Learning theories, professional development, and implmentation motives:

A discussion of teacher peer coaching

Kristen Ferguson
Schulich School of Education, Nipissing University

Abstract

This paper explores teacher peer coaching, a current popular model of professional development in schools. Teacher peer coaching meets many of the criteria required for effective professional development as outlined in the literature. In addition, the characteristics of peer coaching also coincide with the literature on how teachers learn. There are, however, a number of motives behind the implementation of a teacher peer coaching program that may hinder the success of peer coaching. This paper provides a summary of the supporting principles peer coaching and also contains a critical discussion of why and when peer coaching should be used in the educational context.

Key Words: peer coaching; professional development; teacher learning

Introduction

Just as coaches help improve an athlete's performance, the purpose of coaching in the educational context is to help teachers improve their performance in the classroom, with ultimate goal being to improve the quality of instruction for all students (Gottesman & Jennings, 1994; Guiney, 2001; Swafford, 1998). Coaching in the workplace has experienced a boom over the past few decades and continues to grow as a form of professional learning. In schools across North America, peer coaching has seen a resurgence in popularity as a form of professional development for teachers. Most notably is the position of the literacy coach, and literacy coaches are now commonly found in schools across the United States and Canada. Following in the footsteps of literacy coaching, mathematics coaching is also becoming more popular in schools (Hansen, 2016; Obrara, 2010). In Europe, peer coaching is also a popular form of professional development and has become entrenched into a number of educational policies (Burley & Pomphrey, 2011). Peer coaching is clearly an educational initiative that is in vogue. But is there theory that supports the unpinning principles of teacher peer coaching and research that supports its use for professional development? And when should peer coaching be used?

Purpose

Meshing theoretical writings with relevant literature together with motives for implementing a coaching program the aim of this paper is to provide a foundation and some guidance to practicing teachers, school leaders and administrators when implementing a peer coaching program. This paper does not attempt to provide an inclusive meta-analysis of the research on peer coaching, but instead strives to explore these questions and provide a thoughtful critique on some areas of peer coaching not addressed or reported on fully in the literature. As a researcher who has investigated literacy coaching in depth, I have seen both the benefits and the drawbacks of peer coaching. I have seen peer coach-

ing be very successful, yet I have also seen a numbers of problems that arise from coaching. In selecting works for inclusion in this paper, I sought seminal work about learning theories that underpin the practice of peer coaching to provide a theoretical grounding for coaching. In discussing the implementation motives of peer coaching programs and when it should and should not be implemented, I used my knowledge gained as a coaching researcher as a starting point to seek relevant literature to support my stances, as well as used the extant literature about barriers and successes to peer coaching programs.

This paper is divided into four parts. First, the types of peer coaching and how peer coaching is different from other forms of collaborative professional development are briefly outlined. The works of Mezirow (1991), Schön (1983), and Vygotsky (1978, 1981) are next presented and related to peer coaching to provide a theoretical basis for peer coaching as professional learning. How peer coaching fits criteria in the research on effective professional development is then explored. Finally, while there is a solid theoretical and research basis to support peer coaching, I would argue that it is not always the best choice for professional development. Motivations for implementing peer coaching are examined and discussed in this final section.

What is Teacher Peer Coaching?

Marsh, McCoombs and Martorell (2012) explain that peer coaches work with teachers "in an on-going hands-on way that may promote deep personal reflection about teaching practices" and "are intended to service in an non-evaluative, support role for teachers" (p. 3). Like a sports coach can be a leader for a team (Palestini, 2009), peer coaches can be leaders within their schools. As Dole and Donaldson (2006) explain about reading coaches (a type of peer coach, also known as a literacy coach), "Coaches are sometimes cheerleaders and sometimes critics. They guide athletes and help them become better at what they do. Likewise, reading coaches support and guide classroom teachers and act as mentors and assistants" (p. 486). It important to note, however, that peer coaches are still teachers and do not have administrative authority (Burkins, 2007). Peer coaches also work with teachers to improve their practice and student achievement, rather than working with the students directly (Burkins, 2007; Dole & Donaldson, 2006). Therefore, it is often said that peer coaches lead from behind, meaning that peer coaches are leaders by supporting and encouraging teachers (Vogt & Shearer, 2003).

Peer coaching in education usually follows a similar three-step model. Teachers meet and plan lessons, observe teaching, and then discuss and provide feedback on the teaching that was observed, but there can be variations on this model (Zwart et al., 2009). All coaching models, however, can be classified as either reciprocal coaching or expert coaching (Ackland, 1991). In reciprocal coaching (also referred to in the literature as collaborative co-coaching) teachers observe and provide feedback to each other (Zwart et al., 2009; CUREE, 2007; Gibson, 2006). According to Ackland (1991), reciprocal coaching is: 'You watch me teach. I'll watch you teach, and, together, we'll learn about

teaching" (p. 25). Expert coaching is "lesson observation and feedback from an acknowledged expert" (Gibson, 2006, p. 296). Specialists can provide teachers with expertise in areas related to information, content knowledge, strategies, and applying new approaches in the classroom (Cordingly, 2012).

