mutual trust (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

Mental Models

Mental models are "unconscious explanations of how things work in the real world" (Garmston, 2012, p. 91). An individual's mental models can expand or limit his or her view of possibilities by shaping actions and reactions. "Research increasingly supports what we know intuitively, that we see the same event or circumstance through unique lenses" (Garmston, 2012, p.103). To change normal working patterns, one must first change the operating procedures of the mental models, which requires courage and time. "Educators are often so overwhelmed with increasing day-to-day demands that finding either courage or time is difficult" (Garmston, 2012, p.93). Humans do not learn from experience but from reflecting about experience. Mental models are usually tacit, existing below the level of awareness; they are often untested and

unexamined. "They are generally invisible to us until we look for them" (Senge, 1990, p. 36). "Unexamined mental models limit people's ability to change" (Senge, Cambron-McCabe, Lucas, Smith, Dutton, Kleiner, 2012, p.100).

Argyris and Schön (1974) contend that people have mental maps that guide their actions in various situations. Mental maps involve the way they plan, implement, and review their actions. Furthermore, Argyris and Schön assert that it is these maps that guide people's actions rather than the theories they explicitly espouse (Smith, 2013). Knowledge of mental models allows the leader to recognize the map that each member follows. When a leader can accurately assess the mental models a staff member is employing, the leader can then monitor and adjust to the situation. Many people follow a mental map as if it were the only map; the only way to think and act within a given situation. Recognizing and understanding the function of mental models facilitates entrance into the organization's relational side (Calabrese, 2002). When a principal understands mental models are at work within all individuals, work can then be done for the mental models to be explored and communicated within the working environment.

Surface structure is what one sees and hears. Deep structure is what lies beneath the surface, that which truly makes up the individual. The principal who understands deep structure contributes to how a staff member thinks and operates. Deep structure level is not explicit and ties directly into Dilt's (1990) research on values, beliefs, and identity. Dilts goes on to state that values, beliefs, and identity are held deep within a person and are generally difficult to think about because they lie below the surface. When deep structured values, beliefs, and identity are left unexamined, thinking remains unchanged (Creighton, 2005; Costa & Garmston, 2002). The principal should work at setting structures for collaboration in place in order for deep thinking to be explored.

Values are broad preferences concerning appropriate courses of action or outcomes. Values reflect an individual or group's sense of right and wrong or what ought to be (Garmston, 2012). Beliefs require a group or individual to invest emotionally based on assumptions and convictions that a person holds to be true regarding people, concepts, or things. When a group believes that its work is manageable, it will enlist cognitive and emotional resources that allow it to persevere (Garmston, 2012). Identity is a framework for understanding one's self. This framework is formed and sustained through social interaction. Identity is the consistently traceable thread that is unique to the individual over time and distinguishes one from other people or other groups (Garmston, 2012). Albert and Whetten (1985) described organizational identity as an evolving answer to the self-reflective question, "Who are we as an organization?"

True change does not take place without getting below the surface into the mental models at work. Correcting behavior at the surface structure ultimately does not create behavioral change that is lasting because it is just the tip of the iceberg (Bandler & Grinder, 1975.) The sources or roots of behaviors live in deep structure or reference structure, which lies below the surface of the individual. "Reference structure contains intense, primitive experiences, or events in the life of an individual or an organization that have the characteristics of being so unique, emotionally impactful, or novel that they become the source of meaning making for the person or the group" (Garmston, 2012, p. 97). It is from reference structure that individuals and groups form beliefs and get a sense of their values, beliefs, identity, and mental models (Garmston, 2012). Costa and Garmston (2002) explained that what truly drives an individual are the reference structures.

Double-Loop Learning

Reflection is typically a form of single-loop learning, which means reflecting on an event, then making changes to affect the next event (Senge et al., 2012). Double-loop learning explores attitudes, assumptions, and norms that influence behavior. This opens the door for new ideas and possibilities by questioning whether attitudes, assumptions, and norms are appropriate (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Senge et al., 2012). Double-loop learning is necessary if practitioners and organizations are to make informed decisions in rapidly changing and often uncertain contexts. It sets new priorities or restructures the norms with associated strategies and assumptions (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Double-loop learning is focused on thoughts, feelings, and actions and is concerned with the difference between espoused theory and theory-in-use (Smith, 2013). The goal of double-loop learning is to bring to light the true beliefs in order for the thoughts to become that which is acted upon.

Double-loop learning involves questioning the role of learning systems, which underlie actual goals and strategies (Smith, 2013). Argyris and Schön (1974) described double-loop learning as involving the detection and correction of error. When something goes wrong, it is suggested, an initial port of call for many people involves looking for another strategy that will address and work within the governing variables. In other words, given or chosen goals, values, plans, and rules are operationalized rather than questioned. According to Argyris and Schön (1974), this is an example of *single-loop learning*. An alternative response is to question the governing variables themselves, to subject them to critical scrutiny, which they describe as *double-loop learning*. Such learning may then lead to an alteration in the governing variables and, thus, a shift in the way that strategies and consequences are framed (Smith, 2013).

Most people narrowly define learning as mere "problem solving," so they focus on identifying and correcting errors in the external environment. Solving problems is important, but

individuals must look inward for learning to take place. They need to reflect critically on their own behaviors, identify the ways they often inadvertently contribute to the organization's problems, and then change how they act. Argyris' and Schön's (1974) argument suggests people utilize mental maps when they decide how to act in situations. This involves planning, implementing, and reviewing actions. Furthermore, Argyris and Schön asserted these maps guide people's actions rather than the theories they explicitly espouse (Smith, 2013). In particular, a person must learn how the very way they go about defining and solving problems can be a source of problems in its own right (Argyris, 1991). Double-loop learning is a reflection of thinking, which is the cognitive rules or reasoning used to design and implement actions. Teaching people how to reason about their behavior in new and more effective ways breaks down the defenses that block learning. People can be taught how to recognize the reasoning used when determining a course of action and identify the inconsistencies between their espoused and actual theories of action (Argyris, 1991). Finally, people can learn how to identify what individuals and groups do to create organizational defenses and how these defenses contribute to an organization's problems (Argyris, 1991).

Schools have planning periods for teachers to plan out the next lessons. In order for educators within a school to really grow and learn from past events, reflecting periods or times for reflection should be integrated. Reflection is when the deeper thinking is able to come to the surface. In this section, themes central to establishing reflection as a cultural norm in schools included exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit, examining mental models, and integrating double-loop learning.

Self-Direction

The ultimate purpose of coaching is to influence teachers' capacities to modify themselves (Costa & Garmston, 2002). The leader within the organization should be committed to always learning and developing the same trait in others (Fullan, 2014). A leader chooses to coach when development of the coachee is just as important or more important than completing the project or task (Allison, 2010). The job of the coach is to highlight the resources that are within the individual. "The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that will truly tap people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization" (Senge, 1990, p. 4). Utilizing a coach helps enhance self-direction, which contributes to the decision-making, perception, and intellectual functions of teaching. Themes central to building self-directed learners within schools include the distinction of self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying, how a leader builds internal resourcefulness, and the collective efficacy of the system.

Self-Managing, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Modifying

Self-directed individuals seek out new ways to learn and solve problems. First and foremost, when developing a coaching program in schools, it must start with staff understanding self-directed learning and the value individuals place when taking charge of their own development (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Creasy & Paterson, 2005). Self-direction is a key to coaching, with the power of effective individualized support helping the individual teacher, and the integration of coaching, mentoring, and collaborative learning coming to the forefront of adult learning (Creasy & Paterson, 2005). A self-directed learner has the capability to self-manage by clearly setting goals and identifying success indicators. The self-directed learner then utilizes self-modifying behavior by assessing performance and modifying those behaviors to

achieve intended outcomes. Self-directed learners use these cognitive behaviors and apply them to their teaching (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

Self-directed people display the traits necessary to be self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying individuals (Costa & Kallick, 2004). Self-managing people draw on past experiences in order to determine new courses of action. Self-monitoring people think about their own thinking (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Once goals and indicators are put into place, a self-directed learner continues to be mindful of teaching by self-monitoring. Self-monitoring is the ability to reflect on what is happening and to determine if the goals that were set are being achieved. Self-modifying people have the ability to change themselves (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying are necessary for a person to truly become self-directed (Costa & Kallick 2000).

Internal Resourcefulness

According to Costa and Garmston (2002), there are five internal states of mind that enhance a person's success. These five states of mind include interdependence, flexibility, efficacy, craftsmanship, and consciousness. The states of mind offer fluidity to thinking, allowing teachers to reflect and gain more insight into their own and the group's actions (Costa et al., 2014). Successful mindsets are developed when conversations are specific, and individuals and groups can articulate their states of mind (Costa et al., 2014; Dweck, 2009). Drawing out the internal states of mind creates a sense of resourcefulness that encourages hard work and persistence (Goddard, 2001).

When teachers learn to draw on internal resources through the coaching process, the ability to be aware in the moment leads to enhanced student performance. "The coach's concern for consciousness generates increased self-awareness, self-knowledge, and self-monitoring on

the teacher's part" (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011, p. 13). When the coachee is conscious of decision-making and how that contributes to teaching, students benefit. Fostering learning and growth requires mindfulness, the nonjudgmental awareness of what's happening in the present moment, as well as conscious awareness (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011).

Interdependence is the state of mind that relates directly to teamwork. A coachee must learn to draw on the internal resource of relying on others in order to help one achieve at a higher level. Costa & Garmston (2013) defined interdependence as "knowing that we will benefit from our participation in, contribution to, and receipt of professional relationships" (p. 25). The authors further stated that interdependence is "how to create and change relationships to benefit our work" (Costa & Garmston, 2013, p. 25).

In order to become a self-directed individual, one must believe in his or her own capability to accomplish the given task. Bandura (1977) introduced the concept of self-efficacy as perceptions or "beliefs in one's capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). Teachers with strong perceptions of self-capability tend to employ classroom strategies that are more organized and better planned. Teachers' efficacy judgments are also strongly related to trust, openness, and job satisfaction. There is a positive link between teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004).

When efficacy is raised within the individual, other states of mind increase. Teachers' senses of efficacy are positively related to aspects of organizational context, such as positive school climate, lack of impediments to effective instruction and teacher empowerment, as well as principal influence with superiors and the academic press of a school (Goddard et al., 2004; Hoy

& Woolfolk, 2002). The path to self-efficacy requires time for personal and collaborative reflection (Costa et al., 2014).

Collective Efficacy

Once an individual is aware of how to raise his or her own levels of self-direction, it is a next step to consider how internal resources can contribute to group effectiveness. Within an organization, perceived collective efficacy represents the beliefs of group members concerning "the performance capability of a social system as a whole" (Bandura, 1997, p. 469). The group itself can grow in levels of states of mind and work to develop a collective sense of efficacy. Leaders should foster deep reflection and help teachers grow wiser through collective efficacy. For schools, perceived collective efficacy refers to the judgment of teachers in a school, believing their work can have a positive effect on students (Bandura, 1997). A robust sense of group capability establishes a strong belief in collective performance (Goddard et al., 2004). Coaching allows the creation of independent systems of mutual support that help a school find collective efficacy, the difference between high and low performing schools (Costa et al., 2014).

Perceived collective efficacy is a significant factor in the attainment of organizational goals (Hoy & Tarter, 1997). In schools possessing a high degree of perceived collective efficacy, new teachers learn that extra effort and educational success are the norm (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). In turn, these high expectations for action create a norm that encourages all teachers to do what it takes to excel. Schools that formally turn over instructionally relevant school decisions to teachers tend to have higher levels of perceived collective efficacy. Collective efficacy beliefs, in turn, foster commitment to school goals and gains in student achievement (Goddard et al., 2004). Collective efficacy beliefs serve to encourage certain actions and constrain others. The more teachers have the opportunity to influence instructionally relevant

school decisions, the more likely a school is to be characterized by a robust sense of collective efficacy.

Self-efficacy beliefs and collective efficacy have a mutual influence in relationships. Principals should work to have the opportunity to build collective efficacy through the experiences they provide for teachers. Enabling faculty members to exert some control over school decisions may be one approach to strengthening collective efficacy beliefs in schools (Goddard et al., 2004). When collective efficacy is high, teachers in a school believe they can reach their students and that they can overcome negative external influences (Hoy & Tarter, 1997). Given these beliefs, teachers are more persistent in their efforts; they plan more; they accept responsibility for student achievement; and temporary setbacks or failures do not discourage them. Strong collective efficacy perceptions not only enhance individual teacher performance, they also influence the pattern of shared beliefs held by organizational members (Goddard, et al., 2000). Principals can help to cultivate and nourish strong collective efficacy beliefs through communicating confidence in the ability of teachers to promote student learning (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Organizational Learning

Education research reveals that most school variables, considered separately, have small effects on learning**.** The real payoff comes when individual variables combine to influence student learning. Creating the conditions under which that can occur is the job of the principal (Seashore Louis et al., 2010). The York Region District School Board found that shared beliefs and principal leadership were within the top five strategies that improve literacy achievement in students (Fullan & Knight, 2011). In a study in Ontario, literacy and numeracy competency percentages have increased 14 percent across schools "where coaches and instructionally-

focused administrators work together" (Fullan & Knight, 2011, p. 52). According to research, leadership should include capacity building for all (Creighton, 2005). The idea is that leadership is a property of the organizational network itself and that every person within a structure should play a leadership role. Leadership development becomes a process, not an event (Perkins, 2007). Leadership requires letting go and giving over. It involves creating conditions so others can succeed (Corregan, 2001; Creighton, 2005). If these types of environments are not created, people do not feel psychologically safe; they are anxious, and that keeps them from probing deeply into what works and what does not work (Higgins, 2007). Themes central to organizational learning include the leader as coach, distributed leadership, systems learning, and influence.

Leader as Coach

Wise and Hammock (2011) believe schools that are utilizing leaders as coaches have the highest correlation with best practices, and coaches help facilitate professional learning. As coaches interact with colleagues within the school day in a coaching pattern, teachers develop the expectation that thoughtful, mediative questions are the norm and begin to develop an embedded capacity for deeper thinking. Not only does the faculty develop reflective thinking skills, but Allison (2010) explained the more a leader coaches individuals, the more the leader grows in leadership skills as well as coaching skills. Leaders who coach the people around them gain more time and energy to lead, and these coaches gain more ownership and accountability for their actions (Allison, 2010; Allison et al., 2011; Reeves & Allison, 2009).

Connections made through trusting coaching relationships free up teachers to take on new challenges (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011, p.13). Leaders who coach within the organization where they work must take extra care to create conditions of safety and trust where

coachees feel they can say what needs to be said (Allison et al., 2011). The school leader as coach is one way to frame and understand the role of instructional leadership that fosters a culture of trust. Coaches assist people in moving forward toward their goals through conversation and interpersonal relationships. The coach knows when to push and when to back off, based on the needs of the situation. Coaches show genuine concern for both the task at hand and the welfare of those who have to accomplish that task (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

Coaching provides the tools necessary to help facilitate tough conversations while still allowing the coach to maintain empathy for the coachee (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Tough conversations are held due to the coach's expertise in showing empathy and maintaining a non-judgmental stance. The leader who undertakes the role as a mediator of thinking listens without judgment (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Ellison & Hayes, 2006). In this environment, trust is established, allowing the leader to deal with difficult problems, often overlooked or ignored, and help staff members learn and grow as individuals. Leaders with a growth mindset have a deep concern with, and give attention to, personnel development (Collins, 2001; Dweck, 2009).

The principal within the school building has a great effect on student achievement and must be acknowledged as an integral part of a successful coaching program. Studies have shown that the leadership sets the tone for all aspects of the culture that exists within the building (Seashore Louis et al., 2010). Many of the components of coaching, such as establishing goals and expectations for specific teaching approaches, drawing on strategic resources, and planning how best to implement the curriculum, are aligned to leadership practices that positively impact student achievement (Allison et al., 2011, Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Wise & Hammock, 2011). The specific leadership action of coaching is positively associated with student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Robinson et al., 2008). Successful coaching

programs exist where the teacher and principal relationship is a cohesive dynamic with a trusting relationship (Fullan & Knight, 2011). Barth (1990) stated the relationship between the teacher and principal has the greatest effect on the quality of life within a school.

Badaracco (2002) said that true leadership is not grand or heroic. It occurs in small steps as people are guided by humility, practicality, and common sense. These leaders look below the surface (Badaracco, 2002). Leading from below the surface involves expanding decision-making beyond formal and obvious places, such as classrooms, and leading in aspects, such as the political and symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Creighton, 2005). For example, effective principals make decisions in hallways, not just in their offices (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Creighton, 2005). A coaching style of leadership involves the feelings, beliefs, and values of others (Creighton, 2005). Leading from below the surface requires looking at the unconscious level, the part that shapes people's beliefs and perceptions (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Creighton, 2005). Leading from the symbolic and political frame requires the most attention and emphasis in effectively leading schools (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Creighton, 2005). Coaching for school leaders is vital, not only to develop individual leadership capacity, but also to develop the school system as a whole (Devine, Meyers, & Houssemand, 2013).

Goleman (2000) stated that a necessary trait in an effective coach is one where the leader promotes development in others for the future and invests in their capacity building. Effective leadership comes from principals, influential teachers, and staff teams. Leadership from all sources is associated with better student performance on math and reading tests (Mourshed et al., 2010; Seashore Louis et al., 2010). Devine et al., (2013) concurred when they assert effective educational leaders create environments that foster capacity development and reinforce and

sustain ongoing learning. Fullan and Knight (2011) called for coaches to be system leaders and change agents.

