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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this collective case study is to describe the lived experiences of three secondary educators assuming the dual roles of teaching in a core content area and coaching an athletic team during their first semester of employment. Through the lens of occupational socialization, this study explores the significance of previous life experiences on teaching/coaching orientations, the perceptions and motivations of core content area teacher-coaches, the relationship between the social positions of teaching and coaching, and the effects of teacher-coaches’ daily experiences on identity formation. Utilizing various qualitative measures such as observations, interviews, and artifacts as well as a series of open, axial, and selective coding during data analysis, this exploration into two of the most recognizable roles in secondary education is intended to shed light on the phenomenon of what it means to be a core content area teacher/athletic coach in the twenty-first century. Six central themes have emerged based on the cross-case analysis of the socialization of the three primary participants in this study: (1) opportunity, (2) inductive experiences, (3) balance, (4) mentality, (5) connecting social positions, and (6) disposition. Findings suggest that while athletic coaching and numerous other responsibilities can lead to interrole conflict, the social positions of teaching and coaching may also serve to complement one another in a more symbiotic relationship. Based on these findings, implications for teacher education programs, nontraditional alternative certification programs, coaching education programs, and academic and athletic programs in secondary schools will be discussed.
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CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Background

Secondary physical education (P.E.) teachers who take on the roles of teaching and coaching have been a familiar target for socialization research over the years. Studies of this nature often center on the possibility that the goals of teaching and coaching may conflict with one another to produce feelings of tension for educators (Figone, 1994; Sage, 1987). This can be especially problematic for novices entering the profession when considering that these tensions may result from educators having stronger orientations towards either teaching or coaching (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). The fact that these orientations develop over time is important because it necessitates socialization be viewed over an extended period beginning as early as childhood, continuing through preservice teacher preparation, and being affected by the social and cultural aspects of the professional school setting (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Smagorinsky, Wilson, & Moore, 2011).

One of the more commonly cited concerns of researchers in physical education has been the isolation of novice teacher-coaches (Pennington, Wilkinson, & Vance, 2004; Stroot, Faucette, & Schwager, 1993; Stroot & Williamson, 1993). While this isolation may be the result of a physical separation between the school’s athletic spaces (i.e., gymnasiums, athletic fields) and academic spaces (i.e., classrooms), the additional responsibilities brought about by coaching (e.g., preparing athletic venues for games, watching film) may also produce a sense of separation between teacher-coaches and their colleagues outside of physical education (Figone, 1994).
However, physical educators are not the only ones facing the challenge of balancing multiple roles of teaching and coaching; teacher-coaches are also located in a number of content areas across secondary education, which implies that novice teachers in middle schools and high schools across the country may be struggling to balance diverse responsibilities in relative isolation.

**Statement of Problem**

The National Federation of State High School Associations estimates that the number of students under the age of 18 participating in interscholastic sports programs has increased to more than 56 million (as cited in NASPE, 2008). This increase in the number of student-athletes—partially the result of the growing popularity of women’s athletics since Title IX (Feldman & Matjasko, 2005; NASPE, 2008; Sage, 1987) as well as an increase in the number of interscholastic athletic programs (e.g., lacrosse, soccer; NFHS, 2009)—has amplified the need for coaches at the secondary level. However, this greater need for athletic coaches has been problematic for principals and/or school boards who must balance hiring effective teachers and coaches. As early as 1985, Sisely and Chapel “reasoned that expanded girls teams—combined with budget—reduced teaching positions, and teacher-coaches relinquishing coaching duties caused a serious problem for school administrators” (as cited in NASPE, 2008, p. 12). As a result, schools began hiring non-teaching coaches (NASPE, 2008) and teachers from other academic disciplines (Sage, 1987) to fill coaching vacancies. Despite Massengale’s (1974) acknowledgment that P. E. teachers—the individuals who once handled the majority of a school’s coaching load (Wilson, Bloom, & Harvey, 2010)—rarely have much in common with teachers from other content areas, very little research exists regarding the backgrounds and effectiveness of teacher-coaches outside of physical education (Carlin, 2010; Lawson, 1983a;
Lawson & Stroot, 1993; Sage, 1987, 1989). This group of teacher-coaches includes those teaching in core content areas—English/language arts, foreign language, mathematics, science, and social science.

In this era of increased standards and accountability (e.g., U.S. Congress, 2001), a danger for teachers in core content areas who also coach athletics is in the aforementioned notion of isolation. Returning to the field of physical education for a moment, some educational stakeholders consider P.E. to be a marginal, nonacademic subject (to read more about this stereotype, see the work of Herbert & Worthy, 2001; Sparkes, Templin, & Schempp, 1993), which can serve to perpetuate the separation between P.E. teachers and other groups of teachers. Similarly, core content area teachers/athletic coaches may be forced to balance their membership in two separate groups of educators whose roles are viewed as mutually exclusive: academic teachers and athletic coaches. As a result, it is possible that core content area teachers who coach athletic teams may find themselves under the same umbrella of marginalization as P.E. teachers based solely on their participation in the athletic coaching role. Despite having a greater responsibility and working longer hours than many other academic teachers—coaching is often seen as more intensive than other extracurricular assignments due to the daily workload occurring over several consecutive months (Sage, 1987)—core content area teachers/athletic coaches are now being held accountable on two separate fronts by an educational system that relies heavily on measurement-based forms of effectiveness: test scores and winning percentages.

A discussion of effective teaching and coaching will take place in Chapter II; however, the current educational focus on numerical forms of accountability raises the question of whether or not overall success for teacher-coaches has become unattainable in part due to “the dynamic
complexity” (Jones & Wallace, 2005, p. 121) of the teaching and coaching contexts. It is clear that adequately fulfilling the multiple requirements of teaching and coaching has become increasingly difficult over time. To make matters worse is the widespread perception that athletic coaches who also teach in academic subject areas are not as effective in the classroom as non-coaching teachers, and that teacher-coaches in general are more interested in coaching than teaching (Carter, 1985; Chiodo, Martin, & Rowan, 2002; Figone, 1994; Hill, 1997; Hogan, 1980; Massengale, 1974; Millslagle & Morley, 2004). A prime example can be found in Nicole’s description of small-town politics and her perception of teacher-coaches (as cited in Scherff & Daria, 2010):

I have seen ads in the paper for a Football Coach (small print warning there are also teaching duties involved), and work with a handful of those who also graduate from THS. I suspect some of them are here to relive their glory days. The kids worship them more than respect them, and I wonder how much learning goes on in their rooms…We all know the type. (p. 96)

This stigma of athletic coaching is no longer associated solely with P.E. teachers; it is now frequently linked to the field of social science education (e.g., Brown, in press-a, in press-b; Chiodo et al., 2002; Hill, 1997; Weller, 2002; Young, 2007). Yet, the marginalization of teacher-coaches is not limited to social science. For example, Beck-Frazier’s (2005) case study of Logan, a middle school math and science teacher known as “the head coach” (p. 30) offers a fitting description of the stereotypical teacher-coach, someone who causes core content area teachers/athletic coaches to be labeled with a “scarlet ‘C’” and seen as members of a “not-so-elite club of educators…willing to wear a whistle” (Young, 2007, p. 2). While there is little doubt that some core content area teacher-coaches fit this mold, it is problematic to portray teacher-coaches’ general effectiveness without first understanding the personal and professional experiences of their everyday lives.
Purpose

The primary objective of this collective case study is to describe the lived experiences of novice educators who teach in core content areas and coach one or more athletic teams. This research intended to fill a void in the existing literature concerning the actual experiences of core content area teachers/athletic coaches while providing perspective on (1) how teacher-coaches become socialized into the profession; (2) how perceptions of coaching affect teacher-coaches’ professional experiences; (3) how the relationship between the social positions of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches’ professional experiences; and (4) how the daily experiences of teaching and coaching influence teacher-coaches’ identities as educators.

Significance

The significance of this exploration into the socialization of core content area teachers/athletic coaches has been to provide a lens through which to view the development of individuals who take on the roles of teaching and coaching in hopes of “better informing not only current and future preservice teachers interested in these multiple roles but also the institutions who prepare them and the school systems who employ them” (Brown, in press-a, p. 2). In other words, findings from this study hope to “raise new possibilities, open up new questions, and stimulate new dialogue” (Creswell, 2007, p. 205) with regard to novice educators who teach in core content areas and coach athletic teams. As Wooden (2004) once said:

I’ve always considered a coach to be a teacher; the only difference is that he is teaching a particular sport rather than English or chemistry or philosophy. I do believe, however, that a teacher/coach has a better opportunity than the regular classroom teacher to build cooperative values and acceptance of responsibility. Furthermore, I believe most coaches—not all—attempt to do that. (p. 200)

While the building of cooperative values and acceptance of responsibility are certainly important lessons for all student-athletes, educational stakeholders must begin to take a closer look at
whether teacher-coaches are indeed scaffolding these characteristics in students and student-athletes while simultaneously and effectively teaching and coaching both their academic curricula and interscholastic sports.

**Definition of Terms**

Before delving into the primary research questions, several key terms must first be defined in order to fully understand the language, framework, and boundaries related to this study.

*Acculturation* is the first stage of occupational socialization and involves the life experiences of a teacher from birth until the beginning of his or her professional socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

*Apprenticeship of Observation* occurs when novice teachers reproduce teaching styles observed during their past educational experiences (Lortie, 1975). For the sake of this study, apprenticeship of observation will also be considered within the athletic coaching role.

*Athletics and Sports* are used interchangeably and include the following activities as listed in this particular state’s high school athletic association handbook: (fall) cross country, football, swimming, and volleyball; (winter) basketball and wrestling; (spring) baseball, golf, outdoor track, soccer, softball, and tennis. For the purposes of this study, football (fall) and basketball (winter) are the primary sports under observation while soccer (spring) and softball (spring) are given secondary status.

*Career Contingency* is the preference of one occupational role over another (Lawson, 1983a). For teacher-coaches, contingencies are often the result of teaching and coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson 1983a, 1983b).
Core Content Areas include English/language arts, foreign language, mathematics, science, and social science.

Human Capital Model is grounded in Bourdieu’s (1986) notion of cultural capital and contends that workers need explicit knowledge and/or skills to navigate the requirements of specific occupations (Kirby & Grissmer, 1991; Shen, 1997).

Interrole Complementarity is when multiple roles (e.g., teaching and coaching) are seen as interconnected and complementary (O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002; see also Brown, in press-a).

Interrole Conflict is defined as the incompatible expectations of multiple roles (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Hutchinson, 1993; Lawson, 1983b; Locke & Massengale, 1978; O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002; Sage, 1987).

Occupational Socialization is the process of developing specific competencies necessary for success in a respective field of employment. It consists of three stages: (1) acculturation, (2) professional socialization, and (3) organizational socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Sage, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009).

Organizational Socialization is the third stage of occupational socialization and consists of the induction phase where an employee “learns the ropes of a particular organizational role” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211; see also Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

Pedagogical Content Knowledge was a term coined by Shulman (1986) to describe “subject matter knowledge for teaching” (emphasis in original, p. 9). For the purposes of this study, pedagogical content knowledge may refer to academic or athletic subject matter.
Professional Socialization is the second stage of occupational socialization and consists of job preparation such as preservice teacher education and nontraditional alternative certification (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

Role Retreatism, also known as differential commitment (Drake & Hebert, 2002), involves neglecting one particular role for the sake of another (Massengale, 1981).

Secondary Education refers to middle and high schools in the United States.

Shared Technical Culture describes a universal language as well as a common body of knowledge throughout a professional conversation among educators (Lawson, 1993; Lortie, 1975).

Teacher-coaches are educators who teach academic courses and coach athletic teams. For the purposes of this study, a teacher-coach, unless otherwise identified (e.g., P.E. teacher-coach), refers specifically to someone who teaches in a core content area and coaches one or more athletic teams.

Research Questions

Two primary research questions will be examined throughout this study. These questions relate to the past and present experiences of novice teacher-coaches and are listed below:

1. How are previous life experiences significant to the socialization of novice teacher-coaches; and

2. How do the daily experiences of novice teacher-coaches affect identity formation?

Overview of Research Design and Methodology

Qualitative research has been selected to allow for the study of “things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). The phenomenon—see the description of
phenomenology in Van Manen (1990)—of teacher-coaches will be described and interpreted through the methodology of a collective case study, which has been chosen to compare and contrast the individual experiences of novice teacher-coaches across multiple settings. Yin (2009) finds case study research useful for examining real-life phenomena within contextual conditions, which is appropriate considering Potrac, Jones, and Armour’s (2002) claim that “to more fully understand the holistic nature of the coaching process…research should focus on the social world of individual coaches and how they operate within given guidelines” (p. 184). In the case of teacher-coaches, these settings often include contexts such as classrooms, athletic venues, school facilities, and surrounding communities. Gaining access to these diverse settings allows researchers to better position themselves to understand the roles, experiences, perceptions, and expectations of teaching and coaching.

The mere nature of observing teacher-coaches both in the classroom setting and in their respective coaching arenas underscores the idea that these educators regularly face a number of diverse experiences (e.g., academic, athletic, emotional, pedagogical, personal, physical, professional, social). These multiple realities reflect two epistemological perspectives—interpretive and critical—that guide this study (Zeichner & Gore, 1990). Both approaches to socialization follow the general ontological assumption that multiple realities are socially constructed and that they may look different to different people (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). Based on the multiple socially-situated contexts in which core content area teacher-coaches find themselves, this study intends to describe, understand, and interpret the backgrounds and experiences of teacher-coaches while also attempting to “critique and challenge, to transform and empower” (Merriam, 2009, p. 10) the social structures surrounding their novice experiences.
The following research is in the form of a collective case study in which a central issue is “explored through one or more cases within a bounded system” (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). Specifically, this study will be bounded by time (August 2011 through January 2012; the first semester of the academic school year; the fall and winter athletic seasons), location (middle and high school settings), and participants (a total of three primary participants and three supporting participants for each primary participant). The methodology utilizes a mixture of observational and life history approaches in interacting with the three primary participants in this study: (1) Charlotte, (2) Christopher, and (3) Bryant (all names are pseudonyms). An observational case study focuses on observations of primary participants and is supported by techniques such as interviewing and artifact analysis (Merriam, 2009). Life histories, which are also known as life-stories (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2003), consist of interviews with primary participants regarding previous life experiences (Merriam, 2009).

Three sources of data collection are utilized in this study: participant interviews, teaching and coaching observations, and artifacts. During data analysis, multiple data sources were triangulated to help ensure trustworthiness of findings. The study was validated through the use of several strategies including prolonged engagement and persistent observation, triangulation of multiple sources and methods, member checking, thick description, and researcher reflexivity (Creswell, 2007).

**Researcher Positionality**

Etherington (2007) calls reflexivity “a tool whereby we can include our ‘selves’ at any stage, making transparent the values and beliefs we hold that almost certainly influence the research process and its outcomes” (p. 601). Socialization research is especially value-laden, thus requiring researchers to identify their values, biases, and subjectivities early in the research
process (Lawson & Stroot, 1993; Mills & Gale, 2007). This is especially true in studies such as this one that employ the examination of perceptions, orientations, and identities of educators.

As a former English teacher and basketball coach, I first became interested in the topic of teacher-coaches in response to the common perception of teacher-coaches as individuals more interested in coaching athletics than teaching academics. This view of teacher-coaches assumes that these particular educators take a decisive stance on whether to value teaching or coaching above the other. Based on this perception, such a value stance would make teaching or coaching a career contingency (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson, 1983a; Sage, 1987). Personally, I believe that athletic coaches can play an important role in the education of secondary students, although I am also cognizant of the potential harm that can be done if schools employ academic teachers who maintain extreme coaching orientations.

As a former teacher-coach, I consider teaching and learning to be the most crucial concern for all educators. More importantly, I believe teaching and learning can take place in many diverse contexts including classroom and athletic arenas. I am also well aware of the difficulties of effectively balancing two roles as different as teaching English and coaching basketball while managing additional personal and professional responsibilities (e.g., family, social life, and other curricular and extracurricular positions). However, I consider the terms teaching and coaching synonymous in many ways, while at the heart of each is a greater concern for learning (e.g., see the teaching practices of John Wooden as described in Gallimore & Tharp, 2004; see also Lindholm, 1979).

For core content area teachers/athletic coaches in particular, I believe the contradiction between teachers and coaches is found rhetorically in the hyphen dividing the term teacher-coach, much in the way it commonly divides student-athletes into unfair stereotypes such as the
perception of athletes who are “menacing, ignorant, overly sexualized, volatile, and unmotivated to succeed academically” (Morrell, 2004, p. 112). Yet, the true nature of a hyphen is not to divide, but to bring together. Used in this way, the hyphen unites two separate entities (e.g., teacher and coach) to create a single compound word (e.g., teacher-coach). Unfortunately, one common stereotype of teacher-coaches is that of dumb jocks trying to relive their glory days. Such a stereotype tends to further divide these two educational roles despite my belief that teachers and coaches share a common purpose for educating, informing, and bettering the lives of students. Within this study, the figurative hyphen between the roles of teaching and coaching will be explored in order to more fully understand the complexities that serve to connect and/or divide the roles and experiences of teacher-coaches.