It is significant to note that peer coaching has some similarities to, and some differences from, other forms of collaborative professional development. In mentoring, teachers are in an advisory role with more experienced teachers usually mentoring new or novice teachers (Askew & Carnell, 2011; CUREE, 2007). Mentoring and coaching are not mutually exclusive; coaching may be one of many activities used in a mentoring relationship (Fletcher, 2007). While team teaching, teachers may follow a similar process to peer coaching. Two teachers plan, teach, and assess a group of students together, but unlike peer coaching, during team teaching, teachers "are not necessarily observing for the purpose of professional development and improvement" (Watson & Kilcher, 1990, p. 9). Clinical supervision is more formal than peer coaching and involves a supervisory relationship, often resulting in an evaluation of a teacher's competence, whereas peer coaching focuses more on support, growth, and reflection, (Britton & Anderson, 2010).

Learning Theories and Peer Coaching

Askew and Carnell (2011) point out that there is a dearth of literature that examines the theoretical foundation of teacher peer coaching. An examination of learning theories is helpful when exploring teacher peer coaching, because in peer coaching, teachers are learners and are constructing new knowledge with the assistance of a coach. While there are numerous learning theories that could be related to peer coaching, the classic works of Mezirow (1991), Schön (1983), and Vygotsky (1978, 1981) provide theories to ground the principles of peer coaching. The works by these theorists are seminal learning theories and provide a foundation for the practice of peer coaching.

First, Mezirow (1991) has written much about adults as learners, and in particular, what he calls transformative learning. For Mezirow (1991), transformative learning occurs when learners use reflection and change their meaning schemes, transform their meaning perspectives, and integrate these changes into their lives. The role of the teacher in transformative learning is to assist learners in looking critically at their experiences, beliefs, and behaviors, as they appear at the moment, and also within the context of the learners' histories and the consequences in the learners' lives (Mezirow, 1991). Peer coaching fits Mezirow's (1975, cited in 1991) phases of transformative learning (Askew & Carnell, 2011; Griffiths, 2005; Griffiths & Campbell, 2009). Mezirow (1975, cited in 1991) lists ten phases that occur during personal transformation:

1. A disorienting dilemma
2. Self-examination with feelings of fear, anger, guilt or shame
3. A critical assessment of assumptions
4. Recognition that one's discontent and the process of trans-

formation are shared

5. Exploration of options for new roles, relationships and actions

6. Planning a course of action

7. Acquiring knowledge and skills for implementing one's plans

8. Provisional trying of new roles

9. Building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships

10. A reintegration into one's life on the basis of conditions dictated by one's new perspective (p. 169)

As Griffiths (2005) and Askew and Carnell (2011) note, the steps in a peer coaching framework are similar to these transformative phases. Peer coaches work with teachers to solve a problem or improve teaching practices in a specific area, and this may cause some fear or anxiety. The coach dialogues with the teacher, exploring beliefs and assumptions and creates a plan for future coaching activities. The coach continues to work with the teacher, having the teacher try new teaching strategies and gradually giving the teacher more responsibility as the teacher improves his or her skills. According to Griffiths (2005), "confidence and competence is gradually built and ultimately, the transformation becomes a natural state of being" (p. 60). Learning culminates as those who are coached apply the new knowledge and integrate learning into their lives. Reflection is a key element in the tenth and final phase of Mezirow's (1975, as cited in Mezirow, 1991) transformative learning. Critical reflection allows for the opportunity to develop new knowledge and interpretations and can impact future action (Burley & Pomphrey, 2011). Thus, Askew and Carnell (2011) argue that coaching must be reflective in order to result in effective and sustained change. Change, according to Askew and Carnell (2011), "involves changing one's meaning structures –perspective transformation –leading to transformative actions" (p. 34) and, therefore, coaches should be facilitators of reflective discourse. Griffith and Campbell's (2009) research confirms that that the discovery of new knowledge in coaching materializes through cycle of relating, questioning, reflecting, and listening.

Schön (1983) believes that professionals, such as teachers, can self-educate by using reflective practice and tacit knowledge. Teachers, in their every day work lives, possess tacit knowledge that they may not be aware of or be able to verbalize, but it is spontaneous and skillful in execution (Schön, 1987). Because "the knowing is in the action," Schön (1987) refers to this concept as "knowing-in-action" (p. 25). In their daily lives as professionals, however, teachers may encounter "surprises" outside of their routine that may cause them to use reflection to solve a problem or to address a situation (Schön, 1983). Since teachers are reflecting in the moment, or "thinking on their feet" (Schön, 1983, p. 54), such refection is referred to as "reflection-in-action." (Schön, 1983, p. 54; 1987, p. 26). This solution to the problem or surprise often results in new understandings and a change in the situation. Teachers can also learn from the surprise

situation using "reflection-on-action," which allows teachers to reflect on the surprise after the moment has past (Schön, 1987, p. 26). Peer coaching meets the criteria of teacher learning and reflective practice as described by Schön (1983, 1987). Schön (1987) also discusses the reflective practice paradigm, wherein learning occurs though social relationships, and Schön (1987) refers to the teacher in this type of a learning relationship as a master or a coach. While Schön's (1987) coaching paradigm originally describes a teacher/student coaching relationship, this paradigm can also be applied to teacher peer coaching. Because a leaner may not know what he or she needs to learn, the learner must trust the coach, and the coach will help build understanding by arranging particular experiences. Coaches can use telling, demonstrating, or a combination to guide learners through new experiences. Schön (1987) also notes that a coach's instruction or feedback (telling) to a learner should be in the context of "doing," since reflection should be in action or on action (p. 102). A coach can demonstrate an aspect of learning and the learner will imitate the coach. Dialogue is a key part of this process of demonstration and imitation and all the while, both the coach and the student will use "reflection-in-action" on the teaching and learning they experience (Schön, 1987, p. 101). Schön's (1987) reflective practice paradigm parallels the teacher peer coaching models in the literature (Zwart et al., 2009)