Effective principals help define and promote high expectations; they attack teacher isolation and fragmented effort; and they connect directly with teachers and the classroom (Seashore Louis et al., 2010). Creasy and Paterson (2005) described seven action implications that are imperative for school leaders. They are (a) to develop a system, first develop yourself, (b) make sense of the whole, (c) create systems, (d) focus on principles, (e) equip staff with coaching skills, (f) review and reward good coaching practice, (g) use and build external links and networks. "Connections made through trusting coaching relationships free up teachers to take on new challenges" (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011, p. 13). The school leader as coach is one way to frame and understand the role of instructional leadership that fosters a culture of trust. Coaches assist people in moving their goals forward through conversation and their way of interacting with people. They know when to push and when to back off, based on the needs of the situation. They show genuine concern for both the task at hand and the welfare of those who have to accomplish that task (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

Murphy (1988) discussed the unheroic side of leadership, describing six things leaders undertake, which are necessary to develop a high-performing culture. The six items include (a) developing a shared vision, (b) asking questions, (c) coping with weakness, (d) listening and acknowledging, (e) depending on others, and (f) letting go. "These unheroic and seemingly obvious activities capture the time, attention, intellect, and emotions of administrative leaders who often work off-stage to make educational organizations succeed" (Murphy, 1988, p. 655). Leadership is painful, as even well-adjusted managers experience real psychological pain and suffering on the job. Educational leaders are working "at the frontier of social change, where it

is easy to make mistakes and where our every move and utterance is scrutinized closely" (Murphy, 1998, p. 655). Leaders often compound their pain by beating themselves up with evaluations of their agonizing predicaments" (Houston, Blankstein, & Cole, 2007; Murphy, 1988; Murphy, 2009; Silbaugh, 2008). Educational leaders are facing an overwhelming work-load as attempts are made at moving schools forward.

School leaders from the principal to the coach need to continue their professional learning in order to encourage their constituents' continued growth (Foord & Haar, 2012). In order to learn and grow as a leader of coaches and staff, the principal must have a thorough understanding and knowledge of the propositions, capabilities, and beliefs of a coaching model, such as in Cognitive Coaching. Successful leaders provide both feedback and involve themselves in coaching (Kouzes & Posner, 1998). A leader's involvement in coaching then leads to the understanding that coaching is fully integrated into a school system. As a result, both beginning teachers and experienced teachers exhibit growth within their own perceptions of their teaching (Arrington, 2010; Eger, 2006; Reeves, 2008; Rennick, 2002; Rinaldi, 2013).

Distributed Leadership

Outstanding leaders seek innovative ideas from all team members (Fullan, 2014). The basics of successful leadership include "setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization" (Fullan, 2010, p. 76). The concept of distributed leadership overlaps substantially with shared, collaborative, democratic, and participative leadership concepts. Distributed leadership assumes a set of practices that "are enacted by people at all levels rather than a set of personal characteristics and attributes located in people at the top" (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003, p. 22). The role of the leader is to enable, facilitate, and cause peers to interact in a focused manner. Peer interaction is the "social glue of focus and cohesion" (Fullan, 2010, p.

77). System reform will not become fully implemented if only the leaders are engaged in it. System reform takes the work of the teachers as well as the principals. "The best leaders make people feel good about working on and making progress relative to a tough problem or set of circumstances" (Fullan, 2010, p. 74). Coaching is a form of distributed leadership. The focus of coaching is on the in-depth development of "specific knowledge, skills, and strategies of the coachee" (Creasy & Paterson, 2005, p. 62). Embracing teacher leadership does not diminish the role of the principal and other administrators; it only contributes to the overall health of the organization (Reeves, 2008). Coaching is distributed leadership in that the decision-making ability is brought to light for all members of the organization.

Gronn (2002) distinguished two basic forms of distributed leadership, additive and holistic. Additive forms entail the dispersal of leadership tasks among members across the organization without explicit consideration of interactions by those members. Additive distributed leadership is most commonly accepted within education settings, which is essentially sharing the workload. Holistic forms of distributed leadership include attention to high levels of interdependence of both the leader and the group members (Gronn, 2002). These holistic forms assume that the totality of leaders' work adds up to more than the sum of the parts and that there are high levels of interdependence among those providing leadership. Holistic forms of distributed leadership produce leadership activities which emerge from social processes, which in turn, lead to learning for the individuals involved as well as for their organizations. The extent and nature of coordination in the exercise of influence across members of the organization is a critical challenge from a holistic perspective. Interdependence between two or more organizational members may be based on role overlap or complementarily of skills and knowledge (Gronn, 2002).

Barth (1990) said it has become increasingly important for the principal to share leadership and to no longer even aspire to fully understand and control every aspect of the school. Things effective principals accomplish include (a) shaping a vision of academic success for all students, (b) creating a climate hospitable to education, (c) cultivating leadership in others, and (d) improving instruction processes to foster school improvement (Seashore Louis et al, 2010). Collins (2001) suggested leadership should focus with great clarity on what is essential, what needs to be done, and how to get it done. Leaders help others confront problems in ways they have not yet been successfully addressed (Fullan, 2010). Successful leaders build a system where leadership is distributed throughout the organization, its development is embedded throughout the organization; and an assessment of the organization's capacity for leadership development ensures success (Bridwell-Mitchell, 2014).

Systems Learning

When principals and teachers share leadership, teachers' working relationships with one another are stronger, and student achievement is higher (Seashore Louis et al., 2010). There is a strong relationship between where a school system lies in their level of student improvement and the tightness of central control over the individual schools and activities (Seashore Louis et al., 2010). The report, *How Leadership Influences Student Learning,* by Seashore Louis et al., (2010), classified various school systems on the journey of improvement. Systems moving from what was classified as good to great were characterized as systems that cultivated peer-led learning for teachers and principals. Principals and teachers alike conducted the collaborative practice of meeting together and having conversations around student learning. The schools that ensured a journey from good to great emphasized shaping the professional development requirements for individuals, teams, and systems learning. The system itself cultivated

ownership in schools for improvement by introducing self-evaluation for schools and making performance data on the improvement process more readily accessible. School systems classified as moving from great to excellent were characterized as those that coordinated learning communities to create peer-led support and accountability to each other. These schools experienced a shift from central guidance to school-based collaboration and self-evaluation as performance levels increased. Schools that moved from great to excellent focused primarily on the professional learning of the adults. For a system's improvement journey to be sustained over the long term, the improvements had to be integrated into the very fabric of the system (Leithwood, et al., 2004).

Schools that develop and refine teaching talent through systematic, school-wide coaching become a high performance culture (Allison et al., 2011; Curtis & Wurtzel, 2010). Time and attention must be dedicated to reflecting on the deeply held values and beliefs, which will further promote systems thinking (Senge, 2006). When principals and schools implement a coaching program, adequate time must be given in order for the culture to change. Researchers recognize that implementation takes three to five years with clear, well-defined expectations (Fullan, 2001; Hall & Hord, 2001; Seashore Louis et al., 2010). In an attempt to improve learning and increase student achievement, schools adopt more than one innovation at a time, which leads to confusion and weakens the opportunity for successful implementation of any single change (Fullan 2001). Bryk and Schnieder's (2002) research with the Chicago Public Schools cited examples of the impact of multiple innovations at once. Bryk and Schneider (2002) described the Chicago public schools as "Christmas tree schools" because so many innovations started at once, the innovations became like decorations (p. 27).

Leithwood, et al., (2004) described three ways leaders make improvements in systems, which include establishing collaborative practices, developing a mediating layer between the schools and the center, and facilitating tomorrow's leadership. Each of these aspects of sustaining improvement is an interconnected and integral part of the system pedagogy. According to Creasy and Paterson (2005), a system of coaching is built from a desire to make a difference in student learning, a commitment to professional learning, a belief in the abilities of colleagues, and a commitment to developing emotional intelligence. This sort of coaching system is grounded in "establishing rapport and trust, listening for meaning, questioning and understanding, prompting action, reflection and learning, and developing confidence and celebrating success" (p. 4). The components of a coaching program become the ways of communicating in a coaching system. Coaching becomes an integral part of a system that is working toward being a successful school.

"Without coaching, many comprehensive reform efforts will fall short of real improvement" (Fullan & Knight, 2011, p. 50). The system itself must be organized, developed, and maintained in order for the conditions to promote instructional improvement. "Such reform drivers as capacity building, teamwork, pedagogy, and systemic reform are much more compatible with the strategies of good coaches" (Fullan & Knight, 2011, p. 50). Fullan and Knight go on to state "countries that had gone from great to excellent focused 78 percent of their interventions on professional learning and only 22 percent on accountability" (p. 51). The role of school principals must be played out on a systems level to get wide-spread and sustainable improvement (Fullan & Knight, 2011).

Influence

"Influence is the essence of leadership" (Yukl, 2009). The principal is second only to the teacher in terms of impact on student learning (Fullan, 2014; Seashore Louis et al., 2010). Conceptualization of the principal's role inhibits the influence that principals can maintain over instructional improvement in schools (Fullan, 2014). Aspects of new roles for the principal have been around for a while in the work of those focusing on collaborative cultures, learning communities, and capacity building (Fullan, 2010; Fullan, 2014). Kirtman (2013) found that influence for the sake of learning ranks high among effective leaders. These leaders influence others to learn and to take related action. The principal affects student learning indirectly, but nonetheless, explicitly (Fullan, 2014, Leithwood et al., 2010). Robinson (2011) established that leadership domains had significant effects on student achievement, including establishing goals and expectations and resourcing strategically. The most significant factor was leading teacher learning and development.

Robinson (2011) summarized three key leadership capabilities of importance in improving systemic change, which included applying relevant knowledge, solving complex problems, and building relational trust. In order for change to occur, the leader must work in a trusting relationship with staff members, and be able to apply knowledge to solve problems. Two critical components in implementing change is the principal's ability to make progress a collective endeavor for all staff members, and the principal's skills for leading professional learning. Leithwood et al., (2010) concluded that principals who had the greatest impact on student learning focused on instruction. This focus included teacher knowledge, skills, and motivation and ensured supportive working conditions, such as time for collaboration. Learning targeted at working relationships and improving instruction most greatly influenced student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2010). Bryk et al., (2010) found when school leadership was the

driver for change, the forces at work were the professional capacity of teachers, both individually and collectively, and the overall school climate.

School leaders who only emphasize institutional effectiveness concern themselves with performing similar and common goals as previous leadership. Educational leaders who add strategy to their influence within the school community begin to consider different ways of accomplishing the same and additional goals. Political capital is mostly formed by one's reputation and relationship with others (Creighton, 2005). When coaching is a holistic, multifaceted approach to learning and change, it has a key role to play in (a) education, (b) the classroom, (c) professional development, and (d) the creation of learning cultures (Corregan, 2001; Creighton, 2005). Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement (Fullan, 2010). While classroom teaching has the most important impact on student learning, school leadership comes a close second (Devine et al., 2013; Leithwood et al., 2004). School leadership has an important influence on the likelihood that teachers will change classroom practices, and leaders who work with teachers can significantly influence their instructional practices, which in turn, increases student learning (Devine et al., 2013).

In the role of lead learner, principals are crucial to fostering and integrating a system, which values and believes in teachers' abilities to influence student achievement. Bossidy and Charan (2002) explained, "good leaders regard every encounter as an opportunity to coach" (p. 74). The most effective and telling feedback teachers will receive is the purposeful interaction between and among teachers and the principal. In schools with a strong emphasis on relationships, everyone knows the principal is immersed in improving instruction. Rather than taking on the role of direct leadership in groups, principals become a participant within the

group. When the principal understands the role of leading learning, the school moves from an individualistic culture to a collaborative one (Fullan, 2014). Kirtman (2013) described a competent leader as one who builds trust through clear communication and expectations, focuses on team over self, and commits to continuous improvement for self.

Quality leaders multiply the intellect around them. Leadership is a critical force for leveraging the full capability of the organization (Wiseman, 2010). "Multipliers increase intelligence in people and in organizations. People actually get smarter and more capable around multipliers" (Wiseman, 2010, page 28). These leaders attract and optimize talent, create intensity that requires best thinking, extend challenges, debate decisions, and instill ownership and accountability. Multipliers are liberators who invite others to think. The liberator creates an environment where (a) ideas are generated with ease; (b) people learn rapidly and adapt to new environments; (c) people work collaboratively; (d) complex problems get solved; and (e) difficult tasks get accomplished (Wiseman, 2010).

School leaders have an important role to play in creating these learning cultures and linking them to the wider system (Devine et. al., 2013). The context of the work environment matters to which extent deep learning takes place. The type of people with whom principals surround themselves, and to whom they turn for counsel, has great impact on how they think about roles and challenges (Bridwell-Mitchell, 2014). Decision-making is choice making, and for the principal, it is how to make choices within constraints. The Bridwell-Mitchell study investigated two different ways of decision making, political or strategic (2014). This was comparative to Bolmen and Deal's (2008) work of the political, symbolic, and human resource frame. When principals framed their work as political, they turned to advisors who were trustworthy and had influence. When principals framed problems as being strategic, they turned

to people who were accessible and had resources. This finding supported investing in shared decision-making (Bridwell-Mitchell, 2014).

Coaching

There are many different types of coaching that school districts employ. The basis for why there are different styles goes beyond just meeting the needs of the individual school district. Different coaching styles are being implemented based on beliefs about how individuals learn and what the individual learner needs (Duessen, Coskie, Robinson, & Autio, 2007). Coaching does not need to be an additional initiative. It can be an extrinsic element of other developmental and school improvement initiatives that already exist. Senge (1990) stated, "Learning is not an 'add-on,' to be done when we have some free time or at training sessions. Some of the most significant innovations have been in infrastructures and day-to-day practices, allowing teams and intact work groups to integrate working and learning" (pp. 280-281). The many different types of educational coaching styles could be categorized into directive coaching or reflective coaching.

There is debate about whether coaching should be directive and prescriptive, telling teachers how to teach, or collegial and "targeted at enhancing the teachers' capacity for self reflection" (Duessen et al., 2007, p.5). In the directive model, the coach plays the role of an expert, identifying a teacher's specific area of weakness, or helping teachers implement a specific component of a program. The roles and responsibilities of a coach vary as to the individual needs of the coachee. According to Killion and Harrison (2006), the roles require a specific set of skills and knowledge. An instructional coach is a type of coach where strong content knowledge of the given subject is required (Killion & Harrison, 2006; Knight, 2009).

Literacy coaching is a component of instructional coaching, where emphasis is given to specific literacy skills (Toll, 2005; Knight, 2009).

In schools that have well-established cultures of coaching, not only does staff see coaching as an entitlement, a key element of their continuing professional development, but they also care about their responsibilities as professional learners (Creasy & Paterson, 2005). Schools with highly developed cultures of coaching commonly have links with other organizations and networks that support their work and provide new expertise, knowledge, and stimulus for reflection and development (Creasy & Paterson, 2005; Knight, 2011). Coaching can benefit teachers by promoting active reflection on current practices (Boatright et al., 2008).

Coaching for self-reflection entails the teacher and coach to work together to raise questions about the effectiveness of instruction. Cognitive Coaching is described in Knight's (2009) book, *Coaching: Approaches and Perspectives*, as a coaching approach where reflection, complex thinking, and transformational learning, are seen as the driving practice (Ellison & Hayes, 2003). For example, the components of Cognitive Coaching can be applied at times when a coach needs to have an instructional or literacy coaching conversation.

Cognitive Coaching

Differing from other models, Cognitive Coaching focuses on thinking, which is the source of the behavior (Costa & Garmston, 2003). Numerous studies have investigated the influence of Cognitive Coaching on teachers' thought processes, self-directed learning, and reflective thinking (Edwards, 2013). Cognitive Coaching is used to improve the collaborative culture of schools and to embed self-directed learning. Trust is a basic premise and communicates a positive meditational relationship. Cognitive Coaching explores how the person currently thinks and begins to dive into the area of thinking that is unexplored. The use of

Cognitive Coaching as a professional development model impacted teachers and students in several studies (Bjerken, 2013; Costa & Garmston, 2003; Rennick, 2002; Schlosser, 1998). Teachers who worked in Cognitive Coaching programs reported that the training reduced their sense of isolation and helped them grow in trust (Dougherty, 2000). The focus of Cognitive Coaching is to foster self-direction within the people who are being coached (Costa et al., 2014).

A focus of Cognitive Coaching is to capitalize on internal criteria for success (Costa et al., 2014). Skillful leaders work to liberate the vast pool of teachers' internal resources, which are their states of mind. Cognitive Coaching lists that there are five states of mind within which one must operate in order to balance himself/herself as an individual and develop his/her relationship to the group (Costa & Garmston, 2002). The states of mind Costa and Garmston (2002) defined are (a) efficacy, (b) flexibility, (c) interdependence, (d) consciousness, and (e) craftsmanship. Educators who applied the states of mind in their daily work also found them to be transforming and transformative for the school culture (Costa et al., 2014). Teachers who used Cognitive Coaching at least four times showed gains in the five states of mind (Ushijima, 1996). Teachers who were coached scored significantly higher on state of mind of interdependence than did a matched control group who had not experienced Cognitive Coaching (Alseike, 1997). The internal resources, or states of mind, were woven throughout all of Cognitive Coaching, with the coach constantly encouraging members to draw upon those resources (Ellison & Hayes, 2003).

Teachers using Cognitive Coaching reflected more deeply on their practice at the end of a project than at the beginning (McLymont & daCosta, 1998). In the Smith (1997) study on Cognitive Coaching teachers increased in their abilities to think reflectively on qualitative measures of reflection. They also grew in appreciation for the value of self-reflection.

Principals emphasized how their teachers grew in self-reflection skills after using Cognitive Coaching (Edwards & Newton, 1994). When there are more interactions between coach and coachee, teachers ability to think reflectively was strengthened (Edwards, 1993). Coaching brings an increase in the ability to self-reflect, with master teachers, student teachers, and nurses (Brooks, 2000; Maskey 2009). The Alsieke (1997) study on Cognitive Coaching found a significant difference in teachers' interdependence state of mind after receiving both formal and informal coaching. Deeper reflection during coaching gave participants more precision with their thinking and reflecting skills, resulting in refinements of their instructional strategies (Alseike, 1997; Bjerken, 2013; Schlosser, 1998).

The leader who takes on the role as a mediator of thinking listens without judgment (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Senge, 2006). In this environment, trust is established, allowing the leader to deal with difficult problems often overlooked or ignored, and to help staff members learn and grow as individuals. Cognitive Coaching provides the tools necessary to help facilitate tough conversations, and allows the coach to maintain empathy for the coachee (Costa & Garmston, 2002).