**Assumptions**

Based on my position as the primary investigator, a position that has been influenced by my own personal experiences, my socio-cultural surroundings, the views and opinions of others, and the review of literature that follows, several personal assumptions must first be addressed. For this purpose, the term ‘assumption’ represents a piece of information that I believe to be true, but that might not necessarily ring true for others, including readers who attempt to make generalizations about the present study or researchers who hope to replicate this study in some manner. My assumptions are as follows:

1. Teaching and learning should be the first priority of all educators;
2. Effective teaching necessitates aspects of effective coaching;
3. Effective coaching necessitates aspects of effective teaching;
4. A novice educator’s acculturation influences not only his or her motivation to teach and coach but also that individual’s professional and organizational socialization into teaching and coaching (Graber, 1996; Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky, 2010);

5. An interest in sports affects an educator’s desire to coach athletics (Brown & Sieben, 2012a), but it should not predetermine teaching and coaching orientations;

6. While research in the field of kinesiology demonstrates the possibility of teaching and coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001), it is also possible for teacher-coaches to have a mixed teaching/coaching orientation (Brown, in press-a);

7. Individuals participating in an accredited teacher education program are more prepared for the demands of classroom teaching than those entering the induction process through alternative certification (Darling-Hammond, 2003, 2010). However, there is a need for increased diversity in both academic teaching and athletic coaching, which is one of several benefits of having alternative certification programs in public education;

8. Preservice teachers in core content areas receive little preparation for educational responsibilities outside of teaching their subject matter (e.g., leading extracurricular activities such as coaching athletics; Brown, in press-a);

9. Increased preparation for extracurricular responsibilities would actually increase novice teachers’ effectiveness in academic roles by lessening the potential for reality shock;

10. Decreasing the reality shock experienced by novice teacher-coaches through immersion in various educational roles would improve the retention rates of secondary educators;
11. It is possible to effectively balance and fulfill the requirements of teaching academic classes and coaching athletic teams (Brown, in press-a);

12. Core content area teachers willing to coach athletics have a hiring advantage over non-coaching teachers (Brown & Sieben, 2012a);

13. Mentoring and professional development in the roles of teaching and coaching are critical components of the induction process for novice educators;

14. Too great a focus on test scores in academics and winning percentages in athletics will negatively affect learning in these educational contexts; and

15. Extracurricular activities (e.g., interscholastic athletics) are a major part of many secondary schools across the country, which means that teachers are expected to assume leadership roles in these activities now more than ever. Thus, teacher educators can either help prepare future teachers for the additional responsibilities they are certain to face or not feign surprise when novice teachers focus too heavily on extracurricular roles such as athletic coaching.

Limitations

Attempting to form generalizations from the results of case studies can be troublesome (Smagorinsky, 2010; Van Manen, 1990). In this study, a small sample size and the focus on the individual experiences of teacher-coaches has undoubtedly affected generalizability. Furthermore, it should be noted that “a phenomenological description is always one interpretation, and no single interpretation of human experience will ever exhaust the possibility of yet another complementary” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 31, emphasis in original). This is especially true in the sense that analyzing and writing cases is a subjective and multi-layered process that naturally emphasizes certain aspects of some cases over others (Jones et al., 2003).
Because subjectivities and potential biases of researchers will ultimately be a part of the primary instrument, Merriam (2009) suggests that the responsibility of generalization must fall on the reader and not the case study researcher.

The structure of this collective case study may also be considered a limitation. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) believe that data collection should take place one site at a time, not multiple sites at once. This did not occur in this particular study due to the focus on the socialization of three first-year educators into the roles of teaching and coaching in two different settings: Charlotte at Sizemore Middle School and Christopher and Bryant at Proctor High School. Choosing a single case study participant might have been helpful in more fully exploring an individual case, but utilizing the methodology of a single-case study would have limited the findings related to the phenomenon of novice teacher-coaches in core content areas.

Within each setting, levels of access should also be considered a limitation. While both schools and their participants provided full cooperation, access was limited on a few occasions. The original case study design called for weekly journaling by primary participants to be a fourth method of data collection, and one that might have offered a glimpse into blind spots of the study. However, because of a delay in obtaining school system consent, the decision was made to exclude journaling since primary participants had already settled into teaching and coaching routines. Once observations were underway, access was more likely to be limited within the coaching role. For instance, while I had significant access to Charlotte’s basketball program based on her position as the head coach, I missed crucial interactions between her and her female student-athletes by not being present in the locker room before and after games. In many cases, the locker room was the scene of some of Charlotte’s most emotional moments over the course of the season, but I was limited to having Charlotte recollect these stories at a later time.
On the other hand, while I had complete locker room access during Christopher and Bryant’s football season, regulations of high school football often pushed me out of earshot of coaches during games, which limited my ability to observe their interactions with one another and their players. Finally, because I was the only researcher, my own schedule limited my access at times. During the semester under observation, I was charged with teaching an English/language arts methods course on Monday evenings, which made me unavailable to attend JV football games at Proctor High School or Monday evening basketball games at Sizemore Middle School. I also served as a supervisor of preservice teachers during their clinical placements as well as a school liaison that semester. Fortunately, my supervision and liaison duties were limited to Proctor High School, which actually allowed me greater access to all three primary participants due to the school’s close proximity to Sizemore Middle School.

This study witnesses the first semester/season of employment in teaching and coaching for the primary participants. While time restraints prohibited following case study participants through the entirety of their first academic year, two full semesters of observations and interviews would have certainly been worthwhile in considering the overall induction process. In terms of interviews, one limitation that emerged in retrospect was the exclusion of interviews with significant others/spouses or family members as well as middle and high school students being taught and coached by primary participants. Future research should take these potential participants into consideration.

All primary participants were interviewed at least three times and all secondary participants twice with only two exceptions: the athletic director at Proctor High School was only interviewed at the start of the semester—multiple requests for a second interview went unanswered—and the defensive coordinator for the Proctor High School football team was added
late in the semester and thus interviewed only once. This addition occurred after the defensive coordinator emerged as a significant influence on both Christopher and Bryant’s induction into teaching and coaching and in the absence of interviews with the head football coach.

The use of purposeful sampling may also be a limitation in this study. All teacher-coaches will enter the profession with a wide range of experiences and various levels of preparation for both the teaching and coaching roles. This means that all cases should be considered at least somewhat atypical. Furthermore, the relationship between the primary investigator and case study participants may also be considered a limitation. Specifically, I had previous interactions with two of the three primary participants. I led a focus group for aspiring teacher-coaches that was regularly attended by Charlotte, and I served as a university supervisor for Christopher during his methods’ semester prior to student teaching. Neither of these first-year teachers-coaches was asked to participate due to these prior relationships nor was Bryant asked to participate based on a lack of previous interaction. However, the role of gate-keeping was evident in selecting these teacher-coaches based on the desire to fill specific criteria (e.g., content areas, background experiences, teaching and coaching positions; see the participants section in chapter III for more information). Furthermore, it should be acknowledged that previous interactions (or lack thereof) between the researcher and participants may have had some effect on the views expressed during interviews and guided conversations or primary participants’ actions and interactions during observations.

Finally, the decision to examine the occupational socialization of teacher-coaches may in some ways decrease the actual focus on the phenomenon of being a novice teacher-coach. On the other hand, too close an examination of the phenomenon of teacher-coaches may also have a negative impact on understanding the specific experiences of novice teacher-coaches. Despite
this limitation, the lived experiences of teacher-coaches in relation to the overarching phenomenon of what it means to be a teacher-coach would not be complete without a glimpse into the various stages of socialization.

**Organization of Study**

This study is organized into seven chapters. Chapter I has provided an overview of the study while positioning the researcher, the focus of the study, and the research design and methodology in relation to one another. Chapter II provides a review of literature related to novice teacher-coaches. Chapter III provides a description of the methodology, qualitative research design, and measures of trustworthiness. The next three chapters paint a picture of the experiences of three first-year teacher-coaches who serve as the primary participants in this study: Charlotte (Chapter IV), Christopher (Chapter V), and Bryant (Chapter VI). Chapter VII synthesizes the findings of the three primary participants across cases while connecting the overarching themes to the relevant literature. Implications and opportunities for further research will also be discussed in detail in the final chapter.
CHAPTER II:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

Chapter II reviews the literature pertinent to this study and is divided into the following sections: (1) attrition of novice teachers, (2) balancing multiple roles, (3) occupational socialization, (4) teaching/coaching orientations, (5) interrole conflict and complementarity, (6) the role of sports in secondary schools, (7) teacher/coach identity, (8) induction and mentoring programs, (9) effective teaching and coaching, and (10) re-envisioning the teacher-coach.

Attrition of Novice Teachers

Studies have shown that beginning teachers often face an initial and/or ongoing reality shock during the induction process (Bullough, 1989; Ingersoll, 2012; Lortie, 1975; Veenman, 1984). This shock can produce a ‘sink or swim’ mentality as novices tread through the multiple roles they face as educators. Novice teachers who are not strong swimmers add to the overwhelming statistics on teacher attrition, which has been a significant dilemma facing the field of education for many years (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Gold, 1996; Scherff, 2008; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). As of 2007, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) estimated that teacher attrition had risen by fifty percent in the previous fifteen years at a cost of over seven billion dollars per year. In a survey of public school teachers, Feistritzer (2005) found that forty percent of surveyed teachers did not believe they would be teaching by 2010 while the Boston Public School system reported losing fifty percent of their novice teachers in their first three years of teaching (Boston Plan for Excellence, 2005).
Many causes of teacher attrition have been documented. Scherff (2008) asserts that “new teachers enter a building with its own history, ways of interaction, methods of operating, and social and organizational culture” (p. 1329). Unfortunately, schools’ hiring practices do not always provide first-year teachers adequate time to prepare for the upcoming school year or necessary opportunities to familiarize themselves with specific site conditions, both of which can put novices at a disadvantage from the outset (Brickhouse & Bodner, 1992; Bullough, 1989; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Scherff & Daria, 2010). Novice educators may also face burnout as they lose motivation for coping with the daily challenges of teaching in the progression from survival stage to mastery stage (Bullough, 1989). In terms of coaching athletics, Sage (1987) refers to the coaching role as “a young person’s occupation” (p. 223) and mentions that many coaches withdraw from the profession within a few years. As a result, NASPE (2008) believes that many school administrators try to avoid burdening coaches with rigorous requirements (e.g., completing coaching education programs) while also loosening the necessary qualifications because they cannot find and retain qualified athletic coaches.

Inevitably, teachers and coaches face similar obstacles, many having much to do with the culture of the school in which they work. Studies have shown that nearly fifty percent of teachers who leave the profession base their decisions on challenges created by low salaries, inadequate preparation, problems with student motivation and discipline, poor working conditions, distrust of administration, and a lack of voice in schools’ decision-making processes (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 1997, 2003; Ingersoll, 2003, 2004; Scherff, Ollis, & Rosencrans, 2006; Veenman, 1984). One review of empirical research estimated that attrition rates were generally higher among whites, females, teachers of science and math, and teachers with higher academic ability (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006). In a case study of a first-
year, junior high school teacher, Bullough (1989) found the primary concerns to be handling classroom discipline, dealing with individual differences among students, assessing students’ work, and forming relationships with parents. In their case study of a first-year physical education teacher, Hebert and Worthy (2001) discovered that success was largely defined through classroom management and navigating the social and political cultures of school. Overall, the attrition of educators, especially those willing to take on multiple roles, is troubling considering Johnson and Birkeland’s (2004) assertion that many beginning teachers come in undecided about how long they will remain in the field of education at a time when “serial careers are the norm, and short-term employment is common” (p. 585). It stands to reason that novices’ uncertainties about sustaining careers in education may be heightened as a result of the struggle to balance the multiple roles of teaching and coaching.

**Balancing Multiple Roles**

The socialization of inservice teachers is a dialectal process, or what Schempp and Graber (1992) call “a negotiation between a social system and a person” (p. 329). While it is easy for novice teachers to become overwhelmed by managing even a single role, the negotiation between educator and educational responsibilities is made more difficult when teachers take on additional roles (Huberman, 1989; Lacey, 1977; Lawson, 1992; Sage, 1987). In a critical review of literature on first-year English teachers, Brown (2010) noticed that first-year teachers, now more than ever, must learn to maneuver through a broad array of educational contexts while balancing numerous responsibilities outside of teaching. Lawson (1983b) insists that teachers who engage in multiple roles must act like chameleons who “display their colors as the time and conditions warrant” (p. 4). The challenge of balancing teaching with other roles inside and outside of the classroom can be especially difficult for first-year teachers (Brown, in press-a;
Flores, 2006; Flores & Day, 2006; Frank, 2003), especially those who lack the necessary preparation for one or more responsibilities (Flores, 2006; Kardos & Johnson, 2007).

Providing adequate preparation for multiple roles may prove to be a significant factor in retaining novice teachers at a time when “impending shortfalls of teachers…[will] force many of the nation’s school systems to lower standards to fill the increasing numbers of teaching openings, inevitably resulting in a less qualified teaching force and lower school performance” (Borman & Dowling, 2008, pp. 368-369). Guarino et al. (2006) believe that the teachers willing to remain in education are generally satisfied with their overall compensation, which includes payment, working conditions, and personal satisfaction. However, teacher retention may ultimately depend upon the human capital model (Kirby & Grissmer, 1991; Shen, 1997). This model contends that teachers leave the field of education after weighing the overall costs and benefits of their chosen careers while demonstrating that novice teachers are more likely to quit because they have yet to accumulate enough human capital pertinent to one or more roles to ensure a smooth transition into their novice years of teaching (Kirby & Grissmer, 1991; Shen, 1997).

Several researchers have brought to light the challenge of balancing the multiple roles of teaching and coaching. Drake and Hebert (2002) conducted case studies of two teacher-coaches, both of whom struggled with balancing multiple roles even after several years of experience. One participant in particular, Mary, had this recollection of her first year:

I would not repeat my first year for a million dollars! It was school from the time I got up to the time I went to sleep…There was never any break. It was constant…I taught 5 biology classes and coached 2 sports. (p. 176)

Similarly, Brown (in press-a) described the socialization of Kay, who expressed feelings of isolation as the only ninth grade world history teacher and the only women’s athletics coach in
her rural high school. As a first-year teacher-coach, Kay taught three sections of world history; coached volleyball, basketball, and softball; performed other professional obligations (e.g., paperwork, meetings); and balanced family/social obligations. Although Kay said she felt prepared for the teaching role after graduating from a university teacher education program, her socialization into the coaching role was more challenging in part due to the overwhelming struggle to create a niche within the masculinized culture of the school not to mention her lack of preparation for the coaching role.

**Occupational Socialization**

The ability to adjust to a school’s social organization has been shown to have a profound effect on the professional identity and the overall retention of novice teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Flores & Day, 2006; Shulman, 1987). The type of adjustments necessary for novice teacher-coaches has been widely discussed in physical education research on occupational socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Sage, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Generally speaking, occupational socialization is the process of developing specific competencies necessary for success in a respective field of employment. Occupational socialization is made up of three stages: (1) acculturation, (2) professional socialization, and (3) organizational socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). While these stages may overlap or even occur simultaneously (Stroot & Williamson, 1993), each stage has its own unique distinctions.

**Acculturation**

Acculturation, commonly referred to as an individual’s biography, involves the life experiences of a teacher from childhood until the beginning of his or her professional
socialization. For teacher-coaches in particular, this will include past experiences in education (Lortie, 1975) as well as in sport (Sage, 1989). Ultimately, the process of acculturation will entail the internalizing of thousands of hours of educational experiences (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Some educational researchers even believe that acculturation may have a greater impact on the overall socialization of novice teachers than professional socialization (Graber, 1996; Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky, 2010).

**Professional Socialization**

Professional socialization, the second stage of occupational socialization, consists of the preparation of preservice teachers for their initial careers. Today, opportunities for professional socialization in education consist of both teacher education programs and nontraditional alternative certification programs. While past research has questioned the impact of teacher education programs on the values, beliefs, and overall preparation of preservice teachers (Britzman, 1986; Bullough, 1989; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Flores & Day, 2006; Zeichner & Gore, 1990), novice teachers who receive substantial preparation and initial certification are generally considered more effective than those who do not (i.e., participants from nontraditional alternative certification programs; see Darling-Hammond, 2003, 2010).