Vygotsky (1981) believes that learning is rooted within social relationships and new knowledge is created through social interaction. While adult learners have some similarities and some differences from child learners (Lyons & Pinnell, 2001; Toll, 2005), Vygotskian principles can also be applied to adults, such as teachers, as they learn new skills. Peer coaching is a model of professional development that is collaborative in its design, and teachers are actively participating in their own learning and co-creating new knowledge as they dialogue and share with a peer coach. Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development is a key concept that can also be applied to peer coaching. According to Vygotsky (1978), the zone of proximal development is "the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving and under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). The more capable peer provides support, guidance, and knowledge to the learner to help the learner to complete the task. In teacher peer coaching coaching, the coach is the more knowledgeable peer who scaffolds learning for teachers in their zones of proximal development. Thus teacher peer coaching supports teacher learning by providing a social relationship that helps teachers gain new competencies that they would not have been able to own their own, through social activities such as dialogue, reflection, and observing with a coach.

Professional Development and Peer Coaching

Bean (2004) defines professional development as "efforts related to improving the capabilities and performance of educators" (p. 79). The purpose of professional development is to increase "teacher knowledge and instruction in ways that translate into

enhanced student achievement" (Desimone, 2011, p. 68). The literature indicates that professional development for teachers is important because professional development has a positive effect on student learning and achievement (Carpenter et al., 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2000, Robinson et al., 2009). A variety of terms including, staff development and in-service are used synonymously with professional development in the literature (Vogt & Shearer, 2003).

> Traditionally, professional development has consisted of sporadic presentations by "experts" who fly or drive in from somewhere, for an hour to a full day, to share new ideas, methods, and materials in the hope that the attending teachers and administrators will pick up an idea or two and return to the classroom enthusiastic about implementing them. (Vogt & Shearer, 2003, p. 224)

Research, however, suggests that these traditional forms of professional development workshops are ineffective (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Fullan, 1995; Hawley & Valli, 2000; Joyce & Showers, 1982, 1987, 1996, 2002; Wei et al., 2009). Fullan (1995) notes that traditional professional development "lacks any integration with the day-to-day life of teachers" and is, therefore, likely not to be implemented by teachers (p. 253). Joyce and Showers (1996) write that only ten percent of participants actually implement what they learned during their staff development sessions. In order for new skills and teaching practices to be automatic and lasting, classroom teachers need time to learn (Desimone, 2011), time repeat and to practice new strategies (Allen, 2006), have opportunities to study, apply, and reflect on their learning (Killion, 2003), and be active in their own learning (Desimone, 2011). Collaboration and collegiality also facilitate school improvement and teacher learning (Fullan, 1995; Guskey, 1995; Smylie, 1995) towards building a community of practice (Wenger, 1998); however, "most schools still isolate teachers from one another most of the time, providing little opportunity for purposeful social interaction" (Hawley & Valli, 1999, pp. 130-131). In addition, despite being an important part of the learning process, Askew and Carnell (2011) also note that reflective learning is not given much prominence in traditional professional development, perhaps as it is seen as indulgent. Despite what is known about teacher learning, the traditional one-day workshop model remains a popular form of professional development (Wei et al., 2009).

The work of Joyce and Showers (1987, 1996, 2002) has been key in demonstrating the efficacy that peer coaching has on transferring newly learned teaching skills into classroom practices. Joyce and Showers (1987) write that for a complex model of teaching, "we estimate that about 25 episodes during which the new strategy is used are necessary before all the conditions of transfer are achieved" (p. 86). According to Joyce and Showers (2002), there are different levels of transfer, ranging from imitative use to executive use of the new initiative. Transferring new skills by implementing new initiatives in the classroom is a complex task that can be awkward for teachers and which takes time (Joyce & Showers, 2002, 1982). Thus, one-day workshops will not give teachers the depth of understanding or the ability to transfer new learning and

methods of teaching into their teaching repertoires. Because teachers need social support to transfer new learning into practice, peer coaching has a greater effect size on transfer than other methods of professional development (Joyce & Showers, 2002, 1987, 1982). Therefore, teachers who are coached have higher implementation levels of new initiatives (Joyce & Showers, 1996). Recent research on coaching confirms that coaching teaching increases teacher implementation of initiatives more than other forms of professional development. For example, Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) examined the implementation a literacy initiative in elementary schools using four forms of professional development: a workshop; a workshop plus modeling; a workshop, modeling, and practice; and a workshop, modeling, practice, and coaching. They report that the implementation of the initiative was significantly higher with coaching when compared to the other forms of professional development. In addition, Carlisle and Berebitsky (2011) found that teachers who received literacy coaching were more likely to implement a literacy initiative than their peers who did not have any coaching.