One proposition of Cognitive Coaching is that all humans continue to grow cognitively (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Ellison & Hayes, 2006), and a growth-minded leader starts with a belief in human potential and development (Dweck, 2006). Developing the qualities of successful leadership takes time. Gladwell (2008) found that practice, ten years, which typically amounts to ten thousand hours, was key to most successful endeavors. Feedback must be provided frequently (Reeves, 2008). The components of Cognitive Coaching, such as providing data with mediative questions, help provide the feedback necessary for the principal to give the teacher. Kluger (2008) showed how one pursues too many targets or goals, including many of

the wrong ones. Cognitive Coaching helps the thinker choose a goal and work toward that goal. Leadership working towards change involves listening to and learning from others, and forthrightly addressing people's concerns (Fullan, 2010).

Summary

A leader who undertakes the identity of a Cognitive Coach knows the tenets of trust, self-direction, collaboration, reflection, energy sources, and leadership must be fully integrated, as each one cannot stand on its own (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Senge, 1990). A focus on collective efficacy (Goddard et al., 2000) and trust (Bryk & Schnieder, 2002; Tschanen-Moran, 2004) is essential to creating a collaborative culture. "All groups possess collective mental models" (Garmston, 2012, p.94). Schools should engage in the professional learning of all teachers in the educational system. Once teacher capacity reaches a certain level, collaborative peer learning becomes the most powerful source of continuing learning and innovation (Seashore Louis et al., 2010).

Chapter Two contained the Review of Literature, in which the major themes of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning were explored. Chapter Three is a description of the methodology involved in this study. Chapter Four contains the presentation of the findings, and Chapter Five is a summary with implications.

Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

This study aimed to define what deeply embedded practice looks like in the elementary school setting through the lens of Cognitive Coaching. The study explored principals' perceptions of the implementation process and determined factors that facilitated and inhibited building-wide implementation. This study also considered the perceptions of teachers and staff members working within the school environment who embraced Cognitive Coaching as a means for professional growth. The problem in existence is that it is difficult to create a deeply embedded school reform initiative. This case study examined two school cultures and gained insight into what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like, according to principals' perceptions. A qualitative methodology of a case study was utilized as the design of this study. The researcher purposefully selected principals who met specific criteria established for the participants. To determine the perceptions of participants concerning the factors of a deeply embedded culture, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the participants. The researcher developed the interview guide based on the five effective deeply embedded cultural practices that emerged from the literature. This chapter includes a description of the participants and how they were selected as well as the details of the research setting and design.

Participants

The participants in this qualitative study included two principals from school districts in southwest Missouri who were purposefully selected by the researcher using criterion sampling (Creswell, 2012). Practicing principals were selected because they would be able to offer first

hand knowledge of the components necessary to implement a deeply embedded environment. "Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed; that is, how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (Merriam, 1998, p.6). After determining the two participants of the study, an interview with each principal was conducted. After the interview with the principal, the researcher was given four names of teachers within the school who were available for an interview. The four teachers at each of the participant's schools were trained in Cognitive Coaching and were recommended by the principal at the building. This met the guidelines of purposeful sampling as outlined by Creswell (2012). The geographic location of the participants was limited due to the qualitative nature of the study, the logistics of conducting interviews, and the availability of participants who met the qualifications. It is typical in qualitative studies to use some form of convenience sampling based on time or location of participants (Merriam, 1998). This study also incorporated criterion sampling to assure quality participants were selected in order to determine factors of a deeply embedded environment (Creswell, 2012).

Selection/Sampling

This researcher used a purposeful sampling strategy in order to select individuals or sites for this study. Criterion sampling can provide valuable insight to the research questions and purpose of the study (Creswell, 2012; Merriam, 1998). Merriam (1998) stated, "The criteria you establish for purposeful sampling directly reflect the purpose of the study and guide in the identification of information-rich cases" (p. 61). Criterion sampling is useful for quality assurance (Creswell, 2012). To select participants who met the qualifications of deep implementation, the Thinking Collaborative organization was contacted to receive a list of participants who had successfully attended the six-day Cognitive Coaching Advanced Training

Seminar. For the purposes of this study, the list was narrowed to those participants who were building-level principals. Two principals from the southwest Missouri area were identified from this list. While there have been many people trained in the initial eight-day training of Cognitive Coaching Foundations Seminar, and multiple groups trained in Advanced Cognitive Coaching, only two people currently serving as building-level principals had completed both trainings. After the two principals were selected, their particular school environments were explored through the lens of a case study. Data was collected through the use of interviews, observations, and documents that provided descriptive data of the implementation process at each of the buildings.

After determining the two participants of the study, four teachers within each participant's school were interviewed. The four teachers at each of the participant's schools were trained in Cognitive Coaching and were recommended by the principal at the building. This met the guidelines of purposeful sampling as outlined by Creswell (2012). Of the four teachers interviewed at each site, two were regular classroom teachers at the building, one was a counselor, and one worked in a support role for the staff. Therefore, at each of the two sites, five different individuals were interviewed for a total of ten different interviews conducted for the purpose of a case study.

Observations took place at various times and in various settings. Each building site observation included a whole-group faculty meeting led by the principal, and a small-group meeting, where the principal was a participant in the meeting. In addition, a team-planning meeting was observed where the teachers were planning an upcoming instructional unit and reflecting on a previous unit taught. Ten participant interviews and six observations of meetings took place over a five-month time span.

Research Setting

The research was conducted at two elementary schools in southwest Missouri that have principals who highly value Cognitive Coaching. The sites were chosen based on the principals of these schools having both attended the Cognitive Coaching Foundation Seminar and the Cognitive Coaching Advanced Seminar. Only two building-level principals in the geographic location had completed both trainings. The setting was limited geographically to the location of the researcher, as multiple site visits took place over a five-month period and school proximity to the researcher was a viable issue. The researcher was employed full time as an elementary assistant principal and needed to maintain a work schedule during this study.

The researcher had no previous knowledge of the level of Cognitive Coaching implementation within these two specific school environments prior to the interviews and observations. The assumption was that principals who had undertaken Advanced Training had attempted to embed Cognitive Coaching into their school cultures. The ability to develop relationships and trust with the participants was facilitated by the fact that the researcher was a trainer for Cognitive Coaching, had thorough understanding of the components described, and utilized the tools of Cognitive Coaching throughout the interviews and observations.

The two principals in the southwest Missouri area who had completed the Cognitive Coaching training were the building-level leaders at their schools. Both schools were given fictitious names to protect the anonymity of the principals and teachers at the schools. One school, Washington Intermediate School (Washington), is a school of over 800 students in rural Missouri and is a building attendance center containing grades four, five, and six. The other school, Lincoln Elementary School (Lincoln), is a school of 430 students in a populated area of southwest Missouri and is a neighborhood school containing grades kindergarten through fifth

grade. Both Washington and Lincoln were involved in other school reform initiatives. Washington Intermediate School had teachers who attended Adaptive Schools. Lincoln Elementary School was an International Baccalaureate School. This researcher kept the focus on Cognitive Coaching through the structuring of the interview questions as outlined on the Interview Protocol (Appendix E), and through the observations, as outlined in the Observation Matrix (Appendix F).

Research Design

The study used a qualitative analysis to measure the perceptions of principals who were defined as having an advanced level of training of Cognitive Coaching. The method of inquiry was a qualitative case study that included one-on-one interviews with each of the participants. Member checking then took place, with participants being provided a word-for-word transcript of each interview and an opportunity to change any thoughts or add to the thinking with a follow-up reflection on the experience. Observations of three different types of meetings, large group, small group, and team planning took place in order for the researcher to capture a larger picture of the workings of the school system. The interviews, triangulated with textual data and observations, provided the information to tell the story of the implementation process and extended the researcher's understanding of the implementation process.

The design of this study utilized a qualitative case study methodology. Gay, Mills, and Arisian (2009) described the components of a qualitative research as multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, descriptive, and naturalistic approach to subject matter. This means qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of the phenomena of interest. Qualitative research involves a variety of data collection techniques including personal experiences, interviews, observational and textual data that "contribute to an

understanding of the phenomenon under study" (Gay et al., 2009, p. 366). The personal experiences explored in this study included the perceptions of principals who had attended advanced training of Cognitive Coaching. The personal experiences explored also included four staff members from each building who may have been involved in the implementation of Cognitive Coaching within the school setting. Of the four teachers interviewed at each site, two were regular classroom teachers at the building, one was a counselor, and one worked in a support role for the staff. Therefore, at each of the two sites, five different individuals were interviewed for a total of ten different interviews conducted for the purpose of the case study.

Two purposefully selected building principals who met all the criteria for selection were contacted for participation in this study. The researcher contacted each possible participant by email to request his or her participation in this study. After indicating a willingness to be included in the study, a second email was sent. This email contained a letter (Appendix A) explaining the purpose of the study, the selection of participants, and the structure of the interview process. An informed consent form (Appendix B) and an interview guide (Appendix E) containing the questions to be asked during the interview were also provided to each potential participant. After the initial interview with the building principal, the same format was followed with the teachers, counselor, and support staff member.

Observational data was collected at whole-group faculty meetings led by the principal, small-group meetings in which the principal participated, and team planning sessions. Textual data collected and analyzed included the principals' Cognitive Coaching self-reflections, principals' written email communications with staff members, meeting agendas, and strategic improvement plans. Case studies and rich narrative descriptions can provide the story behind the numbers for educational research. Because qualitative research typically provides detailed

observations about a limited number of subjects, the results cannot be generalized to a large population (Reeves, 2008).

A pilot group of area principals and teachers, who would describe themselves as valuing Cognitive Coaching, but did not meet the established criteria of the study, was utilized in order to check for the validity of the interview questions. This pilot group consisted of one southwest Missouri building principal and two teachers who had the initial eight-day Foundation Training of Cognitive Coaching but have not attended the Advanced Cognitive Coaching Training. The pilot group members were interviewed using the same interview questions as utilized in the study in order to determine if the answers would help to validate the overall research questions of the study. The narrative data collected in the pilot study contributed to continuing the study. Suggestions were made by the pilot group members and were used to revise interview questions and format of the interview. The pilot group interview questions did help contribute to the knowledge of what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like.

Triangulation occurred in order to ensure reliability and validity through the use of pilot groups, member checks, and peer reviews. Pilot groups, member checks, and peer reviews provided opportunities for clarification and deeper understanding. Stake (2010) stated that, "Triangulation substantiated an interpretation or clarified different meanings with the interviewee" (p. 173). Audio recordings were listened to multiple times and transcripts were reviewed by the researcher and participants for clarification of specific points. Review of recordings and transcripts provided instances to triangulate information among interviewees and with observational data. Transcriptions were reviewed by the participants who were asked for a confirmation of accuracy. Member checks were conducted with the study participants before it was shared in final form (Gay et al., 2009).

After member checks were conducted with the ten interviews, thorough data analysis occurred in order to look for emerging themes. The data analysis included writing margin notes within field notes, writing reflective passages in notes, drafting a summary sheet of field notes, noting patterns and themes, counting frequency of codes, and making contrasts and comparisons (Miles, Huberman, Saldana, 2014).

Instrumentation

Stake (2010) described qualitative research as assuming "that knowledge is constructed rather than just discovered" (p. 99). This study was designed to construct meaning through the examination of the principals' perceptions of the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching. This study utilized qualitative research methodology (Stake, 2010). Stake defined an instrumental case study as one that "provides information and insight into specific issues for understanding" (p. 3). Interviews, observations, and textual data provided the information and data to tell the story of the implementation process at each campus. Interviews provided the major source of data. These interviews focused on the staff perceptions of what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like based on the critical components of successful schools from Leithwood et al., (2004).

Interviews. Interview data consisted of both field notes and audio transcriptions. The interviews transpired over a five-month period. Each interview session was transcribed through the use of a transcription service. Participants were provided member checks after the interview in order to review statements and add any additional statements. The researcher first conducted interviews with the building principals of Washington Intermediate School and Lincoln Elementary School. The research question protocol guided the questions during the interviews (Appendix E). The protocol contained questions that probed for understanding of the basic

research questions. These questions provided a schema around which to construct meaning and deepen the understanding of the implementation process. The following research questions guided the study:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching Culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?
2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

After each building-level principal was interviewed, the principal provided names of teachers within the building who had been trained in Cognitive Coaching and would be available for interviews. Of the four teachers interviewed at each site, two were regular classroom teachers at the building, one was a counselor, and one worked in a support role for the staff. Therefore, at each of the two sites, five different individuals were interviewed for a total of ten different interviews conducted for the purpose of the case study.

Observations. The observations focused on conversations at whole-group faculty meetings that were led by the principal, small-group meetings in which the principal participated, and team planning meetings in which the principal was not present. The whole-group faculty meeting at Washington Intermediate School was held after school hours, and the whole-group faculty meeting at Lincoln Elementary School took place before school hours. The small-group meeting at Washington Intermediate School was conducted during a staff-training day in which students were still in session, and release time was provided to teachers through the use of

substitute teachers. The small-group meeting at Lincoln Elementary School transpired on a student early-release day in which students had an early dismissal, and teachers had the remainder of the afternoon to work without instructing. The team planning meetings observed at both schools occurred during the normal regular planning times provided to teachers on a weekly and daily basis. The observations provided the opportunity to document the principals' and teachers' uses of the Cognitive Coaching tools and processes at the school sites in varied settings. Observations were recorded as field notes and analyzed for content. The field notes were then recorded into the guidelines of the observation matrix (Appendix F). The observation matrix was further analyzed for emerging themes and patterns.

Textual Data. Documents and textual data containing information related to the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching model and to the training and implementation of Cognitive Coaching were collected both within the district and at the campus sites. These included documentation of the implementation process and trainings provided by personnel at the campus level. Both school sites' principals completed a Cognitive Coaching self-reflection assessment document. Data was collected that pertained to strategic improvement plans and the ways Cognitive Coaching was a factor in the plans. Principal communication with staff members through selected teacher emails was reviewed. Whole faculty meeting agendas, small-group meeting agendas, and team planning agendas were collected.

Assuring Trustworthiness

Validity and reliability were in the constant thought process of the researcher's mind as should be with any qualitative study. Validity and reliability of this study were addressed as the researcher designed the study, collected and analyzed data, and presented the data (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Triangulation of the data was a key component of this study. The actual

ethical practice in a qualitative study is determined by the researcher's own values and ethics (Merriam, 1998). While conducting this study, the researcher maintained and utilized her personal high level of integrity and character.

The validity of this study was addressed through triangulation involving pilot group review, member checks, and peer examinations and clarifying the researcher's biases (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Triangulation in this study involved using multiple sources of data from interviews, observations, and collected documents to confirm the findings with the review of literature. Member checks were incorporated as the researcher shared the transcriptions of the interviews with all interviewees. The researcher used peer examinations by asking colleagues to comment and offer insight on the emerging findings of the study. The researcher attempted to reveal any biases by clarifying initial involvement in Cognitive Coaching and personal assumptions throughout this study. The researcher believed the findings from this study would add to the existing research and literature on Cognitive Coaching, as well as extend to the knowledge base for deep implementation and sustainability of a Cognitive Coaching culture.

The reliability of this study was enhanced by the investigator's position, triangulation, and an audit trial (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). The investigator's position that a study on factors promoting deep implementation of a Cognitive Coaching environment was supported by the third edition of the Cognitive Coaching sourcebook (Costa & Garmston, 2016). This edition provided updated recommendations for future research. The recommendations included asking questions pertaining to the impact of Cognitive Coaching on principals, school staff, self-directedness, and implementation. This researcher is an agency trainer for Cognitive Coaching and has knowledge of factors that support implementation in a school setting. Triangulation for this study included using multiple methods, sources, and levels of data analysis. The researcher

created an audit trail by describing in detail how the data was collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the study (Merriam, 1998).

Data Analysis

Stake (2010) contended "the qualitative researcher concentrates on an instance, trying to pull it apart and put it back together again to make more meaningful analysis and synthesis in direct interpretation" (p. 75). Looking at the combination of instances within the school environment helped gain the greater perspective of what comprised a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. Data viewed through the lens of successful schools was analyzed with the intent to determine the principals' perceptions of the implementation process. Memoing was used throughout the entire process by this researcher in order to reflect and record insights, which could later be analyzed. Data was analyzed through the use of key words or phrases for common categories or patterns that shaped further data collection points and questions. Data was carefully segmented into readable data, which was then coded into similar categories. Once the data was coded, a description was developed from the data. Themes were then defined from the data, and themes were connected and interrelated.

Interviews were audio recorded, listened to multiple times by the researcher, and transcribed by a transcription company. Data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously and continued throughout this part of the study (Creswell, 2012). Triangulation of interviews was conducted through member checking of interviewees (Merriam, 1998). Interviews were sent to the interview participants with an opportunity to clarify any previous statements and offer additional statements. Several of the interviewees did respond with clarifications and additional notes. The researcher then made these adjustments to the transcribed interview.

The process of open coding guided the analytical procedures in order for the researcher to code major categories and themes (Strauss & Corbin, 2015). Data was viewed through the lens of successful school traits, gleaned from the comprehensive review of literature, which include: (a) establishing trusting relationships within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (d) developing organizational learning to take place within the school. These five components formed the basis of the interview guide and served as the structure for exploring how principals develop a deeply embedded and high-performing professional culture.

The basic research questions were utilized to analyze information to develop codes and understanding of the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching. Throughout the data analysis process, data was coded using tentative categories. Interview audio recordings were transcribed in order to identify evolving patterns. Data was analyzed for emerging patterns during the study, and meaning was continuously constructed by chunking key phrases together around themes or patterns (Gay et al., 2009).

The researcher took very seriously the challenge of presenting valid and reliable data in a qualitative case study. Careful examination of each interview took place. Each of the ten interviews was first read in their entirety with overall themes summarized by the researcher. Then each interview was viewed individually with a reading of the question followed by the response while notes were paraphrased to the side in a handwritten format. On the third reading of the interview, the researcher ignored the questions, paying attention to only the respondent's answers. New themes emerged through this process, and the notes were handwritten into the printed interview. On the fourth reading of each interview, the question was first read, then the answer read, and the researcher's summarized notes were typed. On the fifth

reading of each interview, the question was ignored and only the respondent's answers were read and summarized in a typed format. Finally, all handwritten notes were typed as well. This tedious process transpired in order to ensure that both surface level responses and the underlying richness of the answers were viewed multiple times and in multiple formats. With all of the notes now merged, paraphrases could be analyzed in order to begin viewing potential themes (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Miles et. al, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 2015).