Teacher education programs usually consist of three components that affect socialization: 1) general education and content area courses; 2) methods and foundations courses; and 3) field-based clinical experiences (Zeichner & Gore, 1990). Nontraditional alternative certification programs, on the other hand, are often more difficult to characterize. Zeichner and Conklin (2008) define alternative programs as anything outside the common four to five year university undergraduate structure, although many teacher education programs themselves now offer a
fifth-year master’s degree. Many alternative certification programs (e.g., lateral entry programs, Teach for America) award teaching certificates to prospective teachers in return for working in high-need and/or underprivileged areas (e.g., urban and rural communities). Unfortunately, many of these same settings also house schools where teacher turnover is at its greatest (Anderson & Olsen, 2006; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Ingersoll, 2001). While nontraditional alternative certification programs have provided an influx of more diverse teacher candidates including older individuals with more life experiences, an increasing number of minorities, and candidates with a greater interest in science and mathematics (Good et al., 2006; Johnson, 2004; Shen, 1997; Turley & Nakai, 2000), their effectiveness has been difficult to determine in part due to the debate over what exactly constitutes alternative certification (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). Regardless of which route is taken through professional socialization, the path will inevitably lead to the third phase of occupational socialization referred to as organizational socialization.

Organizational Socialization

Upon entering the workforce, novice teachers are inducted into inservice teaching during the stage of organizational socialization, which revolves around the teacher’s initial exposure to the culture of a school. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) refer to this stage as “the process by which one is taught and learns the ropes of a particular organizational role” (p. 211). Unfortunately, knowledge and pedagogies learned from teacher education programs may directly contrast with the values, norms, and expectations of the school culture, and thus may not be transferred to the induction phase of teaching (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Smagorinsky, 2010; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). As a result, prior knowledge of teaching may end up being “washed out” (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981, p. 7) as novices begin their educational
careers. Three stages have been associated with an individual’s induction into teaching: a survival stage based on self concerns, a mastery stage based on task concerns, and an impact stage based on student concerns (Fuller & Brown, 1975). However, it should be noted that novices will move through these phases at various speeds and with varying degrees of success. The addition of multiple roles (e.g., athletic coaching) may also have a profound effect on the amount of time it takes a novice teacher to reach the impact stage. Furthermore, reaching this stage may also depend upon the scope and strength of an individual’s teaching and coaching orientation.

**Teaching/Coaching Orientations**

Teacher-coaches in physical education are often said to enter the profession with a “career contingency” (Lawson, 1983a, p. 7), which causes them to prefer either teaching or coaching. In fact, many physical education candidates are said to enter teacher education programs with a teaching orientation or a coaching orientation (Curtner-Smith, 2001). Wilson et al. (2010) found that the majority of high school physical education teachers in their study had coaching orientations despite being hired as teachers first and foremost. Of course, there was once a time when recruits with coaching orientations felt that physical education was their only viable option for pursuing a career in education (Sage, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Stroot & Williamson, 1993). This is no longer the case, though as core content areas are attracting more and more teachers with a mix of teaching and coaching orientations (Brown, in press-a).

For novice teacher-coaches in core content areas, a mixed teaching/coaching orientation is especially important because an influx of teacher-coaches with purely coaching orientations could have a harmful effect on the academic rigor of core content area courses. This might be the result of ineffective teaching or missed learning opportunities, which in turn can have long-
lasting effects as middle and high school students proceed to continue their education. The same
can be said for educators with teaching orientations who are forced to coach athletic teams, a
current reality particularly in lower income schools in urban and rural areas (for a look at the
rural context, see Brown, in press-a). In this case, student-athletes may suffer by having fewer
opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their athletic goals
(McMillin & Reffner, 1999). While both teaching and coaching orientations are to some degree
a byproduct of acculturation (Curtner-Smith, 2001), teaching orientations are more likely
strengthened during professional socialization due to a greater focus on the teaching role and
thereby less preparation for the coaching role (Brown, in press-a). On the other hand, it is also
reasonable to believe that coaching orientations are increasingly perpetuated during the process
of organizational socialization, especially in schools and communities that place a greater
emphasis on interscholastic athletics.

In looking specifically at professional socialization, many colleges of education now
offer coaching minors and/or majors (McMillin & Reffner, 1999). The majority of these
programs are found within departments made up of areas such as health, human performance,
kinesiology, leisure studies, physical education, and recreation. Based on the lack of educational
research regarding teacher-coaches outside of physical education, it remains to be seen what
percentage of non-P.E. majors are advised to consider and then actually take advantage of
opportunities to prepare themselves for the coaching role. In secondary education, university
students typically major in either teacher education or a specific content area while
concentrating, or in essence minoring, in the other to create a combined program of study (e.g.,
English education). Taking on an additional concentration (e.g., coaching) can be problematic
without early planning and effective advising. In fact, a coaching minor, which generally entails
anywhere from fifteen to thirty credit hours, can add as much as a year of additional coursework for preservice teachers (McMillin & Reffner, 1999). As a result, the separation between university teacher education programs and coaching education programs may actually serve to perpetuate the divide between teaching and coaching (for more on this divide, see Jones, 2006) by isolating core content area preservice teachers from the coaching role (Brown, in press-b).

During organizational socialization, workplace conditions and school culture can drastically affect the morale and commitment of novice teachers (Weiss, 1999), especially if these environments lack what Lortie (1975) calls a “shared technical culture” (p. 67). For a school to engage in a shared technical culture, a universal language and a common body of knowledge must be forged throughout the professional conversations of educators (Lawson, 1993). Without this language and understanding, novice teachers may revert back to what Lortie (1975) has described as an “apprenticeship of observation” (p. 61) whereby novice teachers reproduce teaching styles based upon past educational experiences, many of which may push them towards the status quo of authoritarian institutions (Smagorinsky, 2010). This apprenticeship of observation may be just as prevalent to coaching as it is to teaching as novices retreat to more comfortable models (i.e., orientations based on acculturative experiences) and emerge “with a strongly biographical orientation” (Lortie, 1975, p. 81) that can inhibit the development of professional identities and cause confusion in terms of prioritizing teaching and coaching roles.

**Interrole Conflict and Complementarity**

With every role comes a set of expectations that reflect the norms required of the person who fills that role (Sage, 1987). Part of the reality shock that many teacher-coaches face as novices is based upon the likelihood of experiencing role overload, the struggle to keep up with
the demands of role expectations, as well as interrole conflict, which is defined as incompatible expectations of multiple roles (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Hutchinson, 1993; Lawson, 1983b; Locke & Massengale, 1978; O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002; Sage, 1987). Both role overload and interrole conflict can lead to role stress, a condition whereby conflicting roles cause anxiety or apprehension (Sage, 1987). Stress can also be caused by intra-role conflicts such as the overlapping of two sports during a single season (Drake & Hebert, 2002). However, most reports of stress for teacher-coaches is based on extended workdays filled with conflicting demands. Sage (1987) discussed these demands during his study of the multiple roles of teacher-coaches from diverse content areas. He found that teachers are expected to plan and teach their subject matter while also grading papers, serving on committees, attending meetings, providing supervision during lunch/bus duties, and engaging in other professional commitments. Meanwhile, these same teachers then spend an additional 30-40 hours per week in the coaching role while planning, supervising practices, coaching games, studying film, travelling to events, and meeting with students, parents, teachers, and coaches. As a result, Sage found that a lack of time was a constant theme for teacher-coaches. Drake and Hebert (2002) support this claim by acknowledging that time as well as energy and commitment are the primary interrole conflicts of teacher-coaches.

A pertinent example of interrole conflict from physical education can be found in Stroot et al.’s (1993) description of the experiences of three first-year P.E. teacher-coaches. These novices found themselves overwhelmed by multiple duties, most notably non-instructional responsibilities, which negatively affected their ability to focus on academic teaching. For each of these first-year teacher-coaches, an overemphasis on athletics and a lack of concern for classroom pedagogy remained the standard despite attempts to rally against this status quo. This
is routinely called role retreatism (Massengale, 1981) or differential commitment (Drake & Hebert, 2002), both of which entail neglecting one particular role for the sake of another. Flores and Day (2006) noticed a similar shift in novice teachers’ pedagogical implementation of curriculum as these teachers struggled to balance numerous organizational duties outside of athletic coaching. The resulting instructional shift was a move from “a more inductive and student-centered approach towards a more ‘traditional’ and teacher-centered one” (p. 227).

While role overload and interrole conflict are common, they should not be considered the only viable outcome of taking on multiple roles such as teaching and coaching. In their analysis of how Australian P.E. teacher-coaches manage numerous responsibilities, O’Connor and MacDonald (2002) cautioned that focusing too much on the conflicting nature of multiple roles can prevent researchers from considering these roles as interconnected and complementary. As a result, they found that teacher identity may be a more suitable lens for examining the roles and experiences of teacher-coaches. Through the lens of teacher identity, it is possible to gauge interrole conflict while also viewing how teacher-coaches “reduce tensions and maximize complementarity across the responsibilities [of teaching and coaching]” (O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002, p. 49).

Regardless of the pitfalls produced by interrole conflict, this outlook of viewing the teaching and coaching roles as mutually beneficial is quite rare. One suggestion for how this might look, however, can be found in Appendix A. This adaptation of Sage’s (1987) framework, entitled ‘Interrole Symbiosis’ for the purposes of this study, offers researchers an understanding of how the roles of teaching and coaching affect the formation of teacher-coaches’ professional identities (see also Lawson, 1983b). The primary addition to Sage’s framework is the opportunity for interrole complementarity to connect the social positions of teaching and
coaching while allowing for an identity that reflects both social positions. Before turning to the identity development of teacher-coaches, however, the role of sports in secondary schools, and more specifically, the divisions and connections between academics and athletics, must first be explored.

The Role of Sports in Secondary Schools

In secondary schools, sports are often considered extracurricular, physical activities and are rarely afforded significant standing in academic conversations (Carrington, 2010). Gee (2007) calls this the “problem of content” (p. 22) where activities outside of mainstream academic knowledge are considered merely for play. Nevertheless, the growth of athletics in the United States (see NASPE, 2008; Sage, 1987) has had a profound effect on secondary education. In many parts of the country, schools are often identified as much for athletics (e.g., state championships) as they are for academics (e.g., graduation rates). As a result, teacher-coaches are increasingly identified for the sports they coach rather than the classes they teach, which may be the result of a more public evaluation process for coaches since anyone can buy a ticket to an athletic event but not everyone can observe a teacher’s classroom (Sage, 1987). Some critics would even argue that sports are overprivileged, overemphasized, and overfunded in schools across the country. It is no secret that successful athletes and sports programs often maintain the highest social status in local communities (Frank, 2003). In fact, as early as 1961, the sociologist James Coleman had this to say about the status of athletics in American high schools (as cited in Sage, 1987):

The amount of attention devoted to athletics would be most striking to an innocent visitor….As an impressionable stranger, this visitor might well suppose that more attention is paid to athletics by teen-agers, both as athletes and as spectators, than to scholastic matters. He might even conclude, with good reason, that the school was essentially organized around athletic contests and that scholastic matters were of lesser importance to all involved. (p. 214)
This division between academics and athletics has grown wider over time despite brain-based research suggesting that physical activity benefits students’ overall cognitive processes (Jensen, 2008; Landers, Maxwell, Butler, & Fagen, 2001; McCaughtry & Rovegno, 2001). More than a decade ago, Taylor (1999) expressed the belief that “if MTV and ESPN are any guide, schools appear to have conceded the struggle for the hearts and souls of this generation of students” and placed higher rewards “not for how well they [the students] can run with an idea, but for how well they can run with a ball” (p. 75). This dichotomous relationship between running with a ball and running with an idea may have much to do with the common stereotype of coaches as anti-intellectuals not capable of effectively teaching academic subjects.

On the contrary, sports can be an important motivational tool for many students, and no one knows this better than teacher-coaches. For instance, allowing interested students to engage in sports-related literacies (e.g., sports-related young adult literature, nonfiction, curricular assignments; see Brown & Sieben, 2012b) has been shown to enhance student engagement in academics, particularly among adolescent boys, who are often considered one of the most challenging groups of students to engage in school literacy practices (Brozo, 2010; Dyson, 2001; Hughes-Hassell & Rodge, 2007; Mahiri, 2010; Mahiri & Sablo, 1996; Morrell, 2004; Newkirk, 2002; Simpson, 1996; Smith & Wilhelm, 2002; Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1999). In her seminal work Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms, Heath (1983) offered one classroom teacher’s perspective on this connection between athletics, academics, and literacy:

At the beginning of the year, I tell my students: ‘Reading and writing are things you do all the time – at home, on the bus, riding your bike, at the barber shop. You can read, and you do every day before you ever come to school. You can also play baseball. Reading and writing are like baseball or football. You play baseball and football at home, at the park, wherever you want to, but when you come to school or go to a summer program at
Despite this view of teachers as coaches, it is clear that an overemphasis on athletics can cause teacher-coaches to have far different career contingencies than non-coaching teachers or those who lead non-sports related extracurricular activities (Sage, 1987). This may be especially true if novice teacher-coaches are not encouraged to “establish an identity that supports, not hinders, how they view themselves as teachers [and coaches]” (Brown, in press-a, p. 15).

### Teacher/Coach Identity

O’Connor and MacDonald (2002) described teacher identity as a “reflexive monitoring of action” (p. 42) while Sexton (2008) noted that teacher identity “highlights how an individual mediates teaching—drawing upon different arrays of social positioning, experiences, and resources to enact their professional selves in particular ways” (p. 75). McCann and Johannessen (2004) referred to the development of teacher identity as a defining of a teacher persona. Feiman-Nemser (2003) added that crafting a teacher identity is often a process filled with personal struggle. This struggle may depend upon the teacher’s ability to manage different scenarios—personal, professional, and situated—despite the influence of negative pressures (Day, 2008). Similarly, in her description of a borderland discourse that encompasses a holistic notion of teacher identity, Alsup (2006) has suggested that novice teachers develop their identity by negotiating with the diverse subjectivities and ideologies in which they come into contact.

The position between teaching and coaching has all the qualifications of a borderland as each role comes equipped with what Gee (2007) would call a semiotic domain or “any set of practices that recruits one or more modalities…to communicate distinctive types of meanings” (p. 19). These domains include modes of dominant and nondominant Discourse (see Gee, 2001),
stereotypical assumptions, and rules of conduct. The borderland of teaching and coaching also reflects the three stages of occupational socialization to represent “a time when one’s past, present, and future are set in dynamic tension….a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing, and who one can become” (Britzman, 1991, p. 8). As this statement clearly displays, the notion of identity can be both complicated and multifaceted.

Zeichner and Gore (1990) have called for a focus on the combination of personal identity and role identity as a means of viewing one’s self-identity. When creating a self-identity, Gee (2007) asserts that individuals must believe in their ability to establish themselves in new semiotic domains. More importantly, “they need to believe that, if they are successful learners in the domain, they will be valued and accepted by others committed to that domain—that is, by people in the affinity group associated with the domain” (Gee, 2007, p. 54). This may be difficult based upon negative perceptions of coaches and the fact that many teacher-coaches are referred to solely as ‘Coach’ (Brown, in press-a; Sage, 1989). However, two case studies in particular (Brown, in press-a; Drake & Hebert, 2002), both of which included novice, female teacher-coaches, found that participants were committed to both roles and did not view themselves separately as teachers or coaches despite the title of ‘Coach.’

Nevertheless, the coaching title routinely serves to push teacher-coaches away from non-coaching teachers, thereby eliminating any possibility of Lortie’s (1975) idea of a shared technical culture. Thus, core content area teacher-coaches may encounter two separate groups that represent the divided domains of teaching and coaching—academic teachers and athletic coaches—as they attempt to filter their self-identities into the single identity (see the description of real-world identities in Gee, 2007) of either a ‘teacher-coach’ or simply an educator who fulfills multiple roles in a school. Inevitably, the professional orientations of teacher-coaches as
well as the pressures they feel from the social culture of schools and communities may be the deciding factor in how their identities are established. The most common scaffold for supporting the formation of these professional identities is often located in school or school systems’ induction and mentoring programs.