Peer coaching meets the characteristics for effective development as outlined in the professional development literature. Peer coaching allows teachers to retain some autonomy since coaching is an individualized form of professional development, and it also uses social relationships to support learning, and takes place over a period of time, rather than a one-time workshop (Toll, 2005; Wildman & Niles, 1987). Dialogue is a critical piece in peer coaching and together learners and coaches co-create new knowledge (Burley & Pomphrey, 2011). In addition, the peer coaching model meets a number of the characteristics of effective professional development as described by Hawley and Valli (2000) since coaching is school-based, on-going, supportive, and seeks to improve teaching in order to better student achievement. Peer coaching is also hands-on, integrated into the daily lives of teachers, and balances knowledge and skill, all qualities of effective professional development (Garet et al., 2001). Coaching can also be content specific, as is exemplified through the popular model of literacy coaching, and a focus on content and expertise is important in effective professional development (Cordingly, 2012; Desimone, 2011).

Peer coaching also has other positive benefits for teachers. Coaching encourages self-awareness and self-discovery in those being coached (Geber, 2010), initiates the opportunity to try new teaching skills and strategies (Knapp et al., 1989) and can enhance teacher energy and job satisfaction (Allan, 2007). The use of coaching also helps break the isolation that exists in traditional schools and promotes collegiality among teachers (Gottesman & Jennings, 1994; Joyce & Showers, 1982; Sparks & Bruder, 1987). As Gordon, Nolan and Forlenza, (1995) write, the use of coaching "improves the school as a workplace for teachers, making it more collaborative, supportive, and exciting" (p. 69). There is also a growing body of literature that describes how peer coaching can increase perceptions of self-efficacy (e.g. Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Moen et al., 2009) and teacher self-efficacy is positively linked to student achievement (Ross, 1992). Finally, Askew and Carnell (2011) argue that the reflec-

tive nature of coaching moves beyond the traditional ideology of professional learning for skills, competencies, personal meaning, and learning through social interaction, to a more powerful and deeper reflective learning for perspective transformation.

Desimone (2011) writes that effective professional development should increase teacher knowledge and lead to increases in student achievement. There is ample literature that anecdotally describes the positive effects of coaching on student achievement or that implies a relationship between increases in student achievement and peer coaching (e.g. Lapp et al., 2003; Morgan et al., 2003; Peterson et al., 2009). While professional development's impact on student achievement can be difficult to isolate (Guskey, 2000), there are studies that demonstrate teacher peer coaching has increased student achievement. The early work of Ross (1992) found that student achievement was greater among students whose teachers worked closely with a coach compared to those students whose teachers did not work as much with the coach. Booth Olson and Land (2008) also found that high school students whose teachers were supported by literacy coaches demonstrated significant gains in writing achievement, and this boost in achievement was sustained in following years. Carlisle and Berebitsky's (2011) found that first-graders in the classes of teachers who engaged in coaching showed greater improvement in word decoding than those students in classes whose teachers participated in other forms of professional development such as traditional workshops, demonstrations, and practice.

Peer Coaching: A Panacea for Professional Development?

It is thus evident by reviewing the literature that teacher peer coaching is solidly grounded in the learning theories of Mezirow (1991), Schön (1983), and Vygotsky (1978, 1981). Reviewing the literature also indicates that teacher peer coaching meets the characteristics for effective professional development, has other positive benefits for teachers (e.g. increases in self-efficacy), and has the potential to increase student achievement more than other forms of professional development. There is, indeed, a compelling case that can be made for the widespread implementation of peer coaching for professional development that we currently see across global contexts. But is peer coaching always the right choice for professional development? When is employing peer coaching not a good idea? Teacher peer coaching should be implemented as long-term sustained practice for the betterment of teaching and student learning. There is, however, little extant critical literature that explores the possible negative aspects surrounding the implementation of teacher peer coaching. While not an exhaustive discussion, the following section presents some motives for implementing teacher peer coaching and explores instances when peer coaching might not be the best choice for teacher professional development.

First, teacher peer coaching should not be implemented because of pressures from school districts or departments of Education, or because it is a current trend in education. This motive can cause coaching programs to be rushed into implementation without adequate planning, resulting in expert coaches who are not qualified. In the United States, for example, there is a concern that because literacy coaches are in high demand, there may not be enough specialists available for the positions available (Reading Today, 2006) and those that are working in an expert coaching role may not actually be qualified to do so (Roller, 2006). The International Reading Association (2004), therefore, suggests that "it is better to delay implementing a reading coaching intervention than to push ahead with inadequately trained reading coaches" (p. 4)." Quality teacher peer coaching cannot be sacrificed in a rush to implement coaching (Sturtevant, 2004), and implementing coaching for misguided reasons is a threat to potential and future of peer coaching (Frost & Bean, 2006). If teacher peer coaching is implemented with little thought or attention, particularly in regards to the hiring of expert coaches, it would be easy to deem peer coaching unsuccessful and simply another fad in education.