The interview data were first compiled by question with each series of responses identified. The themes that emerged from each question were noted. The data analysis included writing margin notes within field notes, writing reflective passages in notes, drafting a summary sheet of field notes, noting patterns and themes, counting frequency of codes, and making contrasts and comparisons (Miles et al., 2014).

The emerging themes were then sent to a team of peer reviewers familiar with both Cognitive Coaching and qualitative research, in order to continue to work towards triangulation of the data (Merriam, 1998). Notes from the ten interviewees and twelve questions were paraphrased and sent in the form of interview notes. Open and axial coding was used as the notes were organized into a table connected to the five major themes that emerged from the review of literature as well as the subcategories that were present within each theme (Strauss & Corban, 2015). Finally, frequency counting of the themes occurred, which highlighted the major themes (Creswell, 2007).

While the majority of the research data was derived in the form of interviews, similar processes were followed when analyzing both the observation data and the document data. Notes were first handwritten in the form of field notes. These notes were then scrutinized on several instances in order to paraphrase into researcher notes. The notes were then organized

into themes using the observation matrix, which originated from the review of literature. The themes were then narrowed, and frequency counting occurred (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Miles et. al, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 2015).

Summary

The main objective of this study was to examine factors that facilitate deep implementation of Cognitive Coaching. Chapter Three contained the description of the methodology involved in the study. The participants from this study were purposefully selected as building-level principals who had completed Foundation and Advanced Cognitive Coaching Seminars. Only two potential participants emerged from the geographic region. The two participant schools became the sites for the research. Research was conducted over a five-month period in the form of interviews, observations, and collected documents. Interviews took place with both the building-level principals and four staff members at each building. Triangulation occurred through the use of pilot groups, member checks, and peer reviews. Chapter Four is the presentation of the findings of the study, and Chapter Five is a summary with implications.

Chapter Four

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

Chapter Four presents the results of this case study, which examined what deeply embedded practice looks like in the elementary school setting through the lens of Cognitive Coaching. The study explored principals' perceptions of the implementation process and determined leadership factors that facilitated and inhibited building-wide implementation. This case study also considered the perceptions of teachers and staff members working within the school environment that embraced Cognitive Coaching as a means for professional growth. This case study aspired to expand understanding and knowledge by focusing on perceptions of how Cognitive Coaching can be deeply embedded. The study was viewed through the eyes of ten school participants at two school sites. Peer coaching had been developed in these educational settings to support leaders and colleagues in professional development leading to self-direction, collaboration, trust, and deep reflective thought, which can truly impact the entire culture of an organization (Ellison & Hayes, 2003; Costa & Garmston, 2003; Joyce & Showers, 2002). Interviews were conducted; documents were collected; and observations were made in the data collection portion of the case study. The theoretical framework for this study consisted of the following five critical components gleaned from the comprehensive review of literature: (a) establishing trusting relationships within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (e) developing organizational learning to take place within the school (Leithwood et al., 2004). These five components formed the basis of the interview guide and observation matrix. The five components served as the structure for exploring how principals develop a deeply embedded and

high-performing professional culture. The guiding themes for this qualitative study were chosen from the review of literature, and emerged throughout the interviews and observations. The guiding themes contributed to the possibility of answering the guiding questions and promoted the validation of the study and aided in the direction of the study.

This case study involved semi-structured, in-depth interviews with ten participants, observations of six different meetings, and collection of documents from both school sites. Chapter Four is organized into three parts. Part I will focus on the participants and the setting. Part II will report the results of the data as it pertains to trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning. Part III will address the primary overarching questions that guided this investigation:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?
2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

Part I: Demographics of the participants

"We're very fortunate at our school to have teachers who want to grow, want to be challenged, and want to try new things." Counselor, Lincoln Elementary School

Participants

The participants from this study were purposefully selected as building-level principals who had completed Foundation and Advanced Cognitive Coaching Training Seminars. Only

two potential participants emerged from the geographic region; thus, those two participant schools became the sites for the research. Practicing principals were selected because they were able to offer first hand knowledge of the components necessary to implement a deeply embedded environment.

The principal at Washington Intermediate School (W1) is a certified trainer of Cognitive Coaching and has set in place a systematic plan to train all teachers over the course of the next several years. The principal at Washington has participated in, observed, and conducted multiple Cognitive Coaching Foundation Seminars. She described being on the Cognitive Coaching "journey" for over ten years and described how she uses it both personally and professionally.

The principal at Lincoln Elementary School has also been through Cognitive Coaching Foundation Seminar Training on more than one occasion, and sought out receiving Advanced Training. She described knowing the value of the training and working to get teachers in her building trained in Cognitive Coaching (L1).

After the interview with each of the building principals, the researcher was given four names of teachers within the school who were recommended by the principal at the building, were trained in Cognitive Coaching, and were available for an interview. Both the selection of the site and the participants in the study were selected "because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study" (Creswell, 2012, p. 156). The four staff members interviewed at the Washington Intermediate School site included a staff member, a behavior interventionist coach (W2), a counselor (W3), a sixth grade regular classroom teacher (W4), and a fourth grade regular classroom teacher (W5). The Lincoln Elementary School interviewees were comprised of a staff member, an instructional coach (L2), a counselor (L3), a fourth grade regular classroom teacher (L4), and a first grade regular

classroom teacher (L5). Therefore, at each of the two sites, five different individuals were interviewed for a total of ten different interviews conducted for the purpose of a case study.

Setting

Washington Intermediate School is a school of over 800 students in rural Missouri and is a building attendance center containing grades four, five, and six. The principal at this school also has an assistant principal who has attended Cognitive Coaching Foundation Seminar. Of the 42 certified staff members who work at Washington Intermediate School, 21 of them have been or are currently going through Cognitive Coaching training. Washington also had teachers attend Adaptive Schools, which is under the same parent organization as Cognitive Coaching.

Lincoln Elementary School is a school of 430 students in a populated area of southwest Missouri and is a neighborhood school containing grades kindergarten through five. Lincoln Elementary School is also an International Baccalaureate School where curriculum is conceptually based and not simply content driven. International Baccalaureate Schools place a large emphasis on teacher reflection after units have been taught. The researcher took careful considerations to structure reflection interview questions around processes related to Cognitive Coaching. This researcher kept the focus on Cognitive Coaching through the structuring of the interview questions as outlined on the Interview Protocol (Appendix E), and through the observations, as outlined in the Observation Matrix (Appendix F). Descriptions of the qualifications of being an International Baccalaureate School were present in Lincoln Elementary School teacher interviews. The principal and support staff member described International Baccalaureate and Cognitive Coaching as being complementary to one other. Lincoln Elementary School was already designated as an International Baccalaureate School before teachers there began to be trained in Cognitive Coaching. Cognitive Coaching is a natural

fit for an International Baccalaureate School as the tools and resources in the coaching program match the processes required for this type of school. Of the 28 certified staff members who work at Lincoln Elementary School, 18 of them have been or are currently going through Cognitive Coaching training.

Cognitive Coaching supports whole school reform processes. Washington Intermediate School had teachers who attended Adaptive Schools. Lincoln Elementary School was an International Baccalaureate School. The tools and processes associated with Cognitive Coaching appeared to amplify other reform implementations.

Interviews

An interview protocol was established from the major themes that emerged from the review of literature. This protocol was originally presented to the directed research committee and suggestions from the committee were noted, resulting in revisions to the interview protocol. Research surrounding Cognitive Coaching (Alsieke 1997; Costa & Garmston, 2002; Costa, Garmston, & Zimmerman, 2014; Garmston & Wellman, 1997; Knight, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, 2004) is in line with similar bodies of research on successful schools (Leithwood et al., 2004; Mourshed et al., 2010; Seashore Louis et al., 2010). It is the belief of the researcher that the critical components of successful schools according to Leithwood et al., (2004) are also the components of Cognitive Coaching practice. Therefore, according to the research, a school that is implementing Cognitive Coaching at a deep level could be considered a successful school.

The theoretical framework for this study consisted of the following five critical components gleaned from the comprehensive review of literature: (a) establishing trusting relationships within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (e)

developing organizational learning to take place within the school (Leithwood et al., 2004). These five components formed the basis of the interview guide and served as the structure for exploring how principals develop a deeply embedded and high-performing professional culture.

A pilot group of area principals and teachers, who would describe themselves as valuing Cognitive Coaching, but did not meet the established criteria of the study, was utilized in order to check for the validity of the interview questions. This pilot group consisted of one southwest Missouri building principal and two teachers who had the initial eight-day Foundation Training of Cognitive Coaching but have not attended the Advanced Cognitive Coaching training. The pilot group members were interviewed using the same interview questions as utilized in the study in order to determine if the answers would help to meet the overall research questions of the study. The narrative data collected in the pilot study contributed to the continuation the study. Suggestions were made by the pilot group members and were used to revise interview questions and format of the interview. The pilot group interview questions contributed to the knowledge of what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like.

Interview data consisted of field notes and audio transcriptions. The interviews took place over a five-month period. Each interview session was transcribed through the use of a transcription service. Participants were provided member checks after the interview in order to review statements for clarity purposes and add any additional statements. Interview quotations listed throughout the body of the research were not edited for grammatical errors. Grammatical errors were present in interviewee responses. The researcher first conducted interviews with the building principals of Washington Intermediate School and Lincoln Elementary School. The research question protocol guided the questions during the interviews (Appendix E). The protocol contained questions to probe for understanding of the basic research questions. These

questions provided a schema around which to construct meaning and deepen the understanding of the implementation process. The following research questions guided the study:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching Culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?
2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

After each building-level principal was interviewed, the principal provided names of teachers within the building who had been trained in Cognitive Coaching and would be available for interviews. Of the four teachers interviewed at each site, two were regular classroom teachers at the building, one was a counselor, and one worked in a support role for the staff. Therefore, at each of the two sites, five different individuals were interviewed for a total of ten different interviews conducted for the purpose of the case study. The same questions were asked of all ten interviewees. Interviews took place at different times and days, depending on the availability of the interviewee. Questions were sent to the interviewees in advance, as recommended by the pilot group of participants. It was not made known to the interview participants who the other interviewees were.

Observations

The observations focused on conversations at whole-group faculty meetings that were led by the principal, small-group meetings in which the principal participated, and team

planning meetings in which the principal was not present. The whole-group faculty meeting at Washington Intermediate School occurred after school hours, and the whole-group faculty meeting at Lincoln Elementary School took place before school hours. The small-group meeting at Washington Intermediate School was held during a staff-training day, in which students were still in session, and release time was provided to teachers through the use of substitute teachers. The small-group meeting at Lincoln Elementary School was conducted on a student early release day in which students had an early dismissal, and teachers had the remainder of the afternoon to work on curriculum and instruction. The team planning meetings observed at both schools were held during the normal regular planning times provided to teachers on a weekly or daily basis. The observations provided the opportunity to document the principal's and teachers' use of the Cognitive Coaching tools and processes at the school sites in varied settings. Observations were recorded as field notes and analyzed for content. The field notes were then recorded into the guidelines of the observation matrix (Appendix F). The observation matrix was further analyzed for emerging themes and patterns.

Documents

Documents and textual data containing information related to the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching model and to the training and implementation of Cognitive Coaching were collected both within the district and at the campus sites. These included documentation of the implementation process and trainings provided by personnel at the campus level. Both school sites' principals completed a Cognitive Coaching self-reflection assessment document. Data was collected which pertained to strategic improvement plans and the ways Cognitive Coaching was a factor in the plans. Principal communication with staff members through selected teacher emails was reviewed. These were emails that pertained directly to the meetings observed by this

researcher. Whole faculty meeting agendas, small-group meeting agendas, and team planning agendas were collected.

Assuring Trustworthiness

Validation strategies listed by Creswell (2012) to ensure trustworthiness in qualitative research utilized in this case study include: (a) prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field, (b) triangulation, (c) peer reviews or debriefing, (d) clarifying researcher bias, (e) member checking, and (f) rich, thick description. Validity and reliability were in the constant thought process of the researcher's mind, as should be with any qualitative study. Validity and reliability of this study were addressed as the researcher designed the study, collected and analyzed data, and presented the data (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Triangulation of the data was a key component of this study. The actual ethical practice in a qualitative study is determined by the researcher's own values and ethics (Merriam, 1998). While conducting this study, the researcher maintained and utilized her personal high level of integrity and character.

The validity of this study was addressed through triangulation involving pilot group review, member checks, peer examinations, and researcher's bias clarification (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Triangulation in this study involved using multiple sources of data from interviews, observations, and collected documents to confirm the findings with the review of literature. Member checks were incorporated as the researcher shared the transcriptions of the interviews with all interviewees. The researcher used peer examinations by asking colleagues to comment and offer insight on the emerging findings of the study. The researcher attempted to reveal any biases by clarifying initial involvement in Cognitive Coaching and personal assumptions throughout this study. The researcher believed the findings from this study would

add to the existing research and literature on Cognitive Coaching as well as extend the knowledge base for deep implementation and sustainability of a Cognitive Coaching culture.

The reliability of this study was enhanced by the investigator's position, triangulation, and an audit trial (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). The investigator's position that a study on factors promoting deep implementation of a Cognitive Coaching environment was supported by the third edition of the Cognitive Coaching sourcebook (Costa & Garmston, 2016). This edition offered updated recommendations for future research. The recommendations included asking questions about the impact of Cognitive Coaching on principals and schools staff, self-directedness, and implementation. This researcher is an agency trainer for Cognitive Coaching and has knowledge on factors that support implementation in a school setting. Triangulation for this study included using multiple methods, sources, and levels of data analysis. The researcher created an audit trail by describing in detail how the data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the study (Merriam, 1998).

The first part of Chapter Four listed the participants, setting, and types of archival materials that were described in detail. The next part of Chapter Four contains the results of the interviews, observations, and textual data.

Part II: Results of the Data

"There's not an adult in this building I wouldn't go to with a problem, professional or personal and I think each of them would make time and genuinely care." Teacher, Lincoln Elementary School

In order to answer the four guiding questions of this case study, the researcher asked open-ended questions (Appendix E) based on each of the following elements identified from the literature as necessary components of a successful school: (a) establishing trusting relationships

within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (e) developing organizational learning to take place within the school (Leithwood et al., 2004). The researcher proposed that the components of successful schools are also necessary components of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture. For a theme of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning to be considered a major theme, the concept needed to come to the surface for a combined twenty times throughout the coding of the notes. Twenty was the number decided upon because there were ten interviews, so each person we need to have made mention of the theme at least two times. Each of the five components of successful schools did meet this criterion. The subthemes needed to have been addressed by the interviewees at least ten times to be considered valid subthemes. There is at least one subtheme under each major theme that met this criterion. Each of the themes and subthemes are described throughout this chapter with supporting evidence explained. The following section will address the results of the interviews, observations, and documents organized around the five components of a successful school.

Trust

According to participants in this study, creating a trusting climate is an essential component of a deeply embedded culture of Cognitive Coaching. In a frequency word count of the interview transcripts, trust was mentioned 85 times. Previous research (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy and Tarter, 2003; Reeves, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2004) and research findings from this study (W1; W2; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) indicate deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environments place a large emphasis on trust within the school culture. Trust emerged as the third largest theme, occurring 41 times over the course of the coding of themes from the interviews. It also was observed in all of the meetings observed.

Nine of the ten interviewees (W1; W2; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) spoke explicitly about trust being a factor in coaching conversations. When schools place trust as a priority, schools become successful a coaching environment is instituted (Knight, 2009; Leithwood et al., 2004). In order to institute trust within the school culture, the school must establish trustworthy relationships, define facets of trust, and build a trusting organization. Trust is the only major theme in the study in which all three subthemes met the criteria for being highly valuable in establishing the major theme.

The themes identified for creating a trusting climate are supported in detail below using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the study. Three subthemes related to trust emerged through the review of literature and were examined in this study: (a) establishing trustworthy relationships, (b) defining facets of trust, and (c) building a trusting organization (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). This section will analyze the results of the interview respondents, as well as the observations attended and the documents collected.

Table 1 displays a breakdown of each subtheme of trust categorized by the interview question and the participant responses.

Table 1

Frequency of Interviewees Supporting Emerging Themes of Trust

	Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Establishing Trustworthy Relationships	W1		X	X									
	W2			X					X				
	W3			X									
	W4			X		X							
	W5												
	L1	X		X									
	L2			X									
	L3												
	L4	X					X						
	L5												
Defining Facets of Trust	W1			X									
	W2								X				
	W3												
	W4												
	W5												
	L1			X		X							
	L2	X			X				X				
	L3			X	X			X					
	L4				X								
	L5												
Building a Trusting Organization	W1			X	X	X					X		
	W2												
	W3												
	W4				X		X						X
	W5				X								
	L1			X	X	X					X		
	L2				X						X		
	L3												
	L4				X		X						X
	L5				X								

Establishing trustworthy relationships. The importance of establishing trustworthy relationships within the school environment emerged from the interview answers 12 different times, by seven of the 10 interviewees (W1; W2; W4; W5; L1; L2; L4). The principal of Washington Intermediate School described how two buildings merged, and it was the principal's job to build trust with the new staff members. The establishing of trustworthy relationships took years to institute. Having trust in place was a critical component to having coaching conversations. Cognitive Coaching gave the principal the tools necessary to establish

trustworthy relationships over time. Trust was a necessary component in having the coaching conversations, and coaching conversations contributed to building trust. The principal had to be explicit in stating, "This is how I conduct business and communicate with people" (W1). Teachers also had to feel freedom to say to the principal, "I don't want to be coached right now" (W1). The principal's willingness to patiently apply the components of Cognitive Coaching helped to establish trustworthy relationships. Principals, teachers, and staff members had to work on establishing trust in their school in order to create a symbiotic coaching atmosphere. Trust was needed to have coaching conversations, and coaching is needed to build the culture. "Trust comes from working through a situation with someone else" (W3). The principal from Lincoln said, "The professional atmosphere must be a safe place. Trust creates safety between words and actions" (L1). The safety of the tentative, exploratory language of Cognitive Coaching helps to build trust. When discussing this topic, a teacher at Lincoln stated,

> When working with someone you don't know or doesn't know Cognitive Coaching, sticking with language of Cognitive Coaching helps to build trust because it's non-judgmental and the intentions are truly to move the person forward. Hearing the Cognitive Coaching language makes the other person feel good, provides a safe environment, and makes them feel like they are a part of a team. The language of Cognitive Coaching is safe, so it's important to stay within the boundaries of Cognitive Coaching language. It builds trust because it's not evaluative or judgmental. Being coached makes people feel good (L2).