**Induction and Mentoring Programs**

Studies have shown that many novice teachers express feelings of isolation as they struggle through the induction process of teaching (Brown, 2010; DeWert, Babinski, & Jones, 2003; Flores & Day, 2006; Herbert & Worthy, 2001; Johnson, 2004; Kardos & Johnson, 2007; McCann & Johannessen, 2004; Westheimer, 2008). This isolation may be increased as a result of novice teachers’ immediate separation from their teacher education programs upon graduation (Anderson & Olsen, 2006). In the case of college undergraduates, Smagorinsky (2010) has referred to this as “transitioning from the womb of the university to the responsibilities of adult life” (p. 28). Kardos et al. (2001) found that schools who integrated novice and veteran teachers—what they termed integrated professional cultures—had higher retention rates than schools where novice and veteran teachers remained in isolation (see also Johnson, 2004; Kardos & Johnson, 2007; Scherff, 2008; Westheimer, 2008). However, studies have also shown that novices sometimes feel a lack of support and have limited opportunities for collaboration with more experienced educators (Flores, 2006; Flores & Day, 2006) despite the fact that induction (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Flores, 2006; Guarino et al., 2006; Ingersoll, 2012; Luft, 2009; Luft, Roehrig, & Patterson, 2003; McCann, Johannessen, & Ricca, 2005; Rippon & Martin, 2006) and mentoring (Guarino et al., 2006; Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009; Johnson & Kardos, 2008; Stanulis & Floden, 2009) are commonly referred to as two of the most prominent strategies for socializing novice teachers into the organizational culture of a school.
In their nationwide study on induction, Smith and Ingersoll (2004) found that eighty percent of first-year teachers were involved in some sort of induction program that included either mentoring, administrative support, common planning for grade level or content area teachers, or novice teacher seminars. However, some researchers believe that Smith and Ingersoll’s (2004) study call into question the effectiveness of induction programs based on current attrition levels. According to Fry (2007), “the need to focus on whether or not teachers receive induction seems secondary to the need to evaluate the quality of existing induction programs” (p. 232). Wang, Odell, and Schwille (2008) believe that teacher induction programs, like novice teachers themselves, must be active and collaborative in order to be effective (see also Feiman-Nemser, 2001). This type of collaboration is also essential for effective mentoring programs.

Evertson and Smithey (2000) found that novice teachers involved in mentoring programs develop more effective classroom routines, a better handle on pedagogical instruction, and greater student cooperation and involvement. Like induction, mere involvement in mentoring is never enough. Fantilli and McDougall (2009) have called for mentees to have a say in mentor selection, which they found helped mentees increase their comfort level in this professional relationship. Evertson and Smithey (2000) noted the importance of preparing mentors for the role of mentoring. This is similar to the stance of Feiman-Nemser (2001) and Schwille (2008) who have called for mentoring to be viewed as a specialized practice utilizing learned knowledge and skills instead of being seen as simply a task that any teacher can undertake at a moment’s notice (see also Wang et al., 2008).

Schwille (2008) challenges mentors to be more than just a resource for novice teachers; they should be willing to think “broadly and critically” (p. 164) about the process of mentoring.
Others suggest that mentors should be both qualified and motivated, not just willing, to work with novice teachers (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; McCann & Johannessen, 2004). Ideally, a mentor will act “as a coach, much like in athletics, advising and teaching the political nuts and bolts, giving feedback, and rehearsing strategies” (McPartland, 1985, p. 8). Keeping with the athletics metaphor of mentoring, novice teacher-coaches need more than just a head coach (i.e., formal mentor); assistant coaches (i.e., informal mentors) are also quite valuable to the mentoring process, particularly for mentees who have not built a strong rapport with assigned formal mentors.

While the need for mentor training and preparation is clearly important, there is also a great need for informal mentors to help support novice teachers, especially in schools without the luxury of adequate induction and/or mentoring programs (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Luft, 2009; McCann & Johannessen, 2004). School administrators must be called upon to promote collaborative school environments and help promote effective mentoring by allocating time for mentor-mentee interactions (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Scherff, 2008). Grossman and Thompson (2004) have acknowledged that district policies can promote effective mentoring through “the tasks they assign to new teachers, the resources they provide, the learning environments they create, the assessments they design, and the conversations they provoke” (p. 298). Since mentors and mentees are typically paired from within the same content areas, researchers have called for more subject-specific professional development and further research associated with subject-specific mentoring (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008; Luft, 2009; Maloch & Flint, 2003; Scherff, 2008). With this in mind, it is clear that for novice teacher-coaches to become truly effective in both roles, there is a greater need for
supportive mentors, formal and informal, within the roles of teaching and coaching (Brown, in press-a; Drake & Hebert, 2002; Wilson et al., 2010).

**Effective Teaching and Coaching**

In their discussion of the unequal distribution of highly qualified teachers in American schools, Murnane and Steele (2007) mentioned that hiring decisions, including a prospective teacher’s ability to coach, have historically complicated estimates of instructional effectiveness. In a scenario where a fully qualified candidate is pitted against a less qualified candidate willing to coach athletics, the coach often wins out (Ingersoll, 1999). Coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001) may be a result of this emphasis on coaching at the organizational level while making it difficult for teacher-coaches to effectively balance multiple roles. In her description of the challenges P.E. teacher-coaches face in effectively balancing multiple roles, Frank (2003) noted that teaching should be valued above coaching, but that coaching often takes higher precedent. Interestingly, Frank continued on to say that students themselves recognize and accept the necessity of P.E. teachers to focus more on the coaching role, although she questions what message is sent to students by prioritizing coaching over teaching. Teaching as a career contingency to coaching, which has become a common stereotype of physical educators, was described in detail by Siedentop (2001):

…the teacher-coach who “throws out the ball” during physical education class and spends his or her time on the sidelines working on plays for that afternoon’s interscholastic team practice. Then, at 3:30 P.M., this unenthusiastic teacher turns into a dynamic coach, with a well-prepared practice plan. During the physical education class, our stereotypical teacher-coach does little interacting, except to reprimand students who misbehave. During the afternoon practice, the same person is highly interactive, providing specific skill feedback and encouragement to players. (p. 276)

Based on this perception of physical education teacher-coaches, the obvious question is whether or not core content area teacher-coaches are creating similar stereotypes by ‘rolling out
the worksheets’ and using class time to plan for extracurricular coaching duties. This also leads one to wonder how educators maintain their effectiveness in both roles throughout an entire school year. While effective teaching and coaching are not necessarily the focus of the forthcoming collective case study, it is important for these notions to be defined in order to properly understand the demands of each role. McCann and Johannessen (2004) have suggested that the most effective novice teachers are able to manage their workload and develop positive relationships with students. On the other hand, McCann, Johannessen, and Ricca (2005) have described traits of effectiveness in experienced teachers as expressing an interest in and demonstrating the importance of content material, showing appreciation for students, making clear classroom expectations, and being willing to engage with students outside of class. In a review of research, Darling-Hammond (1997) outlined the elements of teacher effectiveness as consisting of knowledge of subject matter, an understanding of student learning and development, and a perspective on diverse teaching methods.

Research also demonstrates the importance of preparation and certification for coaches. Coaching education programs are intended to offer future coaches the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to put them on the path toward effective coaching (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; McCullick, Belcher, & Schempp, 2005). Côté and Gilbert (2009) have suggested that coaching education programs should promote a definition of coaching effectiveness that considers “coaches’ knowledge and athletes’ outcomes in specific coaching contexts” (p. 309). If programs are successful in this endeavor, they will be endorsing the quality coaching of student-athletes, maintenance of professionalism in the coaching profession, and legal protection for coaches, schools, and school systems (McMillin & Reffner, 1999), many of whom are regularly forced to ask hesitant and underprepared teachers to take on athletic coaching responsibilities.
NASPE (2008) has detailed the importance of proper training for coaches and acknowledges that while many coaches may be suitable for teaching sport-specific skills, “they are likely deficient in other areas such as organizing practices, planning and implementing conditioning programs, caring for and preventing injuries, and using age appropriate motivational techniques” (p. 12). Frank (2003) adds that coaches should have a working knowledge of developmental needs such as “nutrition, supplementation, weight management, pubescent strength training, eating disorders, and a variety of emotional and psychological concerns” (pp. 136-137). Based on these needs, NASPE (2006) has outlined national standards for sports coaches from eight domains: philosophy and ethics, safety and injury prevention, physical conditioning, growth and development, teaching and communication, sport skills and tactics, organization and administration, and evaluation.

Despite the presence of these national standards, many of the studies available on coaching have focused on university-based coaching education programs and small- and large-scale training programs across numerous countries (Trudel, Gilbert, & Werthner, 2010). While a good portion of the research on coaching education and certification programs comes from elite level, international coaches (Erickson, Bruner, MacDonald, & Côté, 2008), studies across many developmental levels show that coaching education programs are more often accessible to students in the field of physical education (Wilson et al., 2010; also see the literature on coaching minors in McMillin & Reffner, 1999) and often play a minimal role in the overall preparation and socialization of coaches (Gilbert, Côté, & Mallett, 2006; McCullick et al., 2005; Trudel et al., 2010)

Studies at multiple levels of athletics have also associated characteristics such as efficiently managing instructional time and balancing the use of praise and criticism with
effective coaching (Bloom, Crumpton, & Anderson, 1999; Lacy & Martin, 1994; Segrave & Ciancio, 1990). However, several studies have drawn somewhat conflicting conclusions regarding successful coaches and, specifically, their use of praise and criticism (see Claxton, 1988; Curtner-Smith, Wallace, & Wang, 1998; Lacy & Darst, 1985; Lacy & Goldston, 1990; Lacy & Martin, 1994). With this in mind, the dichotomy of what is considered effective and what is considered successful may have very different meanings within the coaching ranks. These terms are often used interchangeably, but success if more commonly associated with aspects of coaching that are set apart from direct interactions with student-athletes. Success often includes winning percentages and championships (McCullick et al., 2009) as well as providing entertainment for the community and increasing athletic funding (Curtner-Smith, Sofo, Chouinard, & Wallace, 2007). This is similar to teaching whereby success is often defined more by test scores than the actual learning gains of students. Nevertheless, regardless of how effectiveness is defined (for a discussion of these definitions, see Côté & Gilbert, 2009), this term can have a number of possible meanings for coaches. Ultimately, the challenge of effective coaching is most concretely understood through the diverse usage of what it means to be a coach, a term that over the years has been adapted into many other educational contexts.

Re-envisioning the Teacher-Coach

In the past, professional development for teachers has routinely taken the form of one- or two-day workshops, although in recent years this method has been viewed as relatively unsuccessful in cultivating teacher effectiveness (Knight, 2009). Unlike the many players and coaches within athletics who recognize that mastery is rarely achieved swiftly, teachers in professional development workshops sometimes behave “as though teaching skills were so easily acquired that a simple presentation...[would be] sufficient to ensure successful classroom
performance” (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 8). As a result, professional development is increasingly turning towards academic styles of coaching, which offer authentic experiences to provide “differentiated support for professional learning” (Knight, 2009, p. 2).

Much like athletic coaching, academic forms of coaching promote as its basic premise the building of skills as well as the development of theoretical understandings (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Teemant, Wink, & Tyra, 2011). Some individuals even parallel teaching to athletic training based on the variations of instructional methods that are utilized in both areas. These methods include the development of individual skills, small group interactions, and whole group demonstrations (Hogan, 1980; Joyce & Showers, 2002). In general, academic forms of coaching now include instructional coaching, literacy coaching, cognitive coaching, classroom management coaching, content coaching, differentiated coaching, and leadership coaching (Knight, 2009).

Instructional coaching has become particularly prevalent in the field of secondary education. Instructional coaches are generally seen as teacher leaders who utilize their content area expertise and their connections with co-workers in an attempt to meet the demands of instructional reforms without being forced to establish authority over their peers (Gallucci et al., 2010; Mangin & Stoelinga, 2008; Neufield & Roper, 2003; Taylor, 2008). The role of an instructional coach typically involves observing classroom lessons, modeling effective teaching, conferencing with teachers, and leading professional development seminars (Gallucci et al., 2010; Knight, 2006; Poglinco et al., 2003). Another common form of coaching is the general academic coaching that takes place between teachers and students. Joyce and Showers (2002) have suggested that teachers can strengthen their bonds with students by creating a coaching environment in their classrooms that promotes five major functions: companionship, technical
feedback, analysis of application, adaptation to students, and personal facilitation. These five functions serve to create a scaffold for student learning and achievement.

In a description of out-of-school learning environments such as basketball and track & field, Nasir (2008) found three types of scaffolds prevalent for engaging students in learning: 1) ongoing evaluation and immediate feedback; 2) greater access to expert participants; and 3) teaching and learning as a regular part of the normal practice routine. Specifically, Nasir concluded that out-of-school learning environments tend to foster respectful relationships between coaches and players, the ability to reframe failures as learning opportunities, and responsibilities assigned to learners based on their own personal strengths and active interests. This borderland represents one of the most critical components of the relationship between students/teachers and athletes/coaches and is precisely what teaching and coaching should reflect: a greater focus on learning.

The first step in challenging the assumption that teaching and coaching must remain “two quite distinct positions…occupied by one person” (Sage, 1989, p. 85) is to begin to see that one person, the teacher-coach, as someone capable of effectively fulfilling the requirements of both roles. This blend of these roles was probably summed up best by Hogan (1980): “I teach football. I coach English. And I enjoy both” (p. 24). This type of personal investment in both roles has the potential to play a major part in maintaining an appropriate sense of balance. Only once the negative stigma commonly associated with coaches has been contested can the perception of teacher-coaches ever be re-envisioned to meet the needs of the profession, which is for teacher-coaches to be viewed solely as educators. Such a view combines the notions of teaching and coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001) to produce an identity that allows for a more equitable valuing of both roles, otherwise known as a teaching/coaching orientation (Brown, in press-a).
Ultimately, the goal should be to envision the roles of teaching and coaching as complementary social positions that serve as “a departure from ordinary reality, not in the long run to escape it, but to return to it refreshed, entertained, and even a bit encouraged” (Savant, 2003, p. 14). Despite the fact that coaching orientations and acculturative influences are never easily overturned, it is imperative that both teacher education programs and teacher induction programs begin to “help recruits deliberately and directly confront their underlying belief systems” (Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993, p. 364) if we hope to unite previously separate identities of teachers and coaches (Lawson, 1993) by allowing that tiny hyphen between the term teacher-coach to properly serve its purpose of connecting the social positions of teaching and coaching.

Summary

This review of literature related to novice teacher-coaches began with the issue of attrition and concluded with a discussion on re-envisioning the notion of what it means to be a teacher-coach. In between, the significant demands of fulfilling and balancing the multiple responsibilities of novice teacher-coaches were discussed. How the roles of teaching and coaching are managed is often framed by the occupational socialization and orientations of novice teacher-coaches. The organizational socialization of teacher-coaches may include moments of interrole conflict as well as interrole complementarity, which generally reflect divisions and connections between academics and athletics and will inevitably affect the development of professional identities. Induction and mentoring programs are an important component of supporting identity development, not to mention increasing an educator’s effectiveness in the roles of teaching and coaching. In recent years, coaching has become associated with other diverse contexts (e.g., academic coaching, instructional coaching) and thus
provided opportunities to dispel one of the more notable stereotypes of teacher-coaches, that they are more interested in coaching interscholastic sports than teaching academic classes.
CHAPTER III:

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology for this collective case study of first-year teacher-coaches from core content areas. The beginning sections consist of an overview of phenomenology and case study research. Based on these descriptions of approaches to qualitative research, the specific boundaries—participants, location, and time—for this study will be described. First, the selection and participation requirements of primary and secondary participants as well as the consent procedures for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) will be outlined. Next, multiple settings—academic, athletic, and community—within the study will be examined. Finally, data collection techniques—interviews, observations, and artifacts—as well as specific timelines will be described. In the final three sections, data analysis procedures and issues of trustworthiness will be discussed before concluding with a final summary of the methodology.

Qualitative Research

The purpose of this collective case study is to help fill a gap in the existing body of knowledge on the phenomenon of core content area teacher-coaches in secondary schools. Before turning to the specifics of this study, it is first necessary to explore the implications for examining lived experiences via case study research.
Examining Lived Experiences

This research is grounded in the study of lived experiences, also known as the philosophy of phenomenology (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Pollio, Henley, & Thompson, 1997; Van Manen, 1990). Van Manen (1990) has referred to phenomenology as “the systematic attempt to uncover and describe the structures, the internal meaning structures, of lived experience” (p. 10). To accurately paint a portrait of phenomenology is to describe and interpret a phenomenon with the awareness that intricacies of the lifeworld surrounding the phenomenon are more complex than can ever be revealed by a researcher (Van Manen, 1990). Indeed, the human experience is full of numerous complexities based on interactions with a wide array of objects, ideas, and people (Pollio et al., 1997).

The reasons for incorporating a phenomenological approach to this study are threefold. First, this study intends to “gather other people’s experiences because they allow us to become more experienced ourselves” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 62). One of the highlights of a phenomenological approach is to provide insight into the commonalities and shared experiences of multiple participants in relation to a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). Second, in critically reflecting on their own lived experiences, the hope is that primary participants—novice teacher-coaches—might become more cognizant of their own socialization processes (Jones et al., 2003) through opportunities for self-examination during interviewing and member checking. Third, this study hopes to inform future teacher-coaches and other educational stakeholders about the responsibilities and challenges of fulfilling and balancing the roles of teaching and coaching.