Teacher peer coaching should also not be implemented in an effort to save money. While it may be tempting for administrators to cut back on professional development budgets because peer coaching might be regarded as cheaper, this line of thinking is false, and a quality peer-coaching program is not inexpensive. First, expert coaches must be paid a salary. The research also finds that expert coaches also need on-going professional development; and the research indicates the need for coaches to work with and learn from other coaches (Blamey et al., 2008/2009; Lynch & Ferguson, 2010; Peterson et al., 2009). Research also indicates that expert coaches feel that they need more time to work with teachers (Lynch & Ferguson, 2010) and the more time coaches can devote to working with their peers, the more support coaches can provide (Ferguson, 2013). Coaching time spent working directly with teachers has been found to positively linked to improved student achievement (Boulware, as cited in Taylor et al., 2007; Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2008, as cited in Elish-Piper et al., 2009; Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2010). Thus a fulltime expert coaching program would likely see more positive results in teacher learning and student achievement than a part-time coaching program. Using reciprocal peer coaching is not necessary a cost saving endeavor either. The importance of teachers having scheduling flexibility and release time to work with coaches has been reported in the literature (Elish-Piper et al., 2009; Steckel, 2009). Scheduling on-going release time in a cost-free manner can be difficult and regularly hiring supply teachers is also expensive. To further complicate matters, in some jurisdictions, union guidelines state teachers do not have to give up their preparation time to participate in coaching and participating in professional development outside of the school day is not mandatory (Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario, 2008). Thus, peer coaching is not inexpensive: a significant amount of sustained funding is required to pay for expert peer coaches' salaries and their on-going professional development, or supply teachers are needed to provide release time for school-based reciprocal peer coaching.

Administrators should also be cautious of using teacher peer coaching as only a change mechanism, as a means to implement a specific goal. Peer coaching should meet the needs of individual teachers, adapting for what each teachers needs and wants to learn about. Peer coaching should not be used to control what and how teachers

teach (i.e. using peer coaching to only implement specific change initiatives). If the motivation behind implementing peer coaching is to change and control how teachers teach, several issues can occur. Askew and Carnell (2011) reprove of coaching from a top-down approach where the administration sets specific goals for coaching, arguing that goal-orientated coaching (rather than learner-orientated coaching) results in only superficial change. They argue that coaching should focus on reflective discourse, not on the perceived deficit of skills and competencies of workers (Askew & Carnell, 2011). Lynch and Ferguson (2010) and Ferguson (2011) describe how teacher peer coaching could be viewed as a form discipline (Foucault, 1977/1979) to control what and how teachers teach. As Ferguson (2011) notes, Foucault's theory (1977/1979) of "correct training" (hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and the examination) can easily fit into a peer coaching model (p. 170). In hierarchical observation (Foucault 1977/1979), people in the role of power observe those individuals who need corrected behavior. Foucault's (1977/1979), second method of correct training is normalizing judgment, "where nonconformance is punishable, and the fear of being thought abnormal creates a sense of conformity" (Ferguson, 2011). Foucault's (1977/1979) final method of correct training is the examination. During the examination, the individual in the position of power creates documentation about an individual; the individual is then a case to be compared with others and to be improved. Foucault (1977/1979) describes the prison, a tower which allows guards to view prisoners without being seen by the prisoners themselves, as a central feature of correct training. If prisoners believe they are being watched, even if they are not, they will behave in the normative and correct way. It is quite evident that Foucault's method of correct training parallels, many aspects of peer coaching. Observations of teaching are a standard part of any peer coaching model and teachers are being watched as they teach. If there is a correct way to teach that the peer coach had been told to implement, that being a specific goal, program, or initiative that administrators want implemented, teachers may feel that they must adopt the normalized teaching methods out of fear of being rebuked by the administration. Expert coaches also take notes and set goals with and for teachers to improve their teaching, turning them into a case for improvement. Administrators may use peer coaches as the "the eyes and ears" of the administration (Mraz et al., 2008, p. 147); thus peer coaches can be used to create a panoptic effect and teachers will adopt the normalized methods because they know the peer coach might be watching. Peer coaching thus has the potential be used as a form of "supervisory evangelism" which de-professionalizes" and "disempowers" teachers (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990, p. 239) and can perpetuate inequalities and promote the dominant belief system over an individual's beliefs (Carnell & Askew, 2011). Peer coaching should strive to empower teachers to make genuine transformational changes, and not try to control to normalize teachers into using the "correct" teaching methods.

Another problem that arises when using peer coaching to implement a specific change initiative is the issue of collegiality. First, you cannot simply force teachers to be collegial. Peer coaching should be used as a form of professional development with those teachers

who are willing (Joyce & Showers, 1996). Using the coaches as a panoptic tool for the administration also creates problems between the coaches and teachers. For instance, in some jurisdictions, coaches are also teachers, and under union guidelines, no teacher may evaluate a fellow teacher in any way. This would include discussing with a principal whether a teacher is doing what he or she is "supposed" to be doing. Peer coaches being asked by the administration to report on what they observe teachers doing in the classroom are being put into a precarious position (Ferguson, 2011). Burkins (2007) as well as Poglinco, Bach, Hovde, Rosenblum, Saunders and Supovitz (2003) state that information principals gain about teachers from the coaches may create negative effects on the relationship between the coach and the teachers. With literacy coaching being so popular in the United States and Canada, teacher resistance to peer coaching is commonly cited as a barrier (Casey, 2006; Dole & Donaldson, 2006; Ferguson, 2011). As Lynch and Ferguson (2010) and Ferguson (2011) point out, if coaching is viewed through a Foucauldian perspective, resistance will always exist where power exists (Foucault, 1978/1990). If peer coaching is being used as a method of controlling teachers and peer coaches have power over teachers, teachers will naturally resist this power.