Taking the time to establish trustworthy relationships was a key component of the major theme of trust.

Defining facets of trust. The definition of specific aspects of trust emerged from the interview answers 11 different times, by six of the 10 (W1; W2; L1; L2; L3; L4). Facets of trust described by the interviewees included showing transparency, listening to others, providing open communication, and communicating honestly with each other. "Transparency was a key in building that trust. Building trust has taken a lot of time" (W1). "Transparency was key in first implementing with others" (L2). "Cognitive Coaching provides different level of professionalism and trust. Must have trust in place in order to have honest, open reflections. Must have trust in place so it doesn't feel like a gotcha" (L1). Listening is a component of trust, and this concept was mentioned 27 times throughout the interviews. "Petty things are not as important because you know the other person is on your side. We work better together. Listening equals bonding. The listener is on my side" (W3). "Trust sets the stage for asking hard questions. Must have trust in place in order to have coaching conversations. You know what your role is and what other's roles are. Job role makes for constant pushing of teachers, and trusting relationship creates safety on knowing when to push, [sic] and when to not to push" (L2). Another facet of trust was also having openness to Cognitive Coaching. "Openness to Cognitive Coaching goes along with trust" (L4).

Building trust within the organization. The importance of building a trusting organization emerged from the interview answers 18 different times, by seven of the 10 interviewees (W1; W4; W5; L1; L3; L4; L5).

The principal at Lincoln stated, "Trust is the cornerstone of our school culture" (L1). For a deeply embedded environment of Cognitive Coaching to be in place, trust has to be built throughout the organization. One teacher stated, "There's not an adult in this building that I wouldn't go to with a problem, professional or personal [sic] and I think each of them would

make time and genuinely care" (L4). Trust has to first be established, and the facets of trust have to be explored throughout the organization. Then work must be done to continually build trust. One participant said that staff members can "get down and dirty when you have trust. When you have a trusting organization, nothing is off the table. Discussion can be had around any sort of subject. Without trust in place, you can't go there" (W4). Anything is up for discussion in a trusting organization. In order to have these difficult conversations, school members need trust in each other and trust in the organization.

Many of the interviewees described how having trust between staff members benefitted more than just the staff. "Training staff in Cognitive Coaching has strengthened the relationship among teachers and teacher to principal. Staff has closer relationships with students! Staff relationships and morale has improved. Staff relationships are better with parents. The staff have closer relationships with students, each other, and parents of students" (W1).

When asked about the benefits that come from having a trusting organization, one staff member simply said, "Cognitive Coaching is making our building a better place" (W2). Another teacher stated, "Trust, not just with staff, but also parents and kids, makes for stronger bonds and better relationships with students. The benefit is kids are more successful" (W5). The students are more successful because of the trusting school community. "Using Cognitive Coaching with parents increases trusting relationships which only helps put you on [sic] same team. Greater trust equals greater collaboration with parents" (W5).

Collaboration

According to participants in this study, creating a culture of collaboration was the most important component of a deeply embedded culture of Cognitive Coaching. In a frequency count of the combined interviews, the word *collaboration* was used 30 times, and the word *team*

was used 43 times. Previous research on successful collaborative school environments (Calabrese, 2002; Corregan, 2001; Garmston & Wellman, 1997; Garmston, 2012; Garmston & Zimmerman, 2013) and research findings from this study (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) indicate deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environments value collaboration as an essential component of the school culture. Collaboration emerged as the largest theme, occurring 51 times over the course of the coding of themes from the interviews. Ten of the ten interviewees (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) spoke explicitly about collaboration being a crucial factor in having coaching conversations. When schools place collaboration as a priority, schools become successful, and a coaching environment is instituted (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Leithwood et al., 2004). In order for collaboration to be a living element within the school culture, the school must work to develop a collaborative culture, build team mentality skills, and embrace the importance of dialogue. Developing a collaborative culture and building team mentality skills are the subthemes that met the criteria for being highly valuable in establishing the major theme.

The themes identified for creating a collaborative environment are supported in detail below using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the study. Three subthemes related to collaboration emerged through the review of literature and were examined in this study: (a) establishing a collaborative culture, (b) building team mentality skills, and (c) practicing dialogue in conversations (Corregan, 2001; Creighton, 2005; Garmston, 2012). The themes identified for creating a collaborative culture are supported in detail below using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the study.

Table 2 shows a breakdown of each subtheme of collaboration categorized by the interview question and the participant responses.

Table 2

Frequency of Interviewees Supporting Emerging Themes of Collaboration

	Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Establishing a Collaborative Culture	W1	X		X		X							
	W2	X	X		X	X	X					X	
	W3										X		
	W4								X				
	W5					X			X				
	L1		X			X		X					
	L2		X			X	X						
	L3					X		X					
	L4					X	X						
	L5			X	X	X	X						
Building Team Mentality Skills	W1			X									
	W2									X			
	W3				X	X	X		X				
	W4		X			X			X	X			
	W5												
	L1				X	X	X						X
	L2			X									
	L3						X						
	L4				X								X
	L5								X				
Practicing Dialogue	W1												
	W2						X						
	W3												
	W4						X						
	W5						X						
	L1						X						
	L2						X						
	L3												
	L4												
	L5						X						

While Cognitive Coaching is a tool typically used in one-on-one situations, the respondents' answers showed the importance of also using the tool in collaboration. Washington Intermediate School has trained some teachers in Adaptive Schools, and Lincoln Elementary School has not had teachers trained in Adaptive Schools. Both schools have other, different initiatives currently in place within their respective schools. One of the schools had Adaptive

Schools training, which is under the umbrella of Thinking Collaborative, and the other school is implementing the International Baccalaureate program. The researcher has noted that in both programs, collaboration is a key component.

Developing a collaborative culture. The importance of developing a collaborative culture emerged as being the most crucial element in creating a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. Developing a collaborative culture transpired from the interview answers 27 different times by all 10 of the 10 interviewees (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5). Developing a collaborative culture was discussed by at least one participant in every interview question asked, except for question 9. Developing a collaborative culture is the most critical component in implementing and sustaining a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. The importance of developing a collaborative culture also was discussed in every question asked, with the exception of question nine. A collaborative culture supports the coaching conversations that will take place. Leaders who desire to implement Cognitive Coaching in their schools will put energy and efforts toward developing a collaborative culture. Working to develop a collaborative culture is seen by participants in both schools as a critical component in establishing a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment.

When asked to describe actions that support a collaborative culture, the Washington principal immediately replied that it was "necessary to send teachers to Adaptive School training" (W1). Both school principals designed their schedules to include time for weekly collaboration of teams. The Lincoln principal said that it was "important for the leader to design the schedule and build in time for collaboration" (L1). Both principals described collaboration between the principal and teachers as well as between teachers as a matter of importance. Several teachers described collaboration across teams, such as vertical teaming structures as an

important factor in collaboration. Also, collaboration among special area teams was described as another way that both school sites are working to develop a collaborative culture. One teacher (L2) described a frustration level that has occurred when Lincoln teachers collaborate with teachers from other schools within the district. The teacher stated,

> Teachers are so use to collaborating and truly working together on a goal to accomplish something that they become frustrated if asked to work with teams outside of the building. They have learned that others do not know what true collaborating is, and instead, teams just share ideas. They are not working towards [sic] a common goal. In other sites, schools without Cognitive Coaching, collaboration is simply a share time. We have learned it's important to teach collaboration structures and purposes. Constructivism and inquiry are key components. Others share only their viewpoints in collaborating. We have learned you have to take an idea and make it a group idea (L2).

Collaboration structures and purposes must be explained, modeled, and practiced for a collaborative culture to exist. "Collaboration is a process, and doesn't just happen without training" (L5). This teacher went on to say, "Our team actively sets goals for the next meeting by creating an agenda at the end of each meeting. Then we would know what student data to bring" (L5).

Building team mentality skills. Deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environments work to build team mentality skills. Team mentality skills as outlined in this dissertation include the critical tools of paraphrasing, pausing, and probing questions. The subtheme was discussed 19 times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by nine of the 10 participants (W1; W2; W3; W4; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5).

Working to build team mentality skills is a necessary component in collaboration. Interviewee respondents listed listening, paraphrasing, pausing, and questioning as some of the essential skills necessary for collaborating. *Listening* appeared in a word frequency count of the combined interviews 27 times. The skills necessary for coaching conversations are also important skills when working as a team. To truly collaborate, the skills associated with listening must be present. One teacher stated, "Cognitive Coaching gives a new speaking and listening tool" (W4). A staff member reported that the tools of Cognitive Coaching have helped establish "productive collaboration with decisions being made" (W2). The same staff member went on to say, "I personally use paraphrasing, [sic] and try to assume the positive" (W2). Another teacher described the importance of pausing or using wait time. "Wait time [sic] now given to actually process and answer questions. Wait time is important for reflection. Cognitive Coaching is difficult because it is not a natural way of working through problems" (W3). Teacher (W5) stated the skills learned in Cognitive Coaching are so important to collaboration that "all teachers need to be trained in order to have better collaboration."

While the teachers all described the benefits of using the tools of Cognitive Coaching as a way to have better collaboration, one teacher did describe that having the tool set will also raise the intensity level of the collaboration. "Individuals now communicates [sic] that the person just speaking was heard, and paraphrasing helps to communicate their own ideas. It has actually allowed a more professional structure for banter. CC provides boundaries with language" (L2).

Along with the essential team mentality skills of listening, paraphrasing, pausing, and questioning, also comes the importance of having the right structure in place to utilize the skills. The principal at Lincoln expressed

> I use lots of protocols and structures in place for learning, collecting information, and giving feedback. We attempt to match the structure used to purpose and desired outcome. I use protocols and structures for learning together, collecting information, and giving feedback. The variety of tools used includes verbal or written, and whole group, team or individual. Varied structures are used depending on the intended purpose (L1).

Embracing the importance of dialogue. While dialogue is a necessary component of collaboration, it did not emerge as an essential subtheme from the respondents' answers to interview questions in this study. The subtheme was discussed six times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by six of the 10 participants (W2; W4; W5; L1; L2; L5). Responses around the importance of dialogue only emerged on question 6, which was specifically geared toward dialogue. However, dialogue was observed in the team planning meetings observed at both school sites. The word *dialogue* was specifically stated 21 different times by the interviewees. The answers to question 6 specifically revolved around using dialogue in 6 of the 10 answers, while the other participants' answers involved other areas of collaboration. However, dialogue was observed in the team planning meetings observed at both school sites.

Embracing the importance of dialogue did not emerge as an essential theme. Yet, there were important parts pertaining specifically to dialogue that help in collaboration. "Dialogue allows time to work through questions and ensures all people are on the same goal" (W2). There needs to be a "clear distinction on what is dialogue and what is discussion" (W4). "Dialogue, when no decision is made, is hard, because the work still has to get done. As a school, we have struggled in differentiating between dialogue and discussion. It must be practiced and needs more time" (W3). All teachers need "the training of what dialogue is and is not. Most people

don't understand what dialogue actually is" (W5). "Most [sic] important thing is setting aside your own agenda to hear from others. Setting aside your own self is the most powerful way to encourage dialogue" (L4).

Reflection

Previous research on reflection being an essential component for successful schools (Argyis & Schon, 1974; Berliner, 1998; Glickman, 1985; Hattie, 2009; Heath & Heath, 2010) and research findings from this study (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L4; L5) indicate deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environments place a large emphasis on reflection. Reflection of current practices leads to new learning by teachers and improved teaching. Reflection emerged as a major theme, occurring 22 times over the course of the coding of themes from the interviews. Reflection was also observed in most of the meetings observed. When schools place reflection as a priority, schools become successful, and a coaching environment is instituted (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Hattie, 2009; Leithwood et al., 2004). In order to institute reflection within the school culture, teachers must explore tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit, examine mental models, and integrate double-loop learning. "Reflection is huge!" (W4) stated one teacher in the interview responses. According to the literature review, reflection is a critical element of successful schools. Many of the participants in this study described reflection as being an essential component of a deeply embedded culture of Cognitive Coaching. Reflection was described as a component to which each individual must aspire. "Some teachers don't like reflection because they don't value it personally" (L2). The word *reflection* was counted as being explicitly said by participants 44 different times. "Cognitive Coaching has brought out the idea that reflection is a continuum. When you embrace reflection, you travel on that path. I am able to see huge personal and professional growth in teachers who reflect" (L1). At Lincoln

Elementary School, reflection became such an ingrained part of the culture, that teacher interview questions were revised to include descriptions of ways potential candidates reflect. "Reflection is a must for working at this school; it's a requirement. It is a part of the culture" (L1). The leader built reflection into normal events of school, such as reflection questions for teachers on how parent/teacher conferences went, and reflection has been built into faculty meetings. "People open to coaching and reflection have better attitudes about school" (L1).

While reflection was described passionately by many of the respondents, it did not have a large frequency count. In the subtheme analysis, reflection emerged as an essential theme on 22 different occasions. The themes identified for implementing reflection into the culture are supported in detail below using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the study. Three subthemes related to reflection emerged from the literature review: (a) exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit, (b) examining mental models, and (c) integrating double-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Creasy & Patterson, 2005; Senge, 1990; Senge et al., 2012). This section will analyze the results of the interview respondents as well as the observations attended and the documents collected. Reflection is an important component of Cognitive Coaching and is included in the other school reform initiatives of Adaptive Schools and International Baccalaureate.

Table 3 shows a breakdown of each subtheme of reflection categorized by the interview question and the participant responses.

Table 3

Frequency of Interviewees Supporting Emerging Themes of reflection

	Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Exploring Tacit Knowledge so it Becomes Explicit	W1												
	W2									X			
	W3							X				X	
	W4												
	W5							X					
	L1									X			
	L2												
	L3												
	L4							X					
	L5							X					
Examining Mental Models	W1	X											
	W2												
	W3										X		
	W4							X					
	W5												
	L1	X	X	X		X							
	L2					X			X				
	L3												
	L4						X		X				
	L5												
Integrating Double-Loop Learning	W1							X					
	W2							X					
	W3												
	W4												
	W5												
	L1							X					
	L2							X					
	L3												
	L4												
	L5												

Exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit. Exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit did not emerge as an important subtheme under reflection. The subtheme was discussed seven times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by six of the 10 participants (W2; W3; W5; L1; L4; L5).

Reflection consists of thinking about and examining what happened or what is known, moving beyond the episodic (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Cognitive Coaching has a reflecting

conversation map in order to help facilitate reflecting conversations. According to the interviewee's answers, taking time to reflect is an important component in their schools. "Cognitive Coaching has given us the process to go deeper in reflection conversations. The underlying subtheme of exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit was mentioned seven different times by six different respondents. "Reflection doesn't just consist of what went good or bad. Cognitive Coaching has given a process for analyzing what happened and future steps. Cognitive Coaching gives process [sic] to reflect and gets to the why, as well as next steps" (L4). Another teacher (W5) said, "Reflection was a missing piece in our school prior to Cognitive Coaching." Not having reflection is "like leaving the main ingredient out of a cake. It's just not going to turn out right. It's still going to be a cake, but it's not going to be what it could have been" (W5). The same teacher went on to describe how purposeful reflection has taken place since learning the tools of Cognitive Coaching. The tools "become a part of who I am, instead of just another theory" (W5).

Examining mental models. Of the respondents' answers in regard to the theme *reflection*, examining mental models was the largest subtheme. The responses reflect answers mainly centered around the idea of examining mental models. The only subtheme that emerged under the major theme of reflection as being critical for integrating reflection was examining mental models. The subtheme was discussed 11 times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by six of the 10 participants (W1; W3; W4; L1; L2; L4).

Participants described reflection as a concept that has changed their thinking from a summary of events happened to really thinking about the reasoning behind the events. "True reflection is acknowledging what you need to learn and then deciding on a commitment to application" (L2). One respondent said "There has been [sic] huge change in my personal

reflection since having the training. Now I have a set aside time dedicated to reflecting every single day" (W1). The respondent went on to say, "Instead of just planning for [sic] next event, I will spend time reflecting over what has occurred. Amount [sic] of time spent reflecting since learning Cognitive Coaching has changed enormously" (W1). A different participant shared, "Prior to Cognitive Coaching, I would constantly go, go, go. Now I take time to stop and reflect, analyzing what happened. Cognitive Coaching allows more time for reflection and analysis of what is happening. I see the benefit of reflecting for myself and for others" (W4). One teacher described how taking time to reflect has really allowed her "to see the other person's emotions and feelings associated with the event" (W2). She also described how the idea of reflection has changed for her. "Maybe it's not where we want you to be in the end, but it's that first step, that place that you need to go next before you get there, the journey kind of thing" (W2). A staff member described how listening must take place below the surface. "Important [sic] in collaborating and coaching to find out people's intentions. As a coach, I'm learning to listen below the surface to intention, and I keep a notebook of teachers' intentions. This will help me provide resources" (L2). Listening below the surface is a critical component of examining underlying mental models.

Another major theme in the study that emerged when coding for examining mental models was that of individuals within the school acquiring the identity as a coach. When participants were giving an answer to an interview question or were observed in a whole-group or small-group meeting, what became evident to this researcher is that multiple individuals within the school environment had taken on the identity of a coach (W1; W5; L1; L2; L4). The goal of Cognitive Coaching is for the participants to take on the identity as a mediator of thinking (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Therefore the qualities of successful schools and the tools

of Cognitive Coaching are being implemented at these sites because the leaders of the schools and fellow educators have assumed the identity of a Cognitive Coach.