Despite the benefits of a phenomenological approach, there is also a need to move past a “description of the essence of the experience of the phenomenon” (Creswell, 2007, p. 77) in order to view how the experience affects and is affected by the broader educational framework
that surrounds it. A phenomenological case study approach (Flyvbjerg, 2006) is useful in this regard because it allows for an in-depth study of the phenomenon, which makes findings easier to examine through a critical lens (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). While illuminating lived experiences within the boundaries of a particular phenomenon has the potential to problematize data collection and analysis, utilizing individual cases allows researchers to expose unique and significant factors pertinent to the individuals found within the actual phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). Ultimately, this is the most efficient path to understanding the identities of teacher-coaches in relation to the overarching phenomenon of being a teacher-coach.

**Case Study Research**

While interviews are common in socialization research, numerous sources have called for reflexive interviews and/or persistent behavioral observations in school settings (Lawson, 1983a; Lawson & Stroot, 1993; O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002; Potrac et al., 2002). With this in mind, case study research has been chosen for this study because it “offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding phenomenon” (Merriam, 2009, p. 50). An investigation of multiple cases also offers an opportunity to more fully integrate various data sources (e.g., interviews, observations, artifacts) while paying particular attention to specific contextual factors of the phenomenon (Yin, 2009). As previously mentioned, this collective case study will be bounded by participants, location, and time. Such a bounded system takes into account Van Manen’s (1990) “four existential of lived body, lived space, lived time, and lived relation to the other,” all of which can be “differentiated but not separated” (p. 105).

Case studies may not be generalizable by nature, but they do offer an in-depth view of a particular phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Smagorinsky, 2010; Yin,
(2009) as well as the potential to transcend specific contexts and guide researchers toward a more critical perspective on teaching and coaching (Brown, in press-a). Through situated stories (e.g., the lived experiences of first-year teacher-coaches), readers are invited to question their own personal values and understandings (Bullough, 1989) while exploring unfamiliar cases with a fresh perspective. However, these stories should be used for more than mere exploration if the aim “is to present a reconception of socialization and to demonstrate that it warrants closer intellectual treatment by those who profess a concern for critical educational theory and practice” (Zeichner & Gore, 1990, p. 6).

While readers may not relate directly to specific details and experiences of the primary participants, this collective case study will allow for a more comprehensive and complex depiction of the similarities and differences inherent in the socialization process (Zeichner & Gore, 1990) of first-year teacher-coaches. Through the thick description of individual cases, the reader will gain a more complete understanding of how previous life experiences (i.e., acculturation and professional socialization) can influence teacher-coaches in relation to 1) their decisions to become teachers and coaches; 2) their perceptions of the roles of teachers and coaches; and 3) their daily interactions within the roles of teaching and coaching. Furthermore, the reader will begin to recognize how these educators influence and are influenced by the innate structures found within the socialization process (Zeichner & Gore, 1990) and decide for themselves whether or not these cases represent discrepant or typical experiences (Smagorinsky, 2010) for novice teacher-coaches.

**Pilot Study**

In preparation for this collective case study, a single-case pilot study was conducted to explore the socialization of a first-year, core content area teacher-coach at a small high school in
the rural southeastern United States (see Brown, in press-a). Data collection included interviews, observations, and artifacts while data analysis consisted of a system of open, axial, and selective coding. The primary participant was a first-year, ninth grade world history teacher responsible for coaching the women’s volleyball and basketball teams as well as assisting with women’s softball. Two secondary participants—the teacher-coach’s department chair and athletic director—were also interviewed to offer multiple perspectives on the experiences of the case study participant.

Four themes emerged and were viewed through the lens of teacher identity. These themes were gender and opportunity; interactions within the school culture; teaching and coaching expectations; and interrole conflict and “complementarity” (O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002, p. 49). Several primary conclusions were also drawn as a result of this pilot study:

- Teacher education programs should prepare preservice teachers for the diverse roles and responsibilities they will face as novice teachers;
- School induction programs should provide appropriate mentoring for novice teachers who take on roles outside of classroom teaching (e.g., coaching);
- School administrators should be sympathetic to the multiple, high-pressure demands that accompany the roles of teaching and coaching; and
- The roles of teaching and coaching, which are seen by some as conflicting, may also serve to complement one another.

**Boundaries**

This research has taken the form of a collective case study in which a central issue is explored through multiple cases within a bounded system (Creswell, 2007). Specifically, the study was bounded by three constraints: participants, location, and time. Participants include
three primary participants as well as three secondary participants for each primary participant. Locations include a middle school and high school while observations occurred primarily in academic and athletic venues. With time as the final boundary, this study took place from August 2011 through January 2012, encompassing the first semester of the academic school year and the fall and winter athletic seasons.

**Participants**

**Primary Participants**

The primary participants in this study—all first-year teacher-coaches teaching in core content areas—were purposefully selected from within a local school system in close proximity to the researcher’s university. Purposeful sampling is useful for gaining insights when “one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most” (Merriam, 1988, p. 48). To some degree, primary participants also represented a convenience sample because several secondary schools in the school system did not hire first-year teacher-coaches from core content areas at the beginning of this particular academic year, although several secondary school principals did volunteer other novice teacher-coaches (e.g., second- or third-year educators) or first-year teacher-coaches from other content areas (e.g., physical education, special education).

After receiving the appropriate permissions from the university’s Institutional Review Board and the school system superintendent (see Appendix B), school principals were e-mailed and asked if they had teacher-coaches who fit the criteria for inclusion in the study and, if so, if they would be interested in participating. Based upon preliminary feedback from principals and after an initial meeting with two candidates shortly after the start of the fall semester, these two primary participants from Proctor High School (Christopher and Bryant) were selected. The school’s principal was then asked to sign a letter of agreement (see Appendix B) before consent
forms were distributed to primary and secondary participants (see Appendix B). Consent forms were used to explain the purpose of the study and outline the rights of the voluntary participants during the research process.

While Christopher and Bryant were both first-year educators who coached football, they were purposefully selected due to differences in their content areas, grade levels, professional socialization, and teaching/coaching orientations. A third primary participant (Charlotte) was selected a week later after accepting a full-time position at Sizemore Middle School, a local school that feeds into Proctor High School. After receiving permission from the school’s principal and following an initial meeting with the first-year teacher-coach, the consent process began as Charlotte was invited to participate due to some interesting dissimilarities in gender, content area, grade levels, and coaching assignments. Short biographies for the primary participants are listed below in the order in which they will be discussed in the forthcoming chapters. A more detailed biographical profile for each primary participant can be found in Appendix C.

**Charlotte.** Charlotte is a twenty-three year old, Caucasian female in her first year of responsible teaching and coaching. She is a recent graduate of a teacher education program located within the College of Education of a Division I research institution in the southeastern United States. Charlotte teaches social science and coaches basketball at Sizemore Middle School, where she was hired a few weeks into the school year after substituting for a social science teacher who had recently resigned.

**Christopher.** Christopher is a twenty-five year old, Caucasian male in his first year of responsible teaching and coaching. He is also a recent graduate of a teacher education program located within a College of Education at a Division I research institution in the southeastern
United States. Christopher teaches English and coaches football and soccer at Proctor High School. He spent the spring semester after his college graduation searching for a job and working part-time at the university’s recreation center before being hired at Proctor in the summer prior to the beginning of the school year.

**Bryant.** Bryant is a twenty-six year old, Caucasian male in his first year of responsible teaching and coaching. He graduated from a small, regional university with a bachelor’s degree in biology before spending two years in optometry school. After making the decision to pursue other career interests, Bryant spent a year working in lawn care and volunteering as a football coach in his hometown high school before accepting a position as an alternative certification teacher at Proctor High School where he teaches science and coaches football and softball.

**Secondary Participants**

Three secondary participants per each primary participant were invited to take part in this study. These individuals were necessary for establishing trustworthiness by providing third-party perspectives regarding the experiences of primary participants. Specifically, these individuals were selected based on their exposure to at least one of two facets of the individual teacher-coach’s educational responsibilities: teaching (principal and department chair/team leader) and coaching (principal and athletic director/football coordinator). For short biographies of each secondary participant, see Table 1 and Table 2. Although students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents were present during observations, and while their interactions with the primary participants were observed, these educational stakeholders are not the focus of this collective case study nor are these individuals ever personally identified.
### Table 1

**Secondary Participant Information: Sizemore Middle School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Years in Education</th>
<th>Number of Years in Current Role at Sizemore MS</th>
<th>Other Relevant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Twelve years total as an assistant principal (n=3) and teacher (n=9)</td>
<td>First year as principal</td>
<td>Former assistant principal at the elementary and high school levels; former English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Seven years as a teacher at the middle school/high school level</td>
<td>Second year as team leader</td>
<td>Science teacher; former athletics coach; entered education via alternative certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>Seven years as an elementary P.E. teacher</td>
<td>First year as athletic director</td>
<td>Started the athletic program at Sizemore; all previous educational experience at the elementary level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Secondary Participant Information: Proctor High School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Years in Education</th>
<th>Number of Years in Current Role at Proctor HS</th>
<th>Other Relevant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Twenty-four years total as a principal (n=14), athletic director (n=3), and teacher (n=8)</td>
<td>Third year as principal</td>
<td>Former mathematics teacher and soccer coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher’s Department Chair</td>
<td>Nine years as a teacher</td>
<td>Second year as department chair</td>
<td>English teacher; AP English lead teacher for the school district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant’s Department Chair</td>
<td>Seventeen years as a teacher</td>
<td>Fourth year as department chair</td>
<td>Science teacher; student government association (SGA) sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>Twenty-eight years as a P.E./health teacher</td>
<td>Tenth year as athletic director</td>
<td>Boys’ and girls’ golf coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Coordinator</td>
<td>Three years as a teacher and football team’s defensive coordinator</td>
<td>Fourth year as teacher-coach</td>
<td>Social science teacher; briefly worked in politics/private sector before returning to school for an alternative master’s degree in education; head softball coach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settings

The primary settings for this study include Sizemore Middle School and Proctor High School (both pseudonyms). These schools are situated just a few miles apart—the majority of the students at Sizemore Middle School will eventually attend Proctor High School—in the same school system in a mid-sized city in the southeastern United States. Both schools were built within the past ten years.

Sizemore Middle School has an average daily membership of approximately 475 students. The racial make-up of the school consists of three main subgroups: white (63%), black (31%), and Asian (4%). Located in one of the wealthier suburbs of the city, only 29% of students are eligible for free and reduced lunch. According to the principal, Sizemore Middle School is the only middle school in the system that consistently makes AYP. The community that surrounds the school is very supportive both academically and athletically. In fact, up until this year, interscholastic athletics had been combined with another local middle school due to the relatively small number of students enrolled. The semester under study marked the first time that Sizemore Middle School had an athletic program to call its own. Parental support was one of the central reasons the athletic program was established.

A short drive from Sizemore Middle School, Proctor High School has an average daily membership of over 1,200 students. The racial make-up of the school is approximately 60% black, 35% white, and 3% Asian. A Title I school, approximately 44% of students are eligible for free and reduced lunch. According to the principal, many of the students who live around Proctor High School come from incredibly wealthy families while a significant percentage of students are also bussed in from some of the lowest socioeconomic areas in the city. A look at its AYP status shows that the school did not make AYP last year, although it did meet 15 of 17
goals. The two indicators not met were reading for students in the category of free/reduced meals and the overall academic indicator of graduation rate (90% goal – 82% reached). Proctor High School is currently in year three of a school improvement plan.

**Data Collection**

Qualitative techniques were used in data collection to highlight what Corbin and Strauss (2008) refer to as the “essence” (p. 47) of experiences, issues, and concerns of primary participants. To build rapport with case study participants and to develop a consistent structure of interactions, case studies consisted of prolonged engagement with and persistent observation of primary participants. Secondary participants, on the other hand, were involved in a more limited capacity (i.e., interviews). In general, data collection included three primary sources: interviews, observations, and artifacts.

Interviews and observations took place on the campus of each school. Interviews were conducted primarily in the teachers’ classrooms and the administrators’ offices. Observations were conducted primarily in the classroom for academics and a combination of classroom and athletic facilities for coaching. Other observational settings included hallways where teachers were on duty; lunchtime settings such as the cafeteria, classrooms, and meeting rooms; libraries for professional development; and numerous athletic facilities such as game and practice fields, weight rooms, coaching offices, and classrooms. A number of coaching observations also occurred at athletic venues off school grounds, particularly alternate school sites for the away games of Charlotte’s middle school basketball teams.

**Interviews**

**Primary participants.** Interviews with primary participants consisted of two parts. First, each formal interview contained structured components made up of questions related to
biographical information, acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. A complete list of the potential interview questions can be found in Appendix D. Interview protocols were structured around scripts adapted in part from the works of Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) and Pagano (2004). Second, each interview included guided conversations (Yin, 2009) that were driven by the coding and data analysis of previous observations, interviews, and artifacts. Interviews generally lasted thirty minutes to an hour and took place before or after school. All interviews were audio-taped and later transcribed in further detail as in-process memos (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Informal discussions were also utilized as a less-structured type of interview. These discussions were documented in the form of jottings and were also considered in-process memos.

The interview schedule for primary participants began with biographical information and moved through the three stages of occupational socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). Questions related to acculturation and professional socialization took place during the first two interviews since they represented past experiences in the lives of teacher-coaches. A focused discussion of organizational socialization took place during the final two interviews. Interviews took place approximately a month apart from one another. The interview schedule for primary participants is listed in Table 3.
Table 3

*Interview Schedule for Primary Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Biographical Information, Acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Professional Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 3</td>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 4</td>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because Charlotte was hired later than Christopher and Bryant and her basketball season was quickly approaching, her first two interviews were combined into a single interview. All primary participants were asked to member check transcriptions and provide further information or clarify any misinterpretations.

**Secondary participants.** Interviews were also conducted with three secondary participants for each primary participant: principal, department chair/team leader, and athletic director/football coordinator. Secondary participants were interviewed twice, once early in the semester and once late in the semester. Interviews included discussions pertaining to, but not limited to, biographical information, the organizational socialization of the teacher-coach, and data analysis of observations and artifacts. Similar to interviews with primary participants, interviews with secondary participants were audio-taped and later transcribed in further detail as in-process memos (Emerson et al., 1995). Informal discussions were also utilized as a less-structured type of interview. These discussions were documented in the form of jottings and also considered in-process memos. Since Christopher and Bryant taught and coached at the same high school, interviews were set up with their principal, athletic director, and defensive coordinator to allow for an equitable discussion of both teacher-coaches. Secondary participants
were asked to member check transcriptions and provide further information or clarify any misinterpretations.

**Observations**

Direct observations (also called shadowing; see Curtner-Smith, 1997) of each teacher-coach took place on a weekly basis within the school setting and at various athletic venues (e.g., fields, gymnasiums, coaching offices, classrooms). As described in Brown (in press-a), observations included the instructional day (e.g., teaching, planning, and other duties) as well as extracurricular activities (e.g., practices, games, study halls, team meetings). In the coaching role, a number of observations took place at night and on weekends. These observations included Friday night football games and Sunday afternoon coaches’ meetings and film sessions.

A minimum of two hours of teaching and coaching were observed during the vast majority of observations, and on many occasions entire days were spent observing the participants’ interactions within the roles of teaching and coaching. Over the course of the study, hundreds of hours were clocked in the context of these two schools. However, the beauty of observing educators within the same school as well as at schools within close proximity of one another is that if observations were interrupted (e.g., standardized testing, professional development, an absence due to illness), it was not difficult to find one of the other primary participants to observe. The proximity of the two schools was also helpful in observing the coaching role because it was easy to leave an event at one school (e.g., basketball practice) and make it to an event at the other school (e.g., football game).

Extensive field notes were taken during observations. Field notes consisted of the following sections: description, reflection, and questions (see Appendix E, the observation protocol). Reflections from the observation protocol served as analytic memos as codes were
initially established and the phenomenon of teacher-coaches in core content areas was first considered with the three primary participants in mind. On many occasions, this memoing took place during down time of the observational process, although memos were often reconsidered more extensively soon after observation periods had concluded.

**Artifacts**

Artifacts were used to enhance, support, and/or challenge data analysis from interviews and observations. Much of this evidence is courtesy of primary participants, although certain artifacts are also from secondary participants or outside sources. Artifacts include items such as teaching materials, lesson plans, teaching observations, game plans, PowerPoint presentations, e-mail correspondence, social media, blogs, newspaper articles, classroom decor, and information from the state department of education.