If teachers are forced to work with a coach, it may also create a sense of contrived collegiality and only surface level change, and while teachers may appear to be cooperative and engaged in peer coaching, teachers may be covertly resistant to coaching (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990). Overall, Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) are skeptical of the true collegial nature coaching, stating: "within these initiatives, under the aegis of professional collaboration, lurks an administrative apparatus of surveillance and control" (p. 239). Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) state that while collaborative professional development does bring teachers together to reflect on practice, it also is a "mechanism designed to facilitate the smooth and uncritical adoption of preferred forms of action (new teaching styles)" (p. 230). Hargreaves (1991) argues that while peer coaching may on the surface appear voluntary, teachers may, in fact, have little say and be forced into this type of "collegial" professional development. This type of contrived collegiality disrespects teachers' professionalism and judgment (Hargreaves, 1991). It is ironic that so many negative issues surrounding collegiality can occur within a model of professional development that touted for its collaborative design and benefits. A community of practice (Wenger, 1998) where teachers share and learn from each other to grow professionally must be organic; they cannot be forced by an administration or by a professional development initiative like peer coaching.

Finally, if peer coaching is implemented only for the purposes of adopting specific changes in teaching practices, it thus not an on-going and sustained form of professional development. Once the change has been adopted, is peer coaching discontinued? The purpose of peer coaching should not simply be change in teaching practices. A coaching program cannot be static: it should be continually moving forward, rather than coaching toward one particular goal (Ferguson, 2013). Also, rather than a top-down model, coaches and teachers need to be empowered to develop their own

initiates that are specific to their schools and classrooms. Teacher peer coaching should be focused on grassroots transformational learning, not as a programmatic instructional change (Askew & Carnell, 2011). As teachers and coaches dialogue, they co-construct new knowledge, and this locally-constructed knowledge should be valued. This knowledge should be used to develop grassroots goals and objectives for the peer coaching program, rather than relying on or being bound by solely administrative initiatives (Ferguson, 2013). For learning to be transformative, learning must purposeful and individual to the learner.

In Conclusion

There is little doubt that the literature supports the foundations of teacher peer coaching. It is a model of professional development that is supported by learning theories and the research on effective professional development. To summarize, peer coaching can:

• use transformative learning practices and theories (Mezirow, 1991)

• aid in reflective practice (Schön, 1987 1983)

• support learning within the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978)

• meet the criteria for effective professional development, such as: providing time to learn, practice, and repeat; ongoing, school-based learning; directly relating to teachers' daily work; teachers being actively involved in their learning (Desimone, 2011; Fullan, 1995; Guskey, 1995; Hawley & Valli, 2000, Joyce & Showers, 1982, 1987, 2002)

• increase student achievement more than other forms of professional development (Booth Olson & Land, 2008; Carlisle & Berebitsky, 2011; Ross, 1992)

• have other benefits for teachers such as increased job satisfaction (Allan, 2007) and increased perceptions of self-efficacy (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Moen et al., 2009).

While one could argue that the literature presents a rather clear-cut case exalting the benefits of peer coaching, in practice, teacher peer coaching may not always be so idyllic. Figure 1 outlines reasons that are unsound to implement peer coaching and offers the optimal conditions for implementing a peer coaching program.

Figure 1: Implementing Peer Coaching

Peer coaching should not be implemented because it is…	Instead, peer coaching should be ….
trendy, pressure to implement coaching from higher administration	carefully planned and scheduled, best possible coaches hired
a quick fix, a way to save money for PD and teacher training	a long-term time and financial commitment for schools and school systems
a mandated way to correct or standardize teaching, coaching for a specific goal	teacher driven, voluntary, with a grassroots focus to co-construct knowledge with the coach

Motives, such as implementing a peer coaching program because it is in vogue, for the purpose of saving money, or using coaching as a mechanism to implement and monitor teacher instructional change are unwise, and may lead to a number of tensions occurring within peer coaching programs. The real motivation behind teacher peer coaching should be to provide teachers with an on-going and sustained method of professional development that is contextualized and meets individual teachers' needs for transformational learning

References

Ackland, A. (1991). A review of the peer coaching literature. Journal of Staff Development, 12(1), 22-27.

Allan, P. (2007). The benefits and impacts of a coaching and mentoring programme for teaching staff in secondary school. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 5(2), 31-49.

Allen, J. (2006). Becoming a literacy leader: Supporting learning and change. Portland: Stenhouse.

Askew, S., & Carnell, E. (2011). Transformative coaching: A learning theory for practice. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Bean, R. M. (2004). The reading specialist: Leadership for the classroom, school, and community. New York: Guilford Press.