In the review of literature, values, beliefs, and identity were described as concepts that lie beneath the surface of every individual and can be explored through examining mental models. Mental models are dissected through reflection, and it was the most significant subtheme for reflection. When participants were giving an answer to an interview question or were observed in a whole-group or small-group meeting, what became evident to this researcher is that multiple individuals within the school environment had taken on the identity of a coach.
Teacher (W5) said, "My leader is the model." While an initial look would indicate the subtheme leader as coach, further exploring and comments from the peer review team provided insight into statements that there are indicators for the leader to have the identity of a Cognitive Coach. Principal (W1) described how sometimes she uses coaching and sometimes uses evaluating but makes a clear distinction for teachers when evaluating is happening. Knowing when to coach and when not to coach is an indicator of this being this principal's identity.

Teacher (L2) described how she switches from coaching to collaborating, or intentionally asks meditative questions, a component of coaching, while spending time collaborating. Again, an initial look at these statements would indicate a category of collaboration, but really looking below the surface showed the teacher had an identity as a Cognitive Coach because she was able to use the components in multiple settings. Teacher (L4) said, "Our leader models and uses Cognitive Coaching effectively, which is very important in building that trust." An initial look would indicate organizational learning or trust, but a second look at the themes showed this leader had an identity of a coach. The entire Lincoln Elementary School has taken on the identity of a coach as an entire school by integrating reflection questions into job interview

questions (L1). Examining mental models and the emergence of identity as an essential component are major subthemes of reflection.

Integrating double loop learning. The subtheme of integrating double-loop learning as an element of reflection did not emerge as a critical factor. The subtheme was discussed four times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by four of the 10 participants (W1; W2; L1; L2). Integrating double-loop learning was mentioned just four times by the respondents, by four different participants. What is an interesting note, however, is that four people who really spoke to the idea of double-loop learning were all involved in facilitating professional learning for the adults in the building. When talking about reflection, respondents could not help but talk about other successful school qualities that were interrelated to reflection. One person stated, "Cognitive Coaching [sic] really about good thinking and questioning for everyone. Trust makes it a safe place to think. Trust brings out the reflective nature. Trust builds a reflective nature. If you're going to be open and truthful with those reflections, you have to have the trust" (L2). Reflection was built into the schedule for taking place right after collaboration had happened, allowing opportunity for a reflection on the collaboration itself.

Self-Direction

Self-direction emerged as the second most important component in implementing a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment, just after the component of establishing a collaborative culture. The updated version of the Cognitive Coaching resource book merited a change in the subtitle from "a foundation for renaissance schools" (Costa & Garmston, 2002), to the subtitle which included the phrase "developing self-directed leaders and learners" (Costa & Garmston, 2016). Previous research on the importance of developing self-direction in successful schools (Bandura, 1977; Costa & Garmston, 2013; Fullan, 2014; Garmston, 2002; Koestler,

1972) and research findings from this study (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) indicate deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environments foster self-direction within individuals. Self-direction emerged as the second largest theme, occurring 44 times over the course of the coding of themes from the interviews. Ten of the 10 interviewees (W1; W3; W2; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) spoke explicitly about self-direction being a factor in having coaching conversations. When schools place building self-direction in others as a priority, schools become successful and a coaching environment is instituted (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Leithwood et al., 2004). In order for self-direction to be a component of the school culture, schools must work to build self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying individuals; the leader must work to build internal resourcefulness in others; and the collective efficacy of the system must be built.

The subthemes identified for encouraging self-direction are supported in detail below using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the study. Three subthemes related to self-direction emerged through the review of literature and were examined in this study: (a) the definition of self-direction as self-managing, self-monitoring, self-modifying, (b) how a leader builds internal resourcefulness, and (c) collective efficacy of the system (Bandura, 1997; Costa & Garmston, 2002; Goddard et al., 2004; Hoy & Woolfolk, 2002). This section will analyze the results of the interview respondents, as well as the observations attended and the documents collected.

Table 4 demonstrates a breakdown of each subtheme of self-direction categorized by the interview questions and the participant responses.

Table 4

Frequency of Interviewees Supporting Emerging Themes of Self-Direction

	Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Self-managing, Self-monitoring, Self-modifying	W1			X									
	W2							X		X		X	
	W3			X							X	X	
	W4									X	X		
	W5			X						X	X		
	L1			X	X					X			
	L2									X			
	L3									X	X		
	L4				X					X			
	L5									X	X		
Internal Resourcefulness	W1		X							X	X	X	
	W2								X	X			
	W3			X									
	W4												
	W5												
	L1	X		X		X		X					
	L2								X				
	L3									X			
	L4												X
	L5												
Collective Efficacy	W1												
	W2				X						X		
	W3			X			X						
	W4												
	W5			X									
	L1										X		
	L2												
	L3												
	L4												
	L5										X		

Self-managing, self-monitoring, self-modifying. The defining attributes of self-direction are self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying. Establishing a collaborative culture was the largest subtheme to emerge from the interviewee responses, but based on that same frequency count data, the second largest subtheme revealed was self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying. This concept appeared 23 times in the data, indicating that self-

direction is an essential component of implementing a Cognitive Coaching environment. This subtheme was discussed by all 10 of the interviewees (W1; W3; W2; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5).

When examining self-direction, the respondents' answers varied among all three components of self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying. The three components can stand alone and are also interrelated. Respondents described how they used Cognitive Coaching in their own thinking, and how they used it to help others' thinking. One participant described how she has learned that she "does not have to be a problem solver for everyone. The answers to problems lie within the individual" (W4). Cognitive Coaching increased her ability to analyze her own problems, and how she has reflecting conversations with others, which increases their self-directedness. This same respondent described how she used the tools of Cognitive Coaching in a personal situation with a friend who sought out coaching in determining which path to take for a career change.

> Prior to Cognitive Coaching, my behavior would have been to give an opinion. With Cognitive Coaching I try to set my personal opinion to the side, [sic] and use tools to help others solve their own problems. I use Cognitive Coaching to help clarify thinking of others. It's different than my previous way of communicating. I really try to slow down, [sic] and look at things (W4).

Another interviewee answered that she does not solve problems for others now. "I wanted to just have a fix to the problem prior to Cognitive Coaching. I have learned that it's not about telling someone what to do, but the person figuring out on their own. Now I do not fix it for them" (W2). Several of the respondents mentioned that Cognitive Coaching produced a growth mindset for them and while coaching others. A Lincoln staff member (L2) described a

"willingness to change on individual teacher's parts" when being coached. This teacher also coached herself through use of the Cognitive Coaching maps, which show metacognition. "I paraphrase myself, [sic] and have internal dialogue before speaking. Cognitive Coaching has taught me the tools to think before speaking" (L2). Another teacher described how she asks herself questions. "I know the principal will be using reflecting conversations, so I have a self-coaching conversation first" (L4). Responses indicated that some of the educators have coaching conversations in their heads, and some find a coach to help facilitate thinking. A different teacher said, "I will seek out a coach if I am stuck. The best thing about Cognitive Coaching is the awareness of the individual that the answer to the problem lies within themselves [sic]" (L5).

How a leader builds internal resourcefulness. The leader working to build internal resourcefulness in others was an important subtheme for establishing self-direction in the school culture. The subtheme was discussed 14 times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by seven of the 10 participants (W1; W2; W3; L1; L2; L3; L4). The participants discussed ways the principals, teachers, and staff members work at highlighting the five states of mind when engaging in coaching conversations. The five states of mind described throughout the interviews, observations, and documents collected were efficacy, flexibility, interdependence, craftsmanship, and consciousness.

The need for the leader to help build resourcefulness in others emerged throughout the conversations. One principal expressed,

> It took several years for me to communicate my desire for teachers to be self-directed. My biggest challenge was getting the new set of teachers who came from an authoritarian principal to understand my responses were to encourage self-directedness. I

had to show them I believed in them [sic] and I didn't have to give a final stamp of approval on every little decision that was made (W1).

Several respondents described how Cognitive Coaching built their own professional efficacy. Some also described using interdependence to call on others to coach them when stuck. "I do not believe in solving my teachers [sic] problems anymore. When I first began implementing Cognitive Coaching, it was frustrating initially for teachers when I would use paraphrasing or questioning instead of telling them what to do" (W1). The principal at Washington described how she thought time would have to be spent selling Cognitive Coaching to teachers, but the response from teachers was so large that she now has a waiting list of teachers to be trained. "It was accepted much better than I thought it would be. I thought I would have to 'sell' and convince. Now I have to go to teachers who are not being trained and promise that they aren't being skipped [sic] and they will receive training eventually" (W1).

Another teacher described how she is "self-aware" of the five states of mind. The states of mind are consciousness, craftsmanship, efficacy, flexibility, and interdependence (Costa & Garmston, 2002). "I am willing to ask for help in increasing a particular state of mind. I will go to others and asked [sic] to be coached. Prior to Cognitive Coaching, I was not aware that a change would have been necessary" (W3). A different respondent described the importance of empowerment of problem solving by others as follows:

> Moving from the teachers having to have trust in me to trusting themselves is a piece. There is an increased efficacy and craftsmanship in [sic] professional setting in those who reflect, [sic] versus those who do not reflect. [sic] Important for [sic] leader to be okay with work not getting done the way they [sic] would do it (L1).

The leader's ability to build internal resourcefulness in others is a necessary component of building self-direction throughout the organization.

Collective efficacy of the system. Strengthening the collective efficacy of the entire system was a subtheme that emerged seven times in the respondents' answers. While the literature review indicated that collective efficacy is a critical component in the self-direction of individuals within the entire organization, the respondent's answers in the interview questions lent themselves to a different subtheme within this body of research. One respondent did state how "Cognitive Coaching has built the collective trust of the entire school" (W2).

Organizational Learning

Previous research on the importance of the organization learning and growing together (Collins, 2001; Mourshed, Chijoke, & Barber, 2010; Reeves, 2008; Senge, 1990) and research findings from this study (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4) indicated that deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environments understand that organizational learning is the catalyst that moves an entire organization forward. Organizational learning emerged as a major theme, occurring 28 times over the course of the coding of themes from the interviews. Nine of the 10 interviewees (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4) spoke about important qualities of the organization as being a part of their coaching culture. In order for organizational learning to be a component of the school culture, several important factors are at work. These factors include the following: the leader operates as a coach; distributed leadership is present; the entire system learns; and the leader has influence within and among the school community.

The word *leader* was spoken 66 times and the word *principal* was said 50 times. The two words combined were used 116 times throughout the course of the 10 interviews, indicating that the principal of the building is a critical component in successfully implementing Cognitive

Coaching into the school environment. In the subtheme analysis, organizational learning emerged as an essential theme on 28 different occasions. The themes identified for establishing organizational learning are supported in detail below using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the study. Four subthemes related to self-direction emerged through the review of literature and were examined in this study: (a) the leader as coach, (b) distributed leadership, (c) systems learning, and (d) influence (Allison et al., 2011; Badaracco 2010; Fullan, 2010; Fullan, 2014; Kouzes & Posner, 1998). This section will analyze the results of the interview respondents, as well as the observations attended and the documents collected.

Table 5 demonstrates a breakdown of each subtheme of organizational learning categorized by the interview question and the participant responses.

Table 5

Frequency of Interviewees Supporting Emerging Themes of Organizational Learning

	Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Leader as Coach	W1	X	X				X				X		
	W2	X											
	W3			X									
	W4												
	W5	X											
	L1		X		X	X							
	L2												
	L3								X				
	L4			X									
	L5												
Distributed Leadership	W1	X			X								
	W2												
	W3			X									
	W4												
	W5												
	L1	X				X							
	L2												
	L3												
	L4												
	L5												
Systems Learning	W1	X											
	W2												
	W3												
	W4												
	W5									X			
	L1					X					X		
	L2				X								
	L3												
	L4	X											
	L5												
Influence	W1	X											
	W2												
	W3												
	W4		X										
	W5												
	L1		X			X							
	L2	X											
	L3												
	L4												
	L5												

Leader as coach. The leader operating in the role as coach was the only subtheme under organizational learning that emerged as a critical component of a coaching environment. The subtheme was discussed 12 times over the course of the 12 interview questions, and was mentioned by seven of the 10 participants (W1; W2; W3; W5; L1; L3; L4).

The practice of the leader actually coaching others is an essential element in establishing a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. "Our leader models and uses Cognitive Coaching effectively, which is very important in building that trust" (L4).

In one of the schools selected as a site, the principal is an agency trainer for Cognitive Coaching. Each of the respondents at that site discussed the leader as coach throughout the interview. The Washington counselor described that she "trusts that going to [sic] principal will still bring out this self-directedness and [sic] principal will not just tell [sic] what to do" (W3). "Sitting down with my leader builds my own self-directedness because she doesn't just solve problems" (W4). The Washington Intermediate School principal described how "as trainer and principal leader, I have been able to watch how teachers implement Cognitive Coaching" (W1). The principal also discussed how she teaches specific skills to teachers, such as paraphrasing, pausing, and posing questions, which are built into the normal rotation of faculty meetings. She teaches the tools and utilizes the maps of Cognitive Coaching. "I am able to have follow-up reflecting conversations with teachers that are not tied to evaluation" (W1). The principal does evaluate teachers as to their use of Cognitive Coaching tools with students, specifically wait time and paraphrasing. She looks for these things while conducting walk-through evaluations. The leader wears many different hats in the school building, and the components of Cognitive Coaching help the principal with all of the roles the job requires.

Distributed leadership. Distributed leadership, or shared leadership, was talked about in several of the interviewees' responses but was not a significant subtheme in organizational learning. The subtheme was discussed five times over the course of the 12 interview questions, and was mentioned by three of the 10 participants (W1; W3; L1).

"Collaboration helps develop shared leadership, [sic] and working to build the understanding of shared leadership" (L1). It is important for the leader to "not take growth opportunities away from others" (L1), and instead, utilize coaching to "help build capacity in others" (L1). Through the analysis of collected documents, the building improvement plan at Washington indicates a systematic plan to get everyone in the building trained. The principal at Washington described how she has encouraged distributed leadership through the training of the assistant principal. She stated "There has been a big change in my assistant principal's ability to build relationships. He learned how to communicate with parents so they felt they had a part in the decision, [sic] and in how he handled discipline of the students" (W1).

Systems learning. Systems learning, a component of organizational learning, did not emerge as an important subtheme from the interviews, observations, or documents collected. The subtheme was discussed six times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by five of the 10 participants (W1; W5; L1; L2; L4).

Incorporating systems learning was a subtheme that emerged six times in the respondents' answers. In order to help the organization learn, one teacher explained, "We need to get training for all. The interactions and language of staff will change as more are trained. Everyone needs Cognitive Coaching" (W4).

Both Washington Intermediate School and Lincoln Elementary School staff described different ways teachers work in groups in order to practice their skills, which deepens the learning of the entire system. Washington instituted study groups of teams to practice the skills learned in training. "We have created our own professional learning community on Cognitive Coaching" (W1). The Lincoln principal said, "We didn't talk a lot about shared leadership in Cognitive Coaching training, but I think that has a lot to do with it" (L1). At Lincoln, a staff

member facilitates a leadership group, so the principal does not lead but is a participant. "The leader as a participant contributes to trust amongst the teachers" (L2).

Influence. The influence of the leader in promoting a coaching culture did not emerge as a subtheme under organizational learning. The subtheme was discussed five times over the course of the 12 interview questions and was mentioned by four of the 10 participants (W1; W4; L1; L2). While the literature review gave many reasons that the leader's ability to influence an organization directly related to the success of an organization, the participant responses to this study did not distinguish influence as being a primary factor. Instead, many of the attributes associated with influence would fall under the subthemes of leader as coach or distributed leadership. One teacher said, "Coaching caught on in our school because the principal was using it with the teachers" (L2). Both building-level principals discussed how they had the vision to implement Cognitive Coaching, and they worked to share their vision with their staffs. The principal at Lincoln also described how she had to work to persuade the district-level staff that there would be benefits in implementing Cognitive Coaching training with the teachers. Influence of the leader did not prove in this study to be a significant subtheme for organizational learning within a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture.

Part III: Guiding Research Questions

"For teachers to be open to Cognitive Coaching, they must have the right attitude, respond well to new things, and have a high capacity for change." Principal, Lincoln Elementary School

Part III will address the primary overarching questions that guided this investigation:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?

2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

Research Question 1

In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school? The qualities of successful schools outlined in the review of literature and the interviews, observations, and documents collected through research all support the same five essential ingredients in creating a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture. In order for the tools of Cognitive Coaching to be effectively utilized, a school must a) establish trusting relationships within the school, (b) create a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitate opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) produce self-directed persons, and (e) develop organizational learning to take place within the school.

Research Question 2

How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture? The answers to this guiding research question emerged throughout the collection of data. Every interview conducted indicated that the school had a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture. Evidence was further substantiated through the observations that took place, as there was evidence of the tools of Cognitive Coaching being practiced throughout the meetings by a variety of individuals. Training for all staff members was mentioned multiple times throughout interviews and observations at each school site. The word

"training" had a frequency count of being mentioned 68 times throughout the interviews. Training is a factor in implementation, and practice is a factor in embedding the training.

The concept of identity appeared beneath the surface in multiple respondents' answers. In the review of literature, values, beliefs, and identity were described as concepts that lie beneath the surface of every individual and can be explored through examining mental models. Mental models are explored through reflection, and it was the most significant subtheme for reflection. When participants were giving an answer to an interview question or were observed in a whole-group or small-group meeting, what became evident to this researcher is that multiple individuals within the school environment have taken on the identity of a coach. The goal of Cognitive Coaching is for the participants to assume the identity as a mediator of thinking (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Therefore the qualities of successful schools and the tools of Cognitive Coaching are being implemented at these sites because the leaders of the schools and fellow educators have adopted the identity of a Cognitive Coach.

Research Question 3

What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

The interview responses and observations of meetings supported the successful school research on necessary components in a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. The ability of the leader to model coaching and lead by example is a key factor in sustaining this process. Leaders who value this process ensure the strategies are used and both time and structures are put in place to sustain. Washington Intermediate School described in detail how Adaptive Schools Training was also a key component as a way to incorporate structures for collaborating and implementing the tools of Cognitive Coaching.