**Data Analysis**

Qualitative analysis served as “a process of examining and interpreting data in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 1). Findings were synthesized using a system of theoretical sampling, a data collection method whereby concepts develop in response to their properties, variations, and relationships (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). This inductive process (Merriam, 2009) was based upon constant comparative analysis consisting of open, axial, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, 2008). Coding consisted of creating within-case analyses before moving to cross-case analyses to form an analysis of themes. This analysis was based specifically on the commonalities and complexities of the multiple cases (Creswell, 2007) without losing sight of the individual experiences and identities of primary participants.
The first round of coding took place during data collection as early codes were formed through observation. As previously mentioned, interviews and observations were the major sources of data with artifacts used to triangulate these sources by allowing the primary investigator a third lens through which to build these initial codes. Thus, while observations were technically the basis for the first round of open coding, they were primarily used to open new lines of questioning during interviews and guided conversations. The second round of open coding began towards the end of the semester as interview transcriptions collected up to that point were analyzed. Once again, these codes added to and altered several of the questions asked of primary and secondary participants during the final round of interviewing.

Once the final interviews were transcribed and member checked by primary and secondary participants, the most comprehensive round of open coding took place within each individual case. After all transcriptions were coded (n = 25), similar codes with accompanying quotations were paired in a single manuscript for each primary participant. At this point, data from observations and artifacts were then coded with important ideas and connections inserted into each coding manuscript. After reexamining this collection of codes with the research questions and the review of literature in mind, a total of sixteen codes emerged after the final round of open coding. Because initial sub-questions to the primary research questions were found among these codes (i.e., perceptions of teacher-coaches, relationships between the roles of teacher-coaches), research questions were narrowed to include only the two primary questions included in Chapter I.

With these sixteen codes in mind, a cross-case analysis took place during the first round of axial coding. While a few significant codes emerged related to acculturation and professional socialization, the remaining sixteen codes from within the context of organizational socialization
were whittled down to ten essential codes. After another examination of the relevant literature, the final round of axial coding produced a synthesis that consisted of three primary themes for acculturation, two primary themes for professional socialization, and seven primary themes for organizational socialization. These themes are listed in Table 4.

Table 4

List of Primary Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Professional Socialization</th>
<th>Organizational Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentality</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary participants were given a chance to read and offer feedback on their individual cases. All three teacher-coaches took this opportunity to clarify essential details of their novice experiences before drafts were sent to secondary participants. Later, the cross-case analysis (see Chapter VII) was also sent to primary and secondary participants for member checking. Based upon the saturation of data analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), the following collective case study serves to report the findings from within these primary themes as well as what Creswell (2007) calls naturalistic generalizations, which are described as “generalizations that people can learn from the case either for themselves or to apply to a population of cases” (p. 163; see also Smagorinsky, 2010). This final report intends to serve as “an in-depth, exhaustive description of
the phenomenon” (Creswell, 2007, p. 89) of first-year, core content area teachers/athletic coaches.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness has been established using several procedures: researcher positionality, triangulation, member checking, and thick description (Creswell, 2007). As discussed in the first chapter, researcher positionality is important because it allows researchers to position themselves within the context of the study as well as introduce possible biases or subjectivities that might affect data collection or analyses. Data analysis has included the triangulation of multiple sources (i.e., perspectives of primary and secondary participants as well as that of the researcher) and methods (i.e., interviews, observations, and artifact analysis) to help corroborate findings. An external examination of the transcriptions and findings has taken the form of multiple rounds of member checking to support accuracy and credibility. Finally, the construction of this collective case study includes thick description of the experiences of teacher-coaches to provide enough contextual information for readers to interpret the possibilities for generalization.

**Summary**

This chapter has outlined the methodology utilized in this collective case study. After providing a better understanding of lived experiences and case study methodology, details from a single-case pilot study has offered valuable insights for structuring and investigating these cases. This study has been bounded by participants, location, and time. Data collection techniques include interviews, observations, and artifacts. Data analysis consists of constant comparative analysis and three layers of coding: open, axial, and selective coding. Finally, measures of trustworthiness—researcher reflexivity, triangulation, member checking, and thick description—
have been discussed as a means of understanding the quality, accuracy, and credibility of the findings.

**Preview of Cases**

The next three chapters present the cases of Charlotte (Chapter IV), Christopher (Chapter V), and Bryant (Chapter VI). These cases utilize a combination of verb tenses—past tense (i.e., acculturation, professional socialization, personal reflections) and present tense (i.e., organizational socialization)—to give each case a story-like quality while offering the reader a sense of time and place within the general descriptions. Some cases contain a greater focus on either teaching or coaching; this is by design and serves two purposes: (1) to demonstrate the orientations of each primary participant; and (2) to reflect the challenges faced by each primary participant.

Ultimately, each individual case can stand on its own with a few exceptions. For instance, because Christopher and Bryant share so many common experiences, both are mentioned at times in the other’s respective chapter and many of the pertinent details, particularly within the coaching context, may apply to both teacher-coaches. The same can also be said for secondary participants at Proctor High School since several of them (i.e., principal, athletic director, defensive coordinator) worked with both Christopher and Bryant. The only time Charlotte is mentioned in a case other than her own is in relation to her team leader, a former nontraditional alternative certification teacher/athletic coach, whose perspective was sought to help inform the writing of Bryant’s chapter.
CHAPTER IV:

CASE STUDY RESULTS: CHARLOTTE

**Acculturation**

**Academics**

Charlotte was “born to teach.” From an early age, she wanted to pursue education despite not having any other teachers in her immediate family. Her passion for teaching began in her childhood with her bedroom serving as a classroom, her stuffed animals as her students. Having teachers who cared for her, who pushed her academically, and who made learning interesting were her greatest motivations for a career in education. After her brother married a teacher while Charlotte was in middle school, she began helping her new sister-in-law set up her classroom at the beginning of each school year. Other teaching experiences during her adolescence included volunteering to help with summer school, teaching preschool and Sunday school at church, and working as a camp counselor over summer breaks.

**Athletics**

Charlotte has always had an interest in athletics. When asked about her first interaction with sports, she jokingly recalled a story of her mother playing in a mother-son softball game while still pregnant with her. Charlotte grew up around sports as her older brothers played baseball, basketball, and football while her father coached their little league and middle school teams; her mother would be there watching from the stands. Charlotte was a cheerleader and basketball player in middle school and high school. Her first coaching experiences involved working basketball camps as a high school student.
**Orientation**

Despite her passion for sports, Charlotte was always more interested in teaching than coaching. In fact, she never considered coaching until late in her college career. She was more intrigued by teaching as a result of the constructive relationships she formed with teachers and, on the opposite end of the spectrum, the trepidation she felt for one particular high school athletic coach. Even though she had positive connections with other secondary athletic coaches—several of whom were non-faculty coaches—she vividly recalls the distinction between middle and high school teacher-coaches: her middle school teacher-coaches balanced their roles much more effectively than her high school teacher-coaches, who often focused more on athletics than academics. Charlotte offered this description of one of her math teachers from high school:

> I was supposed to be in an advanced math class. It [the teacher] was the head football coach, and it was during football season. He was on his phone a lot. We would spend days on the same section [of the book]...and advanced students just do not need to spend days on one section that was three pages long.

As she entered her university’s teacher education program, Charlotte vowed never to become the type of teacher who would neglect her students in that way.

**Professional Socialization**

**Preparation**

**Teaching.** Charlotte has a bachelor’s degree in secondary education (grades 6-12) with an emphasis in history from an accredited teacher education program at a major research institution in the southeastern United States. When asked if she felt prepared to teach, she replied that “as far as teaching methods and content knowledge, I felt very prepared. As far as classroom management as well as your daily interactions with students and parents, I felt unprepared.”
This may have had something to do with her clinical placements, none of which reflected her future teaching placement: a middle school in a wealthy suburban area. That being said, Charlotte admitted requesting a large high school in a more rural area during her student teaching placement because she felt she would face fewer classroom management issues. Despite these differences in school settings, she calls student teaching one of the greatest experiences of her life based on the nurturing relationship she formed with her cooperating teacher.

**Coaching.** Charlotte did feel somewhat prepared for the coaching role based on her occasional participation in a teacher-coach focus group geared primarily towards university students from core content areas with an interest in athletic coaching. The purpose of this focus group was to inform future teacher-coaches about the roles and responsibilities of coaching athletics in secondary schools in hopes that they would face less interrole conflict and thereby become more effective classroom teachers. In her opinion, the most beneficial focus group sessions included examining the state’s high school athletic association handbook, brainstorming fundraising opportunities, learning how to interact with officials, and discussing ways to build positive relationships with parents.

**Orientation**

While she participated in basketball at an intramural level in college, day-to-day interaction with the content of basketball was nonexistent. In teaching, on the other hand, Charlotte interacted daily with the social science content area as she moved through her content courses, education courses (e.g., methods), and clinical experiences (e.g., student teaching). When asked why she went into social science, Charlotte suggested that it was “the most applicable to everyday life…[because it] is the study of people and the study of society, and you
always have to deal with people.” As a result, her primary teaching goals revolved around getting students to think critically and become productive members of society.

Charlotte did not consider the coaching role until late in her college career. In fact, she was initially frustrated in her conviction that many teachers of social science had a greater interest in coaching athletics than teaching academics. “I was so frustrated looking at some of the guys in the program that wanted nothing more than to coach….That just made me want to be a better teacher even more because I didn’t want to be like them.” However, it was this same perception that made her realize that coaching might also help her land the teaching job she so desperately desired. Thus, she attended a few basketball games and volunteered to coach softball during her spring student teaching placement. She eventually discovered her own desire to coach when she realized just how much rapport was built between student-athletes and teacher-coaches both on the field and in the classroom through interscholastic athletics.

**Organizational Socialization**

**Opportunity**

Charlotte was hired to fill a social science vacancy that opened a week before the school year began at Sizemore Middle School. Despite never planning to teach in a middle school setting, Charlotte began as a substitute before interviewing and later accepting a full-time position teaching pre-AP 7th grade geography and regular/pre-AP 8th grade world history. According to her principal, “I knew I needed a basketball coach, but all my calls and all our searching was in regard to her as a classroom teacher….and since she was interested in coaching [girls’ basketball], she was invited to participate in that aspect as well.” Charlotte also agreed to co-sponsor the school’s student government association (SGA), which she felt would be beneficial to her and the students because of her passion for teaching civics and government. In
Since this was the first year of Sizemore Middle School’s athletic program, Charlotte was tasked with starting girls’ basketball from scratch. This was a responsibility in which she took great pride, until the boys’ basketball coach, who also served as a core content area teacher in the school, suddenly resigned both positions a week before basketball season. As the lone basketball coach in the school, Charlotte was asked to take over as the faculty sponsor of three teams (girls’, seventh grade boys’, and eighth grade boys’). Even though a non-faculty coach (a former student teacher who had been volunteering with Sizemore’s football team) was hired to coach the two boys’ teams, Charlotte handled the day-to-day responsibilities that included monitoring academics and discipline, completing all necessary paperwork (e.g., eligibility, physicals), interacting with parents, and preparing equipment for games and practices.

While Charlotte accepted the challenge and found it compelling to be named the ‘faculty head coach’ for boys’ basketball, a position rarely held by women at any level of athletics, she was nonetheless overwhelmed by the task. Shortly after this announcement, she mentioned the initial pressure she felt by adding the additional responsibility of the boys’ program: “It’s just a little daunting to think of coaching all three teams. At least as the assistant coach for the boys [her previous title], I had an option of maybe not having to be there every time.” When asked about Charlotte’s responsibilities, her team leader also mentioned her having three different preparations, which is “a lot to be coaching the boys’ and girls’ basketball teams at the same time. I didn’t even know that was possible,” he joked. In reality, Charlotte’s role as the faculty head coach of the boys’ teams ended up consisting mostly of duties that were administrative.
(e.g., paperwork), behavioral (e.g., discipline), and janitorial (e.g., cleaning up the gym and locker room).

Charlotte vividly recalls some of the middle school boys struggling with the notion of having a woman coach the team, although such resentment might have been exacerbated by the fact that Sizemore has mostly male athletic coaches. While these coaches would often come by to check on Charlotte, she grew frustrated when they would “come into the gym and joke around with my [male] volunteer coach and the girls as they were practicing, even though I don’t walk out on their practice field and joke around with their players.” Nevertheless, Charlotte was genuinely pleased with the support she received from her colleagues, administrators, athletic director, and parents who appreciated her willingness to take on the additional responsibilities of being the faculty coach of three basketball teams while also teaching in a core content area.

Schedule

Charlotte arrives at school around 7:00 a.m. each morning and has hallway duty from 7:30 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. on various occasions throughout the semester. Many of her academic team meetings also occur during this time because her split seventh and eighth grade team does not have a common planning period. Her class schedule and the school’s advisory schedule are outlined Table 5 and Table 6.
### Table 5

*Charlotte’s Class Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; block</td>
<td>Pre-AP 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; block</td>
<td>Regular 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; block</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>See schedule below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; block</td>
<td>Pre-AP 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Teachers sit with their students in the cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; block</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; block</td>
<td>Pre-AP 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade Geography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

*Charlotte’s Advisory Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Clubs (SGA for Charlotte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Free Day (e.g., geography lessons for Charlotte)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school day ends at 3:00 p.m. Prior to the beginning of basketball season, Charlotte would regularly stay around the school for several hours planning for the upcoming day and
grading class assignments. During basketball season, the boys’ and girls’ teams alternate practice schedules so both teams are able to have the early and late practice slots throughout the semester. On days that girls practice after the boys, Charlotte holds team meetings or, more often than not, keeps her players in study hall while she plans for upcoming games and practices, handles academic and/or athletic paperwork, returns phone calls from teachers/parents/coaches, puts grades in the online grade book, or straightens up her classroom. On days when the girls practice first, her team heads straight to the gym and is ready by 3:15 p.m. Regardless of which team practices first, Charlotte, as the faculty head coach, is expected to remain at the school until all players have been picked up by parents or guardians. This gives her ample time to accomplish the numerous tasks required of her as a teacher-coach, but it also means long hours, particularly on weeks when her teams play multiple games or participate in weekend tournaments. On game nights, it is common for her to arrive home at 10:00 p.m. or later.

**Induction**

Coaching. Charlotte’s learning curve was by far the steepest in coaching. In thinking about what it meant to be a coach prior to the season, Charlotte never fully grasped the substantial time commitment required for tasks such as keeping up with eligibility forms, physical forms, and sportsmanship tests; organizing basketball equipment; learning how to keep a basketball scorebook; washing multiple loads of uniforms after each game; and ensuring student-athletes are fed before or after away games. While her participation in the teacher-coach focus group at the university offered her some insight into these processes, she later admitted never fully understanding just how much responsibility coaches undertook on a daily basis. She admitted feeling like “a blind man feeling my way along discovering things as I went.”
Her primary uncertainty has revolved around the pedagogical practice of teaching the content of basketball (i.e., X’s and O’s), which undoubtedly resulted from a lack of preparation for basketball coaching (e.g., knowledge, resources, techniques) during her professional socialization. Charlotte recalls her struggle to teach players about aspects of basketball: “They’re catching defenses really well. Offense is a whole different story. We can’t seem to not turn over the ball.” Including herself (i.e., ‘we’) in statements such as this one foreshadows her stake in the ownership of the conundrum; her players were not sure how to make the necessary adjustments because Charlotte was not always sure herself. This same lack of understanding also applied to the rules of the basketball. For instance, while she had previously read through the state athletic policies, she recalls not fully understanding the consequences for receiving a technical foul:

All I said in this game was please watch [a player’s number]; she’s going over the back every time. Tech [technical foul]. And I didn’t know you had to sit down the rest of the game once you got a technical, so it was rather comical.

While doing her best to teach the skills of basketball, Charlotte also finds it difficult to keep her players’ attention in the athletic environment. Although there are certainly more distractions in an open gymnasium than there are an enclosed classroom, the reality is that many of her players have never played basketball, and they get frustrated by Charlotte’s desire to teach the finer points of the game, an endeavor that students sometimes see in direct contrast to playing basketball for enjoyment. As a result, coaching observations suggest that one of Charlotte’s greatest frustrations is being forced to continuously repeat the same ideas and concepts over and over during practices and games. While this is a struggle commonly associated with many academic classrooms, the irony is that Charlotte seems to have a better grasp on keeping students engaged in the classroom than on the basketball court.
**Teaching.** Charlotte’s learning curve was not as steep in the teaching role. All signs point toward her general passion for teaching social science, her teacher education program preparation, and the support she received from colleagues and administration. Overall, Charlotte is well respected by her peers for her teaching acumen and her willingness to be both a team player and a leader in the school. However, as previously mentioned, she did lack a common planning period with other team members because she was part of a split seventh and eighth grade team, an anomaly at this particular school. To go along with the middle school requirement that teachers eat lunch in the cafeteria with their students, significant interactions with other faculty members in relation to the curriculum were often hard to come by.

Fortunately, Charlotte was confident in her pedagogical content knowledge of social science. As a result, much of the necessary growth that took place during her induction revolved around managing the classroom and interacting with parents, colleagues, and administrators. While her principal suggests that Sizemore Middle School does not have as severe the discipline problems as other schools he has seen, the general perception is that Charlotte managed her classroom quite well. “My impression is that she is ahead of the curve as far as beginning teachers in areas like classroom management,” suggested her principal. “Early indications are that she does very well in that area.”