Blamey, K. L., Meyer, C. K., & Walpole, S. (2008/2009). Middle and high school literacy coaches: A national survey. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 52(4), 310-323.

Booth Olson, C., & Land, R. (2008). Enhancing the implementation of a reading/writing intervention through literacy coaching. California English, 14(2), 27-31.

Britton, L. R., & Anderson, K. A. (2010). Peer coaching and pre-service teachers: Examining an underutilized concept. Teaching & Teacher Education, (26)2, 306-314.

Burkins, J. M. (2007). Coaching for balance: How to meet the challenges of literacy coaching. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Burley, S., & Pomphrey, C. (2011). Mentoring and coaching in schools: Professional learning through collaborative inquiry. New York: Routledge.

Cantrell, S. C., & Hughes, H. K. (2008). Teacher efficacy and content literacy implementation: An exploration of the effects on extended professional development with coaching. Journal of Literacy Research, 40(1), 95-127.

Carlisle, J. F., & Berebitsky, D. (2011). Literacy coaching as a component of professional development. Reading & Writing, 24(7), 773-800.

Carpenter, T. P., Fennema, E., Peterson, P. L., Chiang, C. P., & Loef, M. (1989). Using knowledge of children's mathematics thinking in classroom teaching: An experimental study. American Educational Research Journal, 26(4), 499-531.

Casey, K. (2006). Literacy coaching: The essentials. Portsmouth:

Heinemann.

Cordingley, P. (2012). The role of professional learning in determining the profession's future. Retrieved from http://www.curee-paccts.com/publication/role-professional-learning-determining-professions-future

CUREE. (2007). Mentoring and coaching CPD capacity building project: National framework for mentoring and coaching. Retrieved from at http://www.curee-paccts.com/resources/publications/national-framework-mentoring-and-coaching

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 8(1), 1-44. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/392/515

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(8), 597-604.

Desimone, L. M. (2011). A primer on effective professional development. Phi Delta Kappan, 92(6), 68-71.

Dole, J. A., & Donaldson, R. (2006). 'What am I supposed to do all day?': Three big ideas for literacy coaches. The Reading Teacher, 59(5), 486-488.

Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario. (2008). It's up to you: Participating in professional learning outside the school day is your decision. Voice, 10(4), 9-10.

Elish-Piper, L., & L'Allier, S. K. (2010). Exploring the relationship between literacy coaching and student reading achievement in Grades K-1. Literacy Research and Instruction, 49(2), 162-174.

Elish-Piper, L., L'Allier, S. K., & Zwart, M. (2009). Literacy coaching: Challenges and promising practices for success. Illinois Reading Council Journal, 37(1), 10-21.

Ferguson, K. (2013). Exploring the role of literacy coaches: A case study of three schools in Ontario. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 59(4), 1-18.

Ferguson, K. (2011). Examining the relationships of power and resistance in literacy coaching in three school contexts. In P. Dunstan & L.B. Gambrell (Eds.) 60th Yearbook of the Literacy Researchers' Association (pp. 257-269). Oak Creek, WI: Literacy Researchers' Association.

Fletcher, S. (2007). Educational research mentoring and coaching as co-creative synergy. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 5(2), 1-11.

Foucault, M. (1990). The history of sexuality Volume 1: An introduction (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1978)

Foucault, M. (1979). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1977)

Frost, S., & Bean, R. (2006). Qualifications for literacy coaches: Achieving the gold standard. Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse. Retrieved from http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/briefs/literacycoaching.pdf

Fullan, M. (1995). The limits and the potential of professional development. In Guskey, T.R. and Huberman M., (Eds.), Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices (pp. 253-267). New York: Teachers College Press.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Suk Yoon, K. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915-945.

Geber, H. (2010). Coaching for accelerated research productivity in higher education. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 8(2), 64-78.

Gibson, S. A. (2006). Lesson observation and feedback: The practice of an expert reading coach. Reading Research and Instruction, 45(4), 295-318.

Gordon, S. P., Nolan, J. F., & Forlenza, V. A. (1995). Peer coaching: A cross-site comparison. Journal of Personnel Evaluation, 9(1), 69-92.

Gottesman, B. L., & Jennings, J. O. (1994). Peer coaching for educators. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Griffiths, K. (2009). Discovering, applying and integrating: The process of learning in coaching. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 7(2), 16-30.

Griffiths, K. (2005). Personal coaching: A model for effective learning. Journal of Learning Design, 1(2), 55-65.

Guiney, E. (2001). Coaching isn't just for athletes: The role of teacher leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(10), 740-743.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). Evaluating professional development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Guskey, T. R. (1995). Professional development in education: In search of the optimal mix. In Guskey, T.R. and Huberman M., (Eds.), Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices (pp. 114-131). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hansen, P. M. (2016). The Mathematics Coaching Handbook: Working with K-8 Teachers to Improve Instruction (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. In J. Blase (Ed.), The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation (pp. 46–72). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6(3), 227-241.