Research Question 4

What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment? The word *time* had a frequency count of being spoken 85 different times throughout the course of the ten interviews and was the most frequently used word throughout those interviews. Time is a factor that both facilitates deep implementation and inhibits implementation. The word *practice* was articulated 40 different times. Practice and time combined were spoken 125 times throughout the course of the ten interviews, indicating that each interviewee said the word an average of 12.5 times. Practice and time are essential elements in implementing a Cognitive Coaching environment. One of the peer reviewers said,

> Cognitive Coaching is so 'opposite' of the daily business of school that it is no wonder it came up so much! Time for sustainability to allow for daily reflection, reflection after meetings, wait time in conversations, wait time with students, time for dialogue, time for effective collaboration, time for reflective conversations in teacher evaluation, and time for training! It seems that if a district is going to be successful in sustaining Cognitive Coaching, they have to be willing to commit the time!

An additional factor that facilitates or inhibits deep implementation of Cognitive Coaching is the level of support from district-level leadership. The Lincoln Elementary School principal described multiple requests to district-level staff requesting the training of teachers. One Lincoln teacher said she "wished" district-level leadership "was still offering training for teachers" (L4). Time and district-level support were the two factors that emerged that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to analyze factors of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture. Chapter Four presented the analysis of the data. It included a description of

the two school sites and participants, a break down of the themes that emerged from the interviews, observations, and documents collected, and an explanation as to how the data relates back to the guiding research questions of the study. Each theme identified in the study was supported in detail using quotes and other pertinent information gathered from the participants. The participants provided valuable insight concerning how to deeply embed Cognitive Coaching into the school environment. The descriptive data resulting from the interviews, observations, and documents collected was utilized to answer the four research questions for this study. Chapter Five will include the conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Chapter Five

Conclusions and Recommendations

With a lack of reflection, distrust, and teacher isolation prevalent, principals rely on programs instead of eliciting deeply embedded practice (Fullan, 2001; Reeves, 2009; Schmoker, 2004). What is needed is a deeply embedded practice of thinking, reflecting, collaborating, and self-directed learning. This case study aimed to define what deeply embedded practice looks like in the elementary school setting through the lens of Cognitive Coaching. The study explored principals' perceptions of the implementation process and determined leadership factors that facilitated and inhibited building-wide implementation. This case study also examined the perceptions of teachers and staff members working within the school environment that embraced Cognitive Coaching as a means for professional growth. This case study aspired to expand understanding and knowledge by focusing on perceptions of how Cognitive Coaching can be deeply embedded. The study was viewed through the eyes of ten school participants at two school sites. A driving force behind this study was the need to explore what a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment looks like. The researcher accepts that most participants of Cognitive Coaching could describe the necessary components to implement an environment conducive to coaching; however, less is known in regard to how to deeply embed the underlying structural qualities necessary for true coaching to take place. This qualitative study focused on identifying the factors that facilitate and inhibit implementation of Cognitive Coaching (Merriam, 1998).

Leithwood et al., (2004) analyzed the findings from educational research on what creates successful schools. The basics included a core set of structural qualities that are necessary for leaders implementing a deep-seeded culture within a school. The research behind Cognitive

Coaching shares some constructs with this same body of research on successful schools. It is the belief of the researcher that the critical components of successful schools according to Leithwood et al., (2004) are also the components of Cognitive Coaching; therefore a school that is implementing Cognitive Coaching at a deep level could be considered a successful school. The purpose of this study is to determine whether that belief is substantiated. The theoretical framework for this study consists of the following five critical components gleaned from the comprehensive review of literature: (a) establishing trusting relationships within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (e) developing organizational learning to take place within the school. These five components formed the basis of the interview guide and served as the structure for exploring how principals develop a deeply embedded and high-performing professional culture.

This study explored the perceptions of principals, teachers, and staff members regarding a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. The overarching primary research questions were as follows:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?
2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

These questions were designed as a tool to guide the study and construct meaning of how to deeply embed Cognitive Coaching.

This study analyzed two elementary school sites in two different geographic locations in southwest Missouri. The study incorporated qualitative methodology using in-depth, semi-structured interviews to gather the perceptions of the purposefully selected participants. Descriptive data was collected from the interviews, observations, and documents and was analyzed using constant comparative analysis. Themes emerged as the data was analyzed to determine the results of the research.

The main results of the research included the 16 themes that emerged from the descriptive data pertaining to each of the five research-based components of successful schools. The following three themes emerged pertaining to trust within the school environment: (a) establishing trustworthy relationships, (b) defining facets of trust, and (c) building a trusting organization. Three themes emerged in regard to a collaborative school culture: (a) establishing a collaborative culture, (b) building team mentality skills, and (c) practicing dialogue. The following three themes emerged centering around the importance of reflection: (a) exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit, (b) examining mental models, and (c) integrating double-loop learning. The following three themes emerged pertaining to self-direction: (a) self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-modifying, (b) how a leader builds internal resourcefulness in others, and (c) collective efficacy of the system. The following four themes emerged as applicable to organizational learning: (a) leader as coach, (b) distributed leadership, (c) systems learning, and (d) influence. In addition to the major themes that resulted from the review of literature, the theme of identity as a mediator of thinking also emerged.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study included participant and researcher bias in regard to Cognitive Coaching and what constitutes successful schools. In this qualitative study, participant bias was a limitation, because the resulting data relied on the truthfulness and the depth of the participants' responses. Each participant answered the questions based upon his or her own experiences in regard to Cognitive Coaching, and observations were viewed through the structure of the observation matrix containing the five elements of successful schools. The researcher considered the recommendations made by the directed research committee and attempted to structure the interview guide to allow the participants the opportunity to provide objective data pertaining to factors that both facilitate and inhibit deeply embedded structure.

Researcher bias was a limitation of this study due to the fact that the researcher is an agency trainer of Cognitive Coaching and is a practicing assistant principal in an elementary school setting. Additionally, the researcher believed deeply embedded practice to be a worthy topic of study and that the findings from this study would benefit current and future school leaders in implementing and sustaining a Cognitive Coaching environment. Credibility of this study was enhanced by incorporating pilot groups, member checks, peer examinations, rich and thick description, and triangulation of the data.

The scope of this study was also a limitation due to limiting the geographic region to southwest Missouri. Although the study was limited to the five traits of successful schools, a thorough review of the current literature was conducted to identify the research-based practices. Additional traits of successful schools might have been studied; however, the five indicators of successful schools were a result of the synthesis of the review of literature and provided a comprehensive view of how successful schools deeply embed Cognitive Coaching. Lastly, if this study were replicated, it might produce different results. Even though the results might vary

slightly with a different group of participants, it would not diminish the perspectives of the participants in this study.

Results

The four research questions guiding this study were fully addressed through the collection and analysis of the descriptive data of interviews, observations, and documents collected. The questions from the interview as well as the observation matrix were designed around the five qualities of successful schools (Leithwood et al., 2004). The data from the tables showed that at least one component from each of the five qualities emerged a minimum of twenty different times from the ten questions, which led this researcher to include that component as a major factor. In addition to each of the five themes being considered a major theme, each subtheme was required to be addressed by the interviewees at least ten times to be considered a valid sub-theme. There was at least one subtheme under each major theme that met those criteria.

An unintended result was development of the identity of the individuals within the school. The reason the identity was so strong was because individuals within the buildings had their own significant journey in the process of deeply embedding Cognitive Coaching. The data also identified the concept of identity as a subtheme that emerged beneath the surface in multiple respondents' answers. In the review of literature values, beliefs, and identity were described as concepts that lie beneath the surface of every individual and can be explored through examining mental models. Mental models are explored through reflection, and it was the most significant subtheme related to reflection. When participants were giving an answer to an interview question or were observed in a whole-group or small-group meeting, what became evident to this researcher was that multiple individuals within the school environment had taken on the identity

of a coach. The goal of Cognitive Coaching is for the participants to assume the identity as a mediator of thinking (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Therefore the qualities of successful schools and the tools of Cognitive Coaching are being implemented at these sites because the leaders of the schools and fellow educators embraced the identity of a Cognitive Coach. The results of this study were interpreted while considering the overall set of results, the review of literature, the theoretical framework, and the limitations of the study.

The concept of identity was an interwoven thread laced throughout the individuals observed in this study. Time was spent getting to know and hear from five participants at each school site through the interview process, but even more time was spent observing the same participants and their colleagues in whole group, small group, and team planning meetings. The interview data gave specific answers from the participants directly tied to identity as a mediator of thinking being a primary contributor to a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. The observations collected supported identity being the true underlying factor in both the participants interviewed as well as the participants not interviewed. Specific observations of teachers using the tools of pausing, paraphrasing, and posing questions were observed. Planning and reflecting conversations were held in the normal business of the school, in small group meetings and in two person conversations.

While this researcher did not enter the school sites looking to see individuals who had taken on the identity of a Cognitive Coach, it became apparent while observing for indicators of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning. The identity as a mediator of thinking for the individuals contributed not only to the deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture, but also to the high performing successful school culture.

Identity as a Cognitive Coach was woven throughout both school environments. More than just individual identity, collective identity was also living within both schools. Both school leaders certainly exhibited traits of having the identity as a mediator of thinking. Both school support staff interviewed gave indicators of having the identity. Specific teachers interviewed responded to questions with answers showing use of the thinking behind Cognitive Coaching in professional and personal situations. Evidence collected in observations brought out even more people who were using the components of Cognitive Coaching. The collective identity of the schools themselves was cultivated through trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning.

Interwoven Results

Interwoven results were apparent throughout the entire study of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment, from the themes that emerged to similar factors being both facilitators and inhibitors of deep implementation. The themes of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning are threads that are woven throughout the school environments. An overall feeling of positivity was apparent throughout the building cultures through the words that were communicated in the individual interview questions, and the observations of whole-group, small-group, and team planning meetings..

Under the direction of the directed research committee, the interview protocol specifically asked questions related to both facilitating and inhibiting implementation. The major factor of time is both a factor and an inhibitor in deep implementation. Time was necessary at both school sites to foster deep implementation. The principals themselves have spent years honing their Cognitive Coaching tools through practice and continued training. Time to practice skills was also an inhibitor to deep implementation, as the participants described

needing more time to continue practice of skills, and more time to conduct coaching conversations.

The six major themes of the study were also interwoven throughout all interviews, observations, and documents collected. The tables listed throughout Chapter Four were designed to show how the major themes emerged throughout the variety of questions. Trust was described throughout multiple questions, not just the two questions on the Interview Protocol that were directly related to trust. Trust related to helping build collaborative skills, and high levels of collaboration contributed to an enhanced level of trust. The strong collaborative teams were an important component in the deep levels of reflection that took place at the school sites. The self-direction of individuals in the schools was a factor in the overall organizational learning being at a high level. The distributed leadership of the organization also contributed to establishing a collaborative culture, building trust, and facilitating self-direction within the individuals.

The overall findings from this study support the notion that a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching school culture also exhibits the qualities of a successful school (Alsieke 1997; Costa & Garmston, 2002; Costa, Garmston, & Zimmerman, 2014; Garmston & Wellman, 1997; Knight, 2009; Leithwood et al., 2004; Seashore Lewis et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). The five major themes of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning were discussed by each of the participants of the interview questions (W1; W2; W3; W4; W5; L1; L2; L3; L4; L5) and were observed in each of the observations of meetings. Furthermore, the respondents confirmed the data of the themes and subthemes identified in the review of literature. Conclusions were reached by comparing what the relevant literature says with the descriptive data gained from the interviews, observations, and documents collected. For major themes of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning to be

considered major themes, each concept needed to come to the surface for a combined twenty times throughout the coding of the interview notes. Each of the five components of successful schools did meet these criteria. In addition to each of the five themes being considered a major theme, the subthemes needed to have been addressed by the interviewees at least ten times to be considered a valid subtheme. There was at least one subtheme under each major theme that met those criteria.

Conclusions from this study were interpreted from the data gathered from the interviews, observations, documents collected, and the review of relevant literature. When examining the 16 themes listed in this study, all were directly supported by previous research as to what makes successful schools. When combining what makes successful schools and how to deeply embed Cognitive Coaching, all five of the major themes were important factors, and nine of the 16 subthemes were important factors. All five major themes of trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning overlapped with each other as indicated by the breakdown of themes emerging through question numbers listed in the tables. The sixth major theme of identity also emerged. The critical components of successful schools according to Leithwood et al., (2004) are also the components of Cognitive Coaching practice. Therefore a school that is implementing Cognitive Coaching at a deep level could be considered a successful school.

Implications for Leaders

The implications from this research study show how building-level leaders can deeply embed Cognitive Coaching in a school environment utilizing the components of successful schools as indicated by Leithwood et al., (2004). The word most frequently used by participants in this study in interview recordings was the word *time*, and time can both facilitate and inhibit deep implementation. In order for Cognitive Coaching to truly become the identity of the

educators in the school, time must be given to (a) establishing trusting relationships within the school, (b) creating a culture of collaboration, (c) facilitating opportunities in which reflection takes place, (d) producing self-directed persons, and (e) developing organizational learning to take place within the school. These five items take time for the school leader to embrace and model for the teachers and time for the teachers to embrace as well.

In order for Cognitive Coaching to become deeply embedded, educators cannot simply attend the eight-day training. It goes well beyond just training and must become part of the identity of the school. Continued reminders and practice of the components of Cognitive Coaching are necessary for deep implementation. Both school sites in this study had professional development observed by this researcher specifically around paraphrasing and functioning as a team. The leaders of the school buildings were alert to what teachers needed in order to continue to grow in the knowledge and skills of Cognitive Coaching, and professional development was structured around those areas. The leader not only structured professional development around the continuation of Cognitive Coaching, but also watched for specific components being used with students in the evaluation process.

The leaders in both school sites were also the models of deep implementation of Cognitive Coaching. Both school leaders have practiced the tools for years, attended the Foundation Seminar on more than one occasion, and sought out Advanced Training. Both leaders put a plan in place to get the whole staff trained and acquired funds to conduct training. Both principals placed key teacher leaders in the first round of training in order to help develop the entire school's coaching culture. The leaders have worked to build an environment that would sustain itself, whether or not they were the leader of that school.

Recommendations for Future Research

One recommendation for future research would be for a qualitative study centering on the themes of values, identity, and beliefs of Cognitive Coaching and how those themes are necessary when using Cognitive Coaching. Another component worth exploring would be the emergence of the importance of educators having both Adaptive Schools training and Cognitive Coaching training. A quantitative study comparing practices prior to receiving training and practices after participating in training would be of interest. A qualitative study of this nature would also provide the depth necessary to fully understand the implications of receiving both types of trainings. A qualitative study exploring the capabilities and tools of Cognitive Coaching and how implementing those components contribute to deep implementation would be of value. Each participant interviewed had a unique story of his or her own personal journey of Cognitive Coaching. A compilation of stories of individuals would be useful for both trainers and implementers of Cognitive Coaching.

Summary

In order to deeply embed Cognitive Coaching into the school environment, building principals must work to implement and sustain a culture that promotes the five components of successful schools: trust, collaboration, reflection, self-direction, and organizational learning. Interviews, observations, and documents were collected from each of the purposefully selected school sites.

An unintended result emerged through this study, that the identity as a mediator of thinking is a crucial element in establishing a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment. Information throughout the interviews and observations supported the thread of identity as a Cognitive Coach being woven throughout the school sites. The realization emerged that every principal or teacher, everyone who has been trained in Cognitive Coaching has his or

her own journey. The reason the identity was so strongly woven throughout was because each human being had a very significant journey in the process.

The realization of this research project is that all humans have their own journey in developing an identity as a Cognitive Coach.

References

Achinstein, B. (2002). Conflict amid community: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. *Teachers College Record*. *104*(3). Retrieved from: http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=10846.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 7,* 263-295.

Allison, E. (2010). *The foundations of great coaching for sustainable change and a greater good.* Salem, MA: Orange Dog Press.

Allison, E., Clinton, J., Hattie, J., Kamm, C., Lassiter., McNulty, B., Reeves, D., Rose, A., Trujillo, J., Ventura, S., Wasta, M., & White, S., (2011). *Activate: A leader's guide to people, practices, and processes.* Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Alseike, B. (1997). *Cognitive Coaching: It's influences on teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9804083)

Amason, A. (1995). Conflict: An important dimension in successful management Teams. *Organizational dynamics, 24*(2), 20-35.

Argyris, C. (1991, May-June). Teaching smart people how to learn. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/1991/05/teaching-smart-people-how-to-learn.

Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Oxford, England: Dorsey Press.

Argyris, M., & Schön, D. (1974) *Theory in Practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Arrington, C. (2010). *The relationship between transformational leadership and instructional coaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT 3446173)

Awakuni, G. H. (1995). *The impact of cognitive coaching as perceived by the Kalani high school core team.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT 30427893)

Badaracco, J. (2002). *Leading quietly*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Bandler, R., & Grinder, J. (1975). *The structure of magic: A book about language and therapy*. Palo Alto: CA, Science and Behavior Books.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Barkley, S. (2005). *Quality teaching in a culture of coaching*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Berliner, D. (1998). *The development of expertise in pedagogy*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.

Bjerken, K. S. (2013). *Building self-directed teachers: A case study of teachers' perspectives of the effects of cognitive coaching on professional practice.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT3564120)

Blagg, D. (2009, January 9). Expertise is not the (only) answer. Professor Monica Higgins takes a new look at teamwork in education leadership. *Usable* Knowledge. Retrieved at: http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/09/01/expertise-not-only-answer.

Boatright, B., Gallucci, C., Swanson, J., Van Lare, M., & Yoon, I. (2008). Coaching for instructional improvement: Themes in research and practice. *Journal for Research, Leadership, and Practice, 2*(1), 3-5.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2008). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bossidy, L. & Charan, R. (2002). *Execution: The discipline for getting things done. N*ew

York, NY: Crown Business.

Bridwell-Mitchell, E. (2013). Be careful what you wish for: The effects of issue interpretation on social choices in professional networks. *Organization Science*, *25*(2), 401-419. Retrieved at: http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.2013.0840.

Brooks, GR. (2000). Cognitive coaching for master teachers and its effect on student teachers' ability to reflect on practice. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *67*(1), 46-50.

Bryk, A. & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improving schools.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bryk, A., Sebring, P., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons learned from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Caine, R., & Caine, G. (1997). *Education on the edge of possibility.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Calabrese, R. (2002). *The leadership assignment: Creating change*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Clutterback, D. (2014). *Everyone needs a mentor*. London, UK: Chartered Institute of Professional Development.