Limiting down time and engaging students in constant activity, discussion, group work, and technological resources (e.g., utilizing Internet sites and videos on her Promethean board) also gives students increased opportunities to get caught being good. With this in mind, Charlotte utilizes a system of checks and balances where she adds check marks by letters that spell out LINKS when her classes are engaged in learning; the word LINKS is written on the board four times, one for each class. When students in a class veer off task, one of the letters is
removed from the class’s respective LINKS, which symbolizes the link that will be physically be removed from the chain hanging from her board at the end of the day. The class whose links hit the ground first will receive a treat of some sort the following week.

**Mentoring.** When asked about the mentoring program at the school, Charlotte admitted that while her teaching mentor, a more experienced social science teacher, was available when she had questions, there was never a significant connection between the two. “I didn’t feel like I could feel vulnerable and ask questions about certain things or relay any doubts or fears or concerns.” Instead, Charlotte found an informal mentor to assist her with some of the emotionally taxing aspects of teaching (e.g., classroom management) while also creating a bond with another first-year English teacher/tennis coach early in the semester. When the latter teacher was relieved of her teaching and coaching duties late in the fall semester, Charlotte was extremely disappointed because the two had become such close friends and had collaborated exceptionally well across their respective content areas (e.g., common vocabulary words, shared reading and writing assignments, paired teacher/parent meetings).

At the school level, there was much greater support in the teaching role than in the coaching role partially because Charlotte had such encouraging administrators. The lack of mentoring in coaching was especially challenging because Charlotte found the role to be more highly scrutinized, even at the middle school level, based on the public nature of interscholastic athletic events:

> When we did something right, we were so praised for it because we were first-year coaches. But, it seems like when we did something wrong, they [e.g., parents] were very quick to forget that we were *only* first-year coaches. They assumed that we had the knowledge and experience of a ten-year veteran.

Charlotte’s lack of formal mentoring for the sport of basketball was especially difficult as the faculty head coach of three teams because “there was no one on site…who really could offer true
advice on how to handle different situations.” While Charlotte seemed to appreciate the informal mentoring she received from the girls’ basketball coach at Proctor High School and a few former basketball coaches from her past, they never quite filled the void left by the more experienced boys’ coach who resigned the week before basketball season. As a result, Charlotte simply had too much to learn about teaching basketball in the midst of balancing numerous other professional responsibilities.

Experiences

Teaching/coaching. Charlotte does not feel that being rehired the following year will have anything to do with her win-loss record. This was echoed by her principal who suggested, “While I’m certain that we would have some explaining to do if we didn’t do well athletically, we would face a much greater outcry if we hired someone who did well athletically [but] was weak in the classroom.” Yet, it was difficult for Charlotte not to focus on wins and losses as a first-year coach although she did regularly consider these outcomes in a broader context:

There is so much more to sports than winning….The wins are not nearly as important if they’re showing improvement, if they have good attitudes, exhibiting good sportsmanship, [and] working together as a team…..The W [winning] seems to be a good byproduct; however, it may not always be a byproduct of the combined other factors.

Charlotte believes that one of her primary responsibilities as an educator is to cultivate knowledge and help students learn to apply common principles, such as the ones mentioned above. In teaching and coaching, she advocates teaching life skills such as organization, teamwork, and time management as opposed to just specific academic and athletic competencies. Nevertheless, she makes certain that these fundamental building blocks are always grounded in lessons on social science or basketball.

Charlotte hopes to “instill a passion for learning, whether it be social studies or life in general or another subject [e.g., basketball].” Ultimately, she believes that high test scores and
winning percentages should be a natural consequence of progress and development in the classroom and on the court. Figuring out how to assess students’ and student-athletes’ knowledge and understanding has been an important component of gauging this development. Whether she is discussing how the Declaration of Independence was written or how to set a solid screen on a defensive player, Charlotte has learned to carefully evaluate what students know before moving to the next topic.

When asked if teaching has affected her view of coaching, Charlotte acknowledged that “I find myself breaking things down more for the players instead of just expecting them to know it. I wouldn’t walk into a classroom and assume my students know about ancient Greece. I have to teach them in steps…so I no longer walk onto the basketball court assuming they automatically know how to rebound.” This is particularly important considering she has so many girls who have never before played basketball. Early in the season, Charlotte struggled to focus on the progress being made amidst the constant mistakes she was observing in her team’s performance. However, despite having a losing record, her season was considered a success by those around her. As mentioned by her athletic director, “I still see challenges they [the players] have. There’s no doubt; they [still] have to think about dribbling up the floor…. [however] you do see bright spots like people cutting inside to get the ball.”

Charlotte’s principal has also been impressed with her players’ progress, which includes the team playing as a unit, responding to coaching, and learning basic skills. Off the basketball court, he mentioned that Charlotte’s primary objective is to prepare young people for high school in both academics and athletics. Charlotte has done this in an encouraging manner as she treats students and players with equal respect. On the basketball court, she makes it a point to shake the hand of every player who comes off the court, no matter how well or how poorly the player
performed. In the classroom, Charlotte has gotten to know her students on a personal level, which has helped her make deeper connections to learning while providing students with greater opportunities for future success.

On the other hand, one of Charlotte’s most frequent frustrations has been a lack of internal motivation by students in the classroom and student-athletes on the basketball court. Incidentally, part of this frustration may stem from her own upbringing as she was taught to never quit no matter how bleak the outlook. As a result, Charlotte was devastated during a stretch of games when her players appeared both apathetic and lifeless despite her pleas to pick up the energy. While she admitted being both “physically…and mentally tired” by halfway through the season, she personified her own advice by bringing extraordinary energy to both the teaching and coaching roles throughout the semester.

All things considered, Charlotte’s personal investment in teaching was evident from the beginning. While she was also enthusiastic about coaching, it was late in the season before she realized just how excited she would get prior to practices and games. At that point, she reminisced about the attachment she felt to her first basketball team: “You just always remember your first [team]….I told them how special each of them [her players] were. So, emotionally, I was very attached to the girls [and] sad to see my eighth graders go.” While she has very much enjoyed the roles of teaching and coaching, balancing the two has nonetheless been a struggle.

**Balance**

As previously mentioned, one of Charlotte’s earliest goals was to teach her students and student-athletes necessary life skills, one of which includes balancing school and extracurricular activities. Little did she know that finding balance would become one of her own great challenges as she tried to balance the multiple roles of teaching social science, coaching
basketball, co-sponsoring SGA, attending students’ extracurricular activities (e.g., band/chorus concerts, school dances, football games), working at her church, and spending time with her husband and family. According to her principal, Charlotte handles a heavy load. “It’s not a heavy load for a beginning teacher; it’s a heavy load for a teacher.” Then, after Charlotte’s first semester of teaching and coaching, he added his belief that Charlotte never had to sacrifice one role in order to do well in another.

Charlotte does realize that her focus on coaching basketball has somewhat detracted from her efforts in the classroom. In considering her future in coaching, she has come to the conclusion that the time commitment of coaching, not the role of coaching itself, has limited her opportunities to enact some of her best teaching ideas. “Even though I may have spent the same number of hours working on stuff for the classroom as I did for the [basketball] court, it would be hours when my attention span was less or I was more tired.” However, this tension eased as the season went along and she began to plan both her academic lessons and athletic schedule several days in advance:

I always tended to plan ahead, but it would be like a 24 hour or a 48 hour thing. But instead, I would make it a week as a whole….I’d come home at 10:00 [p.m.] from games, [and] I could go straight to bed because I had already accomplished what I needed to do for the next day.

Due to her time constraints, Charlotte admits having to pull many of her ideas and resources off the Internet, although she looks forward to a time (i.e., after basketball season) when she can be more creative. Ironically, even her use of social media has diminished during basketball season as her school blog, Twitter, and Facebook accounts were utilized far less often. For example, a look at her school Facebook account showed a mere seven posts during the months of October through January followed by thirteen posts in the single month after basketball season had come to an end.
Although certain teaching responsibilities (e.g., grading) had to be postponed early in the season to take care of necessary coaching duties, Charlotte felt that the quality of her teaching was maintained. At first, she offered students more book work as she struggled to balance the roles of teaching and coaching. After a few weeks, this made her feel like “a failure” as a teacher, and she began incorporating more learner-centered instruction. In opposition to the normal perception of teacher-coaches who merely roll out the worksheets, Charlotte actually allowed for more group projects and assignments during much of the basketball season. The most pertinent example was a geography unit plan where students worked in groups to put together a three-week itinerary in the form of a brochure of an assigned European country.

Based on observations prior to and during basketball season, the students in Charlotte’s classes seemed to be more actively engaged in this particular unit in comparison to others thanks in part to the freedom and ownership allowed for by the project.

Another frustration from early in the basketball season was the feeling of disorganization that confronted Charlotte for the first time. One of the most interesting representations of her struggle to remain organized was the occasional look of disarray in her classroom, which doubled as a storage closet for basketballs, uniforms, and other coaching equipment.

Fortunately, according to her principal, the school will have new locker rooms and storage areas at the start of the upcoming school year:

She won’t have a rack of basketballs in the back of her room. Those can be down in the locker room so she can more easily separate her roles [so] that when I [speaking as Charlotte] come in this room, I’m your teacher. We can continue to have a relationship, and there are some things that we explicitly carry back and forth, but I’m now in the teaching role. When I walk down the hall to the gym and the locker room, and now I’m in the coaching role. It seems to me that besides the twenty or thirty square feet of space she’ll gain in her classroom by getting her [basketball] stuff out of there, I believe that [additional space] will have an almost psychological impact like I can separate these [roles].
While the academic tasks of planning lessons, grading papers, and organizing her classroom became more tedious during basketball season, a separate balancing act was also taking place outside of school. The first casualty was her nursery duties at church on Sunday mornings and Wednesday evenings, which she gave up for basketball.

Another personal challenge was finding time to spend with her husband, family, and friends. Although sports and education is also a major part of her husband’s life as he works as an athletic trainer in the same school system, their physical separation during basketball season was trying on their first year of marriage. One of Charlotte’s quotations in particular stands out about balancing personal and professional responsibilities:

My husband and I have had several discussions about my time allocations. What seems to get the best of me...should Sizemore [Middle School] get the best of me and he get what’s left over? That’s been a challenge...going home after working 12 hours or more and still being the Charlotte that he married.

Undoubtedly, Charlotte was her own worst critic during her first semester of teaching and coaching. When asked about the pressure she put on herself, her principal acknowledged that “the pressure you’re under is a good motivation to be excellent, but if you don’t keep it in check, it can be counterproductive by adding a layer of stress that’s unnecessary.”

**Mentality**

While the combination of teaching and coaching was indeed stressful for Charlotte, many factors played into her early success in handling these dual roles. One factor was her mix of personality and presence. As a young woman who stands six feet tall and has both a strong voice and an authoritative demeanor, Charlotte has relatively few issues with keeping students on task. However, her likeable personality has also helped her build rapport with middle school students. A concrete example is from her fourth period class: “The girls down the [lunch] table have labeled me ghetto, so be forewarned; you don’t want to see that side of me.” Both the students
and Charlotte had a good laugh at this comment, but when it came time to get back to work, Charlotte’s expectations were abundantly clear to her students.

Charlotte’s general mentality was affected less by the teaching and coaching roles and more by her sense of perfectionism, although her desire to achieve excellence was much more noticeable in the light, and stress, of basketball games. Occasionally, Charlotte’s emotions would interfere with her coaching as she became increasingly concerned about the outcome of the game while momentarily losing sight of what was required to make the team successful:

I’m so competitive and so driven and passionate about things that I commit to, so emotionally I was being torn in so many different directions….There would be times [when] I would be very angry and I had negative interactions with officials or parents or the team. So now that the season is over, I’m definitely more stable emotionally. It’s pretty much all happiness now.

While this mentality was never observed affecting her classroom performance, Charlotte admitted that a feeling of uneasiness would often come upon her later in the day as games and practices drew closer. While productivity was rarely an issue, there were times when Charlotte felt less productive as a result of the additional responsibilities tied to coaching, which occasionally led her to become more frustrated with students and colleagues. In general, though, Charlotte wrapped up her first season with a positive perception of her teaching and coaching experience.

**Disposition**

**Perception.** Charlotte now has a positive connotation of the word ‘coach’ because the role has helped her build rapport with a number of students who appreciate the investment she has in them outside of the classroom setting. Charlotte also acknowledges that coaching has helped her “reach students that [she] would have never reached in the classroom,” and
ultimately, she believes that “coaches are teachers…You’re teaching your athletes the
sport…just like in the classroom, you’re cultivating knowledge of the subject.”

There is the possibility, though, that some educators, particularly those in the content area
of social science, are more interested in coaching athletics than teaching academics. This is a
reality Charlotte knows all too well from her experience with her male, social science
counterparts from her teacher education program. While conflicts between the social positions
of teaching and coaching have the potential to cause dissension among faculty members,
Charlotte has felt no ill effects thanks to her noticeable dedication to teaching. Nonetheless, after
voicing an early concern about not being rehired for the following academic year, a non-
coaching colleague suggested to Charlotte, “Oh, you’re a coach. That’s not going to be a
problem for you.” Regardless, Charlotte found herself worrying about her status for the
upcoming year after watching her closest friend in the school (i.e., the English teacher/tennis
coach) not make it through her first semester. Although administrators routinely sing Charlotte’s
praises, she has made it a point to do her best in both roles to help ensure that she never gives
anyone an excuse to judge her solely on one role in particular.

**Orientation.** Charlotte entered her first year of teaching and coaching with a profound
showing of outward confidence, or what her principal calls “a stronger personal position,” than
most first-year teachers. Yet, her inner confidence has always seemed to reflect her orientation
with teaching holding a higher social position than coaching based on her acculturative interest
in the teaching role. Despite this tilt towards teaching, Charlotte has held a mixed
teaching/coaching orientation since the start of basketball season. Unlike teacher-coaches
participating in fall sports, though, Charlotte had the advantage of focusing on teaching prior to
juggling these two roles. As a result, it should be noted that giving teaching a head start may
have had something to do with Charlotte’s capacity for effectively managing her time and resources during her first semester.

Charlotte’s personal investment in social science and basketball also had much to do with her mixed teaching/coaching orientation. Her team leader mentioned this mixed orientation on several occasions, once saying, “I think she really enjoys coaching, but she also really enjoys teaching. So, I think she’s balanced.” On another occasion, he spoke about her investment in teaching: “I’ve heard her talk about certain things she’s teaching, and you can tell she really enjoys what she’s talking about. She’s not just dispensing facts, but really she also has some personal interest in it.”

This personal investment can also be seen in basketball. In the bleakest of moments, one of Charlotte’s most profound strengths is her ability to look ahead. At one point midway through the basketball season, she said this about her players: “They’re tired, but they stepped it up in our last game, and I’m proud of them. I think we have another chance to play [team name] next week. I think it could turn out in our favor for sure.” This emphasis on progress and program building has been crucial to Charlotte’s success as a first-year teacher-coach, and it has much to do with her ability to maintain a balanced orientation.

**Identity.** With regard to her identity as a teacher-coach, Charlotte admits that “the lines are very blurred. I’d rather not have a label as much as just be this figure, this influential figure that is exuding love and passion [for both roles].” Nonetheless, she is adamant that her first priority is “being an excellent classroom teacher.” Her athletic director supported this claim by recalling something she mentioned early in the basketball season: “From 8:00 to 3:00, I’m a teacher. That’s what I do,” he recalls her saying. This was evidenced when opposing coaches
would call her classroom during the school day, and she would refuse to speak to them until her planning period or after school.

For now, Charlotte has emerged as not only a teacher-coach but also an educator intertwining many diverse roles that include teaching, coaching, and club sponsoring. More important, she has effectively managed these roles despite the fatigue that accompanies taking on multiple responsibilities in a secondary school setting. “She is banking relationship deposits, positive impressions…that she’s going to reap in the coming years,” says her principal. By the end of the semester, these relationships with students have kept Charlotte going, hence her reflection that “it was so awesome to wake up every day…[being] exhausted but passionate about what you do. That sounds so cliché, but if you’re going to do it [teach and coach] for sixty hours a week, you better love it.” Indeed, she does.
CHAPTER V:

CASE STUDY RESULTS: CHRISTOPHER

Acculturation

Academics

Christopher grew up in a family of teachers as his mother, brother, sister, aunt, and cousins all worked in daycares, elementary schools, or secondary schools. He was one of the first in his immediate family to go to college, though, and while he made good grades throughout school, he recalls being a “devil student” to his teachers. “I was never blatantly disrespectful, never cursed at a teacher, never yelled at one, never threatened one....As much as a smart aleck as I was, I knew my place. I knew that I was a student and they were the teachers, and they had done something to get here.” Even as a secondary student, Christopher already understood the value of teachers, although his only actual teaching experience was working as a counselor in after-school programs at the YMCA, which he referred to as more or less “babysitting.”