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (2000). Research Bulletin: Learner-Centered Professional Development. Phi Delta Kappa Center for Evaluation. Retrieved from http://tlcliteracy.org/images/downloads/Professional_Development/learner_centered_pro.

pdf

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond and G. Sykes (Eds.), Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice (pp. 127-150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

International Reading Association, (2004). The role and qualifications of the reading coach in the United States. A position statement of International Reading Association. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED486188.pdf

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). Student achievement through staff development (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 53(6), 12-16.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 4-10.

Killion, J. (2003). Use these 6 keys to open the doors of literacy. Journal of Staff Development, 24(2), 10-16.

Knapp. K., Stephenson, S., & Thornley-Hall, C. (1998), Peer coaching: Program to assist classroom excellence. Mississauga, ON: Peel Board of Education.

Lapp, D., Fisher, D., Flood, J., & Frey, N. (2003). Dual role of the urban reading specialist. Journal of Staff Development, 24(2), 33-36.

Lynch, J., & Ferguson, K. (2010). Reflections of elementary school literacy coaches on practice: Roles and perspectives. Canadian Journal of Education, 33(1), 199-227.

Lyons, C. A., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). Systems for change in literacy education: A guide to professional development. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Marsh, J. A., McCombs, J. S., & Martorell, F. (2012). Reading coach quality: Findings from Florida middle schools. Literacy Research and Instruction, 51(1), 1-26.

McCutchen, D., Abbott, R. D., Green, L. B., Beretvas, N., Cox, S., Potter, N. S., et al. (2002). Beginning literacy: Links among teacher knowledge, teacher practice, and student learning. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35(1), 69–86.

Mezirow, J. (1991). Transformative dimensions of adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moen, F., & Skaalvik, E. (2009). The effect from executive coaching on performance psychology. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 7(2), 31-49.

Morgan, D. N., Saylor-Crowder, K., Stephens, D., Donnelly, A., DeFord, D., & Hamel, E. (2003). Managing the complexities of a statewide reading initiative. Phi Delta Kappan, 85(2), 139-145.

Mraz, M., Algozzine, B., & Watson, P. (2008). Perceptions and expectations of roles and responsibilities of literacy coaching. Literacy Research and Instruction, 47(3), 143-157.

Neubert, G. A., & Bratton, E. C. (1987). Team coaching: Staff development side by side. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 29-32.

Obara, S. (2010). Mathematics coaching: A new kind of professional development. Teacher development, 14(2), 241-251.

Palestini, R. (2009). From leadership theory to practice: A game plan for success as a leader. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Peterson, D. S., Taylor, B. M., Burnham, B., & Schock, R. (2009). Reflective coaching conversations: A missing piece. The Reading Teacher, 62(6), 500-509.

Poglinco, S. M., Bach, A., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., Saunders, M., & Supovitz, J. A. (2003). The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's Choice schools. University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/AC-06.pdf

Reading Today (2006). IRA surveys coaches, 23(5). 1-3.

Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Llyod, C. (2009). School leadership and student outcomes: What works and why. New Zealand Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515/60169/60170

Roller, C. (2006). Reading and literacy coaches report on hiring requirements and duties survey. Retrieved from http://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/resource-documents/reading-literacy-coaches-report.pdf?sfvrsn=4

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. Canadian Journal of Education, 17(1), 51-65.

Schön, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Servatius, J. D., & Young, S. E. (1985). Implementing the coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 42(7), 50-53.

Smylie, M. A. (1995). Teacher learning the workplace: Implications for school reform. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices (pp. 92-113). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sparks, G. M., & Bruder, S. (1987). Before and after peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 54-57.

Steckel, B. (2009). Fulfilling the promise of literacy coaches in urban schools: What does it take to make an impact? The Reading Teacher, 63(1), 14-23.

Sturtevant, E. G. (2004). The literacy coach: A key to improving teaching and learning in secondary schools. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/80/50/80508f5f-bec4-

4214-ab80-8142123d188f/ccny_grantee_2003_coach.pdf

Swafford, J. (1998). Teachers supporting teachers through peer coaching. Support for Learning, 13(2), 54-58.

Taylor, R. T., Moxley, D. E., Chanter, C., & Boulware, D. (2007). Three techniques for successful literacy coaching. Principal Leadership, 7(6), 22-25.

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

Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. The Elementary School Journal, 110(2), 228-245.

Vogt, M., & Shearer, B. A. (2003). Reading specialists in the real world: A sociocultural view. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The Genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), The concept of activity in soviet psychology (pp. 144-188). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S. & Souberman, E. (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson, N., & Kilcher, A. (1990). Peer coaching: A review of the literature and a glimpse of Ontario practice. Toronto: Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. National Staff Development Council and The School Redesign Network at Stanford University. Retrieved from http://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/nsdc-studytechnicalreport2009.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wildman, T. M., & Niles, J. A. (1987). Essentials of professional growth. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 4-10.

Zwart, R. C., Wubbels, T., Bergen, T., & Bolhuis, S. (2009). Which characteristics of reciprocal peer coaching context affect teacher learning as perceived by teachers and their students? Journal of Teacher Education, 60(3), 243-257.

Kristen Ferguson is an associate professor with the Schulich School of Education at Nipissing University in North Bay, Ontario. Her research interests include elementary and post-secondary literacy education, literacy coaching, emergent literacy, teacher professional development, and stress and coping in teaching.