Cogan, M., & Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Sspecial method for the supervision of teachers.* New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great. Why some companies make the leap…and others don't*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Corregan, D. (2001). The changing role of schools and higher education institutions with respect

to community-based interagency collaboration and interprofessional partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education,75*(3), 176-195.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (2003). *Cognitive coaching in retrospect: Why it persists.* Retrieved From: www.ThinkingCollaborative.com/

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (2013), Cognitive coaching seminars foundation training learning guide. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (2016). *Cognitive coaching: Developing self-directed leaders and learners.* Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield.

Costa, A.; Garmston, R., & Zimmerman, D. (2014). *Cognitive capital: Investing in teacher quality.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (2000). *Habits of mind: A developmental series.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (2004). Launching self-directed learners. *Educational Leadership, 62*(1), 51-55.

Creasy, J., & Paterson, F. (2005). Leading coaching in schools. *National College for School Leadership.* Retrieved from: www.ncsl.org.uk

Creighton, T. (2005). *Leading below the surface.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Curtis, R. & Wurtzel, J. (2010). *Teaching talent: A visionary framework for human capital in education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement.* New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

DeSteno, D. (2014). Who can you trust. *Harvard Business Review*, 92 (3), 112-115.

Devine, M., Meyers, R., Houssemand, C. (2013). *How can coaching make a positive impact within educational settings?* Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences 93. 1382-1389.

Dilts, R. (1990). *Changing Beliefs Systems with NLP*. Capitola, CA: Meta Publications.

Dougherty, P. (2000). *The effects of Cognitive Coaching training as it pertains to: Trust building at the development of a learning community for veteran teachers in a rural elementary school* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Pro Quest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT 3054864)

Duessen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., and Autio, E. (2007). "Coach" can mean many things: five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First. Issues and Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 005). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

DuFour, R. and Marzano, R. (2009). High leverage strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership*, (66)5, 62-68.

Dweck, C. (2009). Mindset: The new psychology of success. New York, NY: Random House

Edwards, J. (2013). Cognitive Coaching: A synthesis of the research.

Edwards, J. and Newton, R. (1994). Qualitative assessment of the effects of Cognitive Coaching training as evidenced through teacher portfolios and journals. (Research Rep. No. 1994-3).

Eger, K. A. (2006). *Teachers' perception of the impact of cognitive coaching on their teacher thinking and behaviors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT 3446173)

Ellison, J. and Hayes, C. (2003). *Cognitive Coaching: Weaving threads of learning and change.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Ellison, J. and Hayes, C. (2006). *Effective school leadership: Developing principals through Cognitive Coaching.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Elmore, R. (2002). *Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education.* Washington, DC: Albert Shankner Institute.

Fletcher, J., and Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In Pearce, C. and Conger, J. (Eds.), Shared leadership: Reframing the how's and whys of leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foord, K. and Haar, J. (2012). Gauging effectiveness. *School Administrator*, 69(1), 33-36.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2010). *Motion leadership: The skinny on becoming change savvy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M., and Knight, J. (2011). Coaches as system leaders. *Educational Leadership*. 69(2) 50-53.

Garmston, R. (1997). Can collaboration be taught? *Journal of Staff Development*. 18 (4).

Garmston, R. (2012). *Unlocking group potential to improve schools.* Corwin.

Thousand Oaks: CA.

Garmston, R., Linder, C., and Whitaker, J. (1993). Reflections on Cognitive Coaching. *Educational Leadership*. 51(2), 57-61.

Garmston, R., and Wellman, B. (1997). *The adaptive school: Developing and facilitating collaborative groups.* Mansfield, OH: Bookmasters, Inc.

Garmston, R and Zimmerman, D. (2013). The collaborative compact: operating principles lay the groundwork for successful group work. *Journal of Staff Development*. 34(2), 10-14.

Gay, L., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and Applications.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success.* New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.

Glickman, C. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: a developmental approach*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Goddard, R. (2001). Collective Efficacy: A neglected construct in the study of schools and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93 (3), 467-476.

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., and Hoy, A. (2004). Collective Efficacy: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. Educational Researcher. Pages 1-13.

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., and Woolfolk, A., (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. American Educational Research Journal. 37(2). 479-507.

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78-79.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed Leadership. In K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger, K. Seashore-

Louis, G. Furman-Brown, P. Gronn, W. Mulford and K. Riley (eds) Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration, Dordrecht: Kluwer

Hall, G. and Hord, S. (2001). Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hatch, T. (2001). It takes capacity to build capacity. *Education Week*, 44-47.

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning. A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York, NY: Routledge.

Heath, C., and Heath, D. (2010). Switch: How to change when change is hard. New York, NY: Broadway Books.

Henry, A. G. (2012). *Cognitive coaching: An examination of the reflective journaling of teacher candidates.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 1022190266).

Higgins, M. (2005). Career imprints: Creating leaders across an industry. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Hoy, W. and Tarter, C. (1997). The road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change, Elementary Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoy, W. and Tarter, C. (2003). Administrators solving the problems of practice: Decision-making, concepts, cases, and consequences. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hoy, W. and Woolfolk , A. (1993). Teachers sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 356-372.

Huckman, R. and Staats, B. (2013). The hidden benefits of keeping teams intact. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(12), 27-29.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria,

VA: ASCD.

Killon, J. and Harrison, C. (2006). *Taking the lead: new roles for teachers and school based coaches.* Oxford, OH: NSDC.

Kirtman, L. (2013). *Leadership and teams: The missing piece of the education reform puzzle.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Kluger, J. (2008). Simplexity: *Why simple things become complex (and hoe complex things can be made simple).* New York, NY: Hyperion Books.

Knight, J. (2009). *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knight, J. (2011). What good coaches do. *Educational Leadership*. 69(2) 18-22.

Koestler, A. (1972). *The roots of coincidence*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. Z. (1998). *Encouraging the heart: a leaders guide to rewarding and recognizing others.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. Its management and value. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Louis, K., Marks, H., and Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers professional community in restructuring schools. American Educational Research Journal. 33: 757-798.

Marzano, R.J., Waters, J.T. & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *What works in school leadership: Research to results.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Maskey, C. (2009). Cognitive Coaching has an exciting place in nursing education. *Teaching and learning in nursing*. 4(1), 63-65.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

McLymont, E. & da Costa, J. (1998). Cognitive Coaching: The vehicle for professional development and teacher collaboration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

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

Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler, *Trust in organizations* (p. 261-287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mourshed, M., Chijoke, C., Barber, M. (2010). *How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better*. London: McKinsey & Company. Retrieved at: http://mckinseyonsociety.com/how-the-worlds-most-improved-school-systems-keep-getting-better/

Murphy, J. (2009). The Leadership Trap. Leadership is never easy but it can be more fruitful if leaders welcome the uncomfortable as part of their work. Retrieved at: http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/09/01/leadership-trap

Murphy, J. (1988). The unheroic side of leadership: Notes from the swamp. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 69(9) 654-659.

Nidus, G., and Sadder, M. (2011). The principal as formative coach. *Educational Leadership*. 69(2) 30-35.

Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press.

Perkins, D. (2002). *King Arthur's round table*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Perkins, D. (2007). King Arthur's round table: How collaborative conversations create smart organizations. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Reeves, D. (2009). *Finding your leadership focus*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Reeves, D. (2008). *Reframing teacher leadership to improve your school.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Reeves, D. B. & Allison, E. (2009). *Renewal coaching: Sustainable change for individuals and organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rennick, L. W. (2002). *The relationship between staff development in balanced literacy instruction for kindergarten teachers and student literacy achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT305558874)

Rinaldi, L. (2013). *The effects of learning about the five states of mind on elementary children in grades 3, 4, and 5.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT3591907).

Robinson, V. M. J. (2011). Student-centered leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on school outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5)635-674.

Rock, D. (2006). Quiet leadership: Six steps to transforming performance at work. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Rock, D. (2009). Your brain at work. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Saban, J. (2003). Enculturating cognitive coaching in a complex system. In J. Ellison & C. Hayes, Cognitive coaching: Weaving threads of learning and change into the culture of an organization (pp. 3-11). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Saphier, J. (1993). How to make supervision and evaluation really work: supervision and evaluation in the context of strengthening school culture. Carlisle, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Scherer, M. (2011). The art of changing minds. *Educational Leadership*. 69(2) 7.

Schlosser, J. L. (1998). *The impact of cognitive coaching on the thinking processes of elementary school teachers.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9821080).

Schmoker, M. (2004). Tipping point: From feckless reform to substantive instructional improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(6), 424-432.

Seashore Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report on research findings.* New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, New York: Random House Publishing.

Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., Kleiner, A., (2012). *Schools that learn.* New York, New York: Random House Publishing.

Silbaugh, H. (2008). Reforming the Education of School Leaders. Retrieved from: https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/08/05/reforming-education-school-leaders

Slinger, J. L. (2004). *Cognitive Coaching: Impact on students and influence on teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No.

AAT 3138974)

Smith, M. (2013). Chris Argyris: theories of action, double-loop learning and organizational learning. Retrieved from:

http://infed.org/mobi/chris-argyris- theories-of-action-double-loop-learning-and-organizational-learning/.

Solomon, R. C. and Flores, F. (2001). *Building trust in business, politics, relationships, and life.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sousa, D. (2003). The leadership brain: How to lead schools more effectively. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Spillane, J. (2002). Local theories of teacher change: The pedagogy of district policies and programs. Teachers College Record, 104(3), 377-420.

Spillane, J. and Jennings, N. (1997). Aligned instructional policy and ambitious pedagogy: Exploring instructional reform from the classroom perspective. Teachers College Record, 98(3), 449-482.

Stake, R. (2010*). Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. New York, NY: The Gulliford Press.

Strauss, J,. & Corbin, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tamer, M. (2014). The Value of Self Reflection. Harvard Usable Knowledge website.

Tarter, C., Sabo, D. and Hoy, W. (1995), ``Middle school climate, faculty trust and effectiveness: a path analysis", Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 29 No.1,pp.41-9.

Toll, C. (2005). *The literacy coach's survival guide: Essential questions and practical answers, second edition.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2000). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 38(4)

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, B., and Tschannen-Moran, M. (2011). The coach and the evaluator. *Educational Leadership*. 69(2) 12-16.

Ushijima, T. (1996). *Five States of Mind Scale for Cognitive Coaching: A measurement study* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Pro Quest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT 9720306).

Wise, D. & Hammock, M. (2011). Leadership Coaching: Coaching Competencies and Best Practices. *Journal of School Leadership,* 21(3), 449-477.

Wiseman, L. (2010). Multipliers: How the best leaders make everyone smarter. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Yukl, G. (2009). Leadership in Organizations, Seventh Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

APPENDIX A

Request for Participation

July 1, 2015

Participant Name
Participant Address

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student at Southwest Baptist University and am working on my doctoral dissertation. It will be a qualitative case study focusing on principals' perceptions of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment, and I would like to formally request your participation. You have been purposefully selected as a potential participant in this study, because you meet the following specific criteria established by the researcher: have completed Advanced Cognitive Coaching training are an elementary principal located in southwest Missouri.

The study will help determine how principals can deeply embed Cognitive Coaching within the school culture. Your involvement will require setting aside time for an interview in which you are asked to elaborate on how you have embedded Cognitive Coaching throughout your school. You will be provided a transcript of our interview and will have the opportunity to change any statements that you feel are not clear or are inaccurate. I will also ask you to complete the Cognitive Coaching Self-Assessment for my viewing purposes.

As this is a case study, I would also request permission to come and observe a faculty meeting, a small group meeting, and a team planning session. Additionally, I would request a short interview with three of your teachers and a staff member. There may also be follow up contacts by me in the event that I need to clarify any information that I have obtained as a result of our interviews.

If you can participate, we will set up an interview at a time and place that is convenient for you, and I will provide interview questions in advance. Please contact me at the phone number or the e-mail below to let me know if you can participate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rachel Tennison
Bolivar Primary School Assistant Principal
Doctoral Student, Southwest Baptist University
417-350-5448
rtennison@bolivarschools.org

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form

Dear Colleague,

My name is Rachel Tennison, and I am the assistant principal at Bolivar Primary School in Bolivar, Missouri. I am a doctoral student at Southwest Baptist University, and I am conducting a research study to gather information about how principals can deeply embed Cognitive Coaching into the school culture. I would like to invite you to participate in this qualitative case study incorporating in-depth, semi-structured interviews. You have been purposefully selected as a potential participant in this study, because you meet the specific criteria established by the researcher. Possible benefits include an opportunity for you to reflect on your leadership involving Cognitive Coaching and offer insight to others concerning how you implement those practices.

I realize that you are very busy; the interview should take about one hour of your time to complete. During the interview, I will ask you for information about your experience with how you implement Cognitive Coaching and integrate successful school practices identified as effective by current literature. I will follow the included Researcher-developed Interview Guide, which contains questions pertaining to effective, research-based successful school practices.

Your privacy is important; information reported will not indicate individual participants or school districts. Each participant will be given a fictitious name, and no identifying characteristics will be acknowledged. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Your response to this letter will indicate your consent to participate and permission to use the information that you have provided in my study.

Before you make a final decision about participation, please read the following statements about how your responses will be used and how your rights as a participant will be protected:

- Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may stop participating at any point without penalty.
- You need not answer all of the questions.
- Your answers will be kept confidential. Results will be presented to others in summary form only, without names or other identifying information.
- Your participation will take approximately one hour. During this time you will answer questions about how you implement effective, research-based leadership practices.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the RRB Committee at Southwest Baptist University (326-1659). The committee believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights.

You may contact me at 417-350-5448 if you have questions or concerns about your participation. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, you may contact me via email at rtennison@bolivarschools.org. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Rachel Tennison
Bolivar Primary School

APPENDIX C

Member Checking Letter

Participant Name
Participant Address

Dear Participant,

Thank you again for taking part in my doctoral research project concerning how principals deeply embed Cognitive Coaching into the school culture. The descriptive data you offered during our interview provided valuable insight toward answering the research questions for this study.

I am currently in the process of analyzing the descriptive data you provided. Ensuring trustworthiness is an important component of qualitative research. Therefore, I am using member checking as one step toward addressing the validity of this study.

I am including a copy of the transcription of our interview for you to review. Please let me know if there are any statements that need to be corrected or changed for accuracy or clarity purposes. These transcriptions will not be published and will remain confidential. Quotations and paraphrases from our interview will be used to support the emerging themes, but confidentially will be maintained throughout the study.

Your feedback is important, and I value any input or comments you may have to enhance my research. Thank you again for taking the time to participate in this study and allowing others to learn from your knowledge and experiences.

Sincerely,
Rachel Tennison
Bolivar Primary School
Doctoral Student, Southwest Baptist University

APPENDIX D

Peer Review Letter

Colleague Name
Colleague Address

Dear Colleague,

I have a small favor to ask of you. I am working on my dissertation: *A Qualitative Study of the Factors Supporting the Implementation and Sustainability of a Deeply Embedded Cognitive Coaching School Culture*. I have interviewed a principal and four certified staff members at two separate school sites to gather their perceptions concerning *how* to deeply embed Cognitive Coaching. I identified five successful school practices from the literature and interviewed each person pertaining to these practices.

I am currently in the process of analyzing the descriptive data from each of the interviews. I coded all of the participants' responses and looked for emerging themes. Ensuring trustworthiness is an important component of qualitative research. Therefore, I am incorporating peer examinations of the emerging themes as one step toward addressing the validity of this study.

I am including a copy of the emerging themes for the study for you to review. I have also included notes paraphrasing each of the interviewee's descriptive data. Each of the emerging themes is highlighted a specific color, and the matching supporting data from each interviewee is highlighted the same color.

Please review this document and let me know if the themes that emerged from the supporting data seem plausible to you. Your feedback is important, and I value any input or comments you may have to enhance my research. Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this process.

Sincerely,
Rachel Tennison
Bolivar Primary School
Doctoral Student, Southwest Baptist University

APPENDIX E

Interview Protocol and Questions

Instructions: The interview will be digitally recorded. The interview will be less than one hour in length.

Introduction: This interview is being digitally recorded, and confidentiality will be maintained as outlined in the consent form. Are you ready to begin the interview?

Guiding Research Questions:

1. In what ways does a school that has a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching culture exhibit the qualities of a successful school?
2. How do members of the school community perceive Cognitive Coaching as deeply embedded within the school culture?
3. What are the factors that facilitate a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?
4. What are the factors that inhibit implementation of a deeply embedded Cognitive Coaching environment?

The following questions come from the review of literature:

1. In what ways have you worked to develop a school-wide culture of coaching?
2. What have been some of the challenges in implementing Cognitive Coaching within your school?
3. How has building a trusting relationship with staff changed since you had Cognitive Coaching training?
4. What are the benefits that have come from having a trusting organization?

5. What are some of the ways you support a collaborative culture within your building?
6. What are some of the practices you have implemented to encourage dialogue among group members?
7. How has the importance of reflection changed for you since receiving Cognitive Coaching training?
8. What are some ways you encourage reflective conversations within your building?
9. In what ways has participating in Cognitive Coaching enhanced your own self-directedness?
10. In what ways has participating in Cognitive Coaching contributed to helping develop self-directedness in others?
11. How has implementing Cognitive Coaching gone compared to how you thought it would go?
12. Is there anything else you have not shared that you would like to share?

Closing: Thank you for your participation in this study. As previously discussed, your responses will not be connected to any identifiable information.

Nondirective probes for open-ended questions:

• What else do you wish to add?

• Can you tell me more about your thinking on this?

• What are some other things that come to mind?

• What specifically occurred?

• Are there any other issues involved?

APPENDIX F

Observation Matrix

Trust	
• Establishing trustworthy relationships • Defining facets of trust • Building trust within the organization	
Collaboration	
• Developing a collaborative culture • Building team mentality skills • Embracing the importance of dialogue	
Reflection	
• Exploring tacit knowledge so it becomes explicit • Examining mental models • Integrating double loop learning	
Self-Direction	
• Self-managing, self-monitoring, self-modifying • How a leader builds internal resourcefulness • Collective efficacy of the system	
Organizational Learning	
• Leader as coach • Distributed leadership • Systems learning • Influence	