Athletics

Christopher enjoyed playing sports as a kid. Because he attended a magnet school that did not offer basketball or football, two sports in which he had some interest, he was never able to play interscholastically, though. After he picked up soccer in high school because it was the cheapest sport available, he grew to love the game. Basketball was still his greatest passion, so when he entered college, he decided to walk onto the university’s basketball team. After not making the cut, Christopher set his sights on the sport of rugby and eventually played for the university’s club team for three years.
Orientation

Until shortly before high school graduation, Christopher had planned to pursue a career in engineering. “I took the engineering classes in high school and realized I hated it. Then, I decided I wanted to coach [athletics], and that's when I decided I'd major in history because I was really good at history in high school. [I’d] be a history teacher and a coach.” When asked if being a history teacher and athletics coach was his long-term goal out of high school, he responded that his ultimate goal was to become an athletic director.

Professional Socialization

Orientation

Before deciding to pursue a bachelor’s degree in secondary education (grades 6-12) with an emphasis in English language arts from a major research institution in the southeastern United States, Christopher entered the university’s teacher education program admitting that “I kind of wanted to teach [history]…[but] I was still pretty steadfast in coaching.” This coaching orientation did not last, however. Christopher recalls the moment he knew teaching was his main priority:

Probably my sophomore year in college, I was [voluntarily] helping tutor a guy [a close friend] who was on the football team at [the university] and realized how behind he was. I decided I wanted to teach more than I wanted to coach, [and I] kind of gave up on the coaching thing. I switched over to English not too long after that…just because I realized how hard a time a lot of people have with communicating their ideas.

Communication was one of the most important reasons Christopher became an English teacher.

Looking back on one of his favorite professors, he recalls liking the professor’s candid manner of discussing literature, a style he would carry with him into his own clinical placements.
Preparation

**Teaching.** Christopher believes that his experience in the teacher education program adequately prepared him for the classroom, although he most appreciated the time he spent in his clinical placements despite the fact that few of them resembled the school environment in which he would eventually teach. Fortunately, many of his content area courses at the university focused on American literature, which was invaluable considering his personal interest in the subject and his future position as a novice English teacher in grades ten and eleven, both of which focus on American literature.

In general, Christopher felt he learned the most during student teaching as his cooperating teacher offered him guidance in aspects of teaching such as methods, grading, and discipline. More importantly, he learned that “it’s okay most times to sit in the chair and discuss [literature] with the children. That made me happy because I actually kind of structure my classroom similar to how she does [i.e., discussion-based instruction].” When asked about the differences in his style and that of his cooperating teacher, Christopher admits that he uses a bit more technology than she did, and “I’m probably a bit more sarcastic.”

**Coaching.** Christopher received no preparation for the coaching role as part of his teacher education program. Much later, he reflected that if he knew he would eventually become an athletic coach, he would have helped with the football team during his fall internship when a close friend, who was also student teaching at the school, asked him to volunteer. Christopher believes that actual coaching experience is the only thing that will prepare someone for the coaching role much in the way he feels that the physical practice of teaching (e.g., clinical placements) is the best preparation for the teaching role.
Organizational Socialization

Opportunity

Christopher applied for numerous jobs in the spring and summer before he was hired. The majority of his applications were in the vicinity of his university, so he was able to work as a personal trainer and supervisor in the university’s intramural sports office during the job search. Ultimately, he received a total of three calls and only a single job offer, an English position at Proctor High School, which would require him to serve as an assistant coach for the football team, an assistant coach for the varsity boys’ and girls’ soccer teams, and the junior varsity (JV) coach for the boys’ soccer team.

Christopher admits that his focus was on finding a teaching position out of college. However, with an abundance of English candidates in the system, he knew that a willingness to coach athletics might help him get a job. As it turns out, athletic coaching was indeed a necessary credential. When asked about the hiring process, the principal at Proctor High School acknowledged having 250 applicants in the system for two English positions and that he did not have to look far to find qualified English teachers. He said Christopher stood out for two reasons: 1) his potential as an academic teacher; and 2) his willingness to coach football and soccer.

The principal says his priority is always finding effective teachers but that he could not put off hiring athletic coaches any longer:

With a 6A football team and five coaches on campus, we went into the interviews with both Christopher and Bryant knowing that not only was it [coaching] a priority, but it was pretty much non-negotiable that we had to hire athletic coaches.

When he found out that Christopher had experience with soccer, the principal felt relieved because there had not been a single soccer coach teaching on campus the previous year, a
situation he felt was “unhealthy” for the school. While Christopher was initially skeptical about coaching two sports as a first-year teacher, a close friend justified his time commitment by telling him that mentoring students in athletics might be just as valuable for some students as teaching them in a classroom. Thus, Christopher entered his first year as a teacher-coach with an open mind and a desire to be successful in both roles.

**Schedule**

The school system in which Proctor High School resides has implemented an alternating schedule for the first two periods of each school day. Initial reaction to the alternating schedule has not been very positive in general. Christopher’s department chair discussed at length the struggles many teachers have had in creating routines as well as the challenges students in standard classes have faced building momentum due to the lack of daily interaction with the curriculum. While Bryant’s department chair recalled the difficulties in adjusting to the new schedule for experienced teachers, much less first-year teachers, Bryant’s defensive coordinator suggested that Christopher and Bryant may actually have an advantage because they are less cognizant of how things have worked in the past. As a result of the alternating schedule, Christopher’s daily schedule, which can be seen in Table 7, has an A day and a B day.

Table 7

*Christopher’s Class Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) block (A/B)</td>
<td>Honors English 10/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) block (A/B)</td>
<td>Planning/Regular English 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) block</td>
<td>Regular English 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(^{th}) block</td>
<td>Regular English 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As previously mentioned, English 10 and English 11 both focus on American literature (i.e., Early American literature and 20th American literature). Christopher’s largest class is 37 students (Honors English 11) with his smallest class being just under twenty students (Regular English 10). Christopher’s normal work day begins around 7:30 a.m. and ends some time after 5:00 p.m. He has hallway duty every morning prior to first period from 7:45 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. Depending on the alternating schedule, he has a ninety minute planning period during either first or second period. The school day ends at 3:20 p.m., and after finalizing any necessary business in the classroom (e.g., responding to student questions, checking e-mail, straightening up the room), Christopher makes his way to the teacher’s lounge to change clothes before arriving at the practice field at approximately 3:40 p.m. where he works primarily with the junior varsity offensive players including receivers, backs, and tight ends.

Because players participate in weight training and conditioning drills during a fourth period physical education class, Christopher is usually able to leave right after practice between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. each afternoon. He enjoys going home for a nap whenever possible before heading over to the university’s recreation center to lift weights. On games days (middle school, junior varsity, and varsity), however, he is often at the football field until late into the evening, 8:00 p.m. at the earliest and 11:30 p.m. at the latest. Once at home, he occasionally suffers from insomnia when trying to sleep, and he admits that the stress of coaching does not help his sleeping pattern.

While some teachers may not take work home with them, football coaches spend portions of their weekends engaged in football-related activities. Fortunately for Christopher, his relative lack of experience with football affords him fewer responsibilities than other coaches. However, he typically spends his Saturday afternoons and/or Sunday mornings watching film from the
previous game in order to break down defensive fronts and blitzes before the coaches’ meeting on Sunday afternoons. During this meeting, the coaching staff reviews previous game film, previews upcoming games, probes potential schematic changes, and discusses any necessary personnel changes before meeting with the team to watch film. Needless to say, the inclusion of Sunday meetings and practices can make for long weeks, especially when considering that these weeks have been occurring since the middle of the summer.

**Induction**

**Coaching.** Christopher’s introduction to Proctor High School first occurred in the context of football during summer workouts as he was asked to serve as the strength and conditioning coach based on his previous employment as a personal trainer. Summer workouts began around 6:00 a.m. daily and would run until just before noon. When asked about his preparation for the coaching role, Christopher recollected just how naive he was about what it meant to be a coach. “I didn’t know what to expect….I remember going to a coaching conference and calling [the head football coach] and asking, ‘What do I wear, man’? I just didn’t even have a clue about the culture or anything like that.”

Christopher’s athletic director suspects that learning the concepts and principles of the school’s coaching philosophy was a difficult process, or as the team’s defensive coordinator called it, “a trial by fire.” Indeed, coaching served as Christopher’s most profound learning curve as he started the season scared to make a mistake while slowly progressing to the point of taking on more important responsibilities (i.e., teaching football skills and techniques). In hindsight, Christopher was appreciative of participating in the summer workouts because they served as a prologue to his teaching experience and an introduction to many of the students, teachers, coaches, and administrators in the school.
Coaching quickly became a source of fatigue, though, as the grueling schedule took its toll. Even in the summer, Christopher remembers how coaching impacted his lesson planning in particular. “[When] you’re up here that much, and you’re doing physical stuff outside in the 110 degree heat, the last thing you want to do is to go home to shower and come back to make lesson plans.” Fortunately, his enthusiasm and passion for teaching English kept him focused on his goal of becoming an effective classroom teacher.

**Teaching.** When asked about the primary focus of novice teacher-coaches, Christopher’s principal replied that it is “extremely important that they be able to manage their classes, establish a rapport with students, [and] effectively instruct…students.” This proved challenging, though, as Christopher struggled to handle discipline issues while simultaneously attempting to increase the academic rigor of his English classes. Ironically, while classroom management tends to blend instruction, engagement, and discipline, there was a noticeable divide between these principles during teaching observations, although Christopher believes the majority of his discipline concerns had much to do with which students were present on a given day. “I have one student who cannot make it through an entire class without getting put out [in the hallway]. That’s a struggle, but, otherwise, it’s just teaching.”

Increasing academic rigor was also problematic early in the semester due to Christopher’s lack of resources. Ultimately, the lessons he created utilized curriculum components from many sources, which included other teachers, the Internet, the library, and class textbooks. “It’s a beggars market,” acknowledges Christopher, “I just go around and see what I can find.” Despite being in a classroom that was once an ACCESS lab—a room set up for distance learning—before being converted into a regular classroom due to overcrowding in the school, another one of Christopher’s early tests was gaining access to technology as neither of the computers in his
classroom worked properly. As a result, Christopher spent the first few weeks making trips across the school to enter grades into a library computer. He quickly learned the need for flexibility because “you never know what’s going to be thrown at you in a school,” or as his department chair put it, “You find out some days you’re not in control...as much as you would like to be.”

**Mentoring.** First-year teachers at Proctor High School have a new teacher meeting once a month where novices gather to share common experiences and concerns. Christopher also has a formal mentor as well as a group of informal mentors with whom he eats lunch everyday: four female English teachers (including his mentor and his department chair), a male English teacher (who is also the head soccer coach), and a male social studies teacher. The advice they provide typically focuses on managing the classroom, interacting with parents, and understanding school policies. Although Christopher receives considerable resources from the teachers in his department, any actual mentoring that occurs is usually not related to the curriculum.

In coaching, on the other hand, the content of football is where Christopher receives the bulk of his mentoring. While he is not assigned a formal mentor for the coaching role, he feels that he has learned a lot from the group of coaches as a whole. When asked which individual he considers a mentor, he mentions the team’s defensive coordinator, which comes as a bit of a surprise since Christopher coaches on the offensive side of the ball. However, the fact that the defensive coordinator is also a core content area (i.e., social science) teacher and has proven to be very accessible to Christopher makes him a logical choice.

**Experiences**

**Teaching.** Christopher’s expectations of himself are much higher in teaching than they are in coaching. This expectation is supported by his principal who acknowledges, “I'm very
understanding of maybe some shortcomings in athletics if I see that the effort is there…[but] we have to have a teacher doing an outstanding job in the classroom.” Christopher prides himself on teaching students to learn to think deeply and meaningfully about the English language arts curriculum. On one writing assignment early in the semester, he tells students he will not grade them on grammar or organization; “I just want to see your thoughts.” His goal is to make his classroom “student-based” by involving students in whole-class discussions. When asked about his teaching style, he explains that he utilizes a discussion/lecture format. “[There are] very few PowerPoints. I get up. I show you something. I tell you something. I write it on the board. We talk about it.”

The disadvantage of this approach is that Christopher sometimes struggles to keep students engaged during lengthy conversations. This is especially true in his ‘standard’ classes where a number of students are just as likely to fall asleep as they are to pay attention or misbehave. A lack of student motivation has led to many frustrations for Christopher, such as on the following occasion when the principal dropped by for an unannounced observation:

Some kids didn’t bring their books, and half of them didn’t read. So I said, forget about it. I’m not discussing it. I’m not going to go over something to give you guys a day off where I get to tell you what all happened the first four chapters. You guys will have to do this. So I made them get in small groups to read.

Interestingly enough, motivation was also a concern for students in Christopher’s advanced classes despite his department chair acknowledging that he has done a good job of “changing the way that he presents materials to keep their interest.” For students in Honors English 11, he realizes that they have many other priorities, namely AP courses, and that his English class may take a back seat at times.

Another growing concern for Christopher has been cutting out down time since he relies so heavily on pedagogical styles like individual reading, seatwork, and lecture. He recognizes
that one of his greatest challenges is allowing students to carry the weight of classroom
discussions because he has been known to spend too much time discussing his own viewpoints,
which can quickly turn conversations into lectures and exclude students who are not as
comfortable speaking up in class.

One specific example was an observation after a class reading of *The War Prayer* by
Mark Twain. In the subsequent discussion, Christopher found ways to connect the idea of war to
topics such as sports, music, and gangs while focusing on the implicit and explicit meanings
found in the text. Although students were initially engaged by the topic, their interest waned
over time as very few of the connections were actually initiated by the students themselves. On
the other hand, one of Christopher’s most effective teaching moments was a day midway through
the semester when he found himself under the weather and was forced to rely on his students to
read aloud and carry the bulk of the conversation. Although not all students chose to participate,
it was one of the liveliest discussions of the semester.

Discussion and lecture are Christopher’s pedagogical tools of choice, although he also
allows significant time for independent and whole-class reading. While students are reading
independently, Christopher usually spends his time grading essays, although he rarely gets much
accomplished while trying to ensure that students remain on task. Nevertheless, he realizes that
assessing student writing is one of the most critical aspects of teaching English. On a particular
persuasive writing assignment that asked students to consider ethos, pathos, and logos in the
context of an argumentative case, Christopher allowed them to choose their own topics. While
discussing possible ideas, one student asked to write about “keeping gay marriage illegal.”
When a neighboring student made an inappropriate remark, Christopher took control of the
conversation before entering into a conversation on the varying viewpoints of gay marriage in
the United States. He encouraged the student to write about the topic as long as the paper was written respectfully and stayed focused on the topic at hand.

Assessment is also a major part of Christopher’s English classes as his students are regularly evaluated via oral questioning, quizzes, tests, and writing assignments. Early in the semester, Christopher was afraid that too many of his students were failing, and he worried how this might look to his administrators. In essence, he struggled with his desire to provide a rigorous course of study while avoiding “dumbing down” the curriculum to ensure students passed the state graduation exam. In general, Christopher prefers to get as much of his grading done during the school day—primarily during his planning period—because the quality and timeliness of his responses are often better than if he takes work home with him.

In one interview, Christopher mentioned, “I have a stack of papers and tests in there [homework bins] that have been sitting there for a couple days. You know, the papers don’t have to be given back until I’m ready for them to go back….There’s no sense in handing back a paper until you’re ready for them to write another paper.” Ironically, this lack of initiative for grading papers stands in direct contrast to his breaking down defensive fronts and blitzes after football games when he feels a greater sense of urgency due to the expectations set forth by the coaching staff.

Coaching. While the bulk of Christopher’s time outside of actual teaching and coaching is spent planning his classes and assessing student work, the expectations placed upon him by the football program are often more intense:

I do feel more pressure from football. With teaching and stuff, if I don’t get my papers done, the only people I have to tell are the students [pause] and myself. And with the students, I can say well I didn’t get it done because honestly we need to focus on this, and I can shift the focus. I’m more in control. Football, though, if I don’t get that video broken down by 2:00 on Sunday, the head coach is hurting; the offensive coordinator is hurting; the offense is hurting.
Aside from breaking down game tapes, the bulk of Christopher’s responsibility is merely managing players—similar to classroom management in the academic setting—and throwing passes to receivers during practice drills. His primary responsibility during football games is to record the offensive plays called by the head coach, who also serves as the offensive coordinator.

As the season moves along and Christopher became more comfortable with the system, he begins to do more teaching on the practice field and on the sidelines during games. However, one of his frustrations is players’ lack of seriousness on the playing field. “I was sort of surprised how much of a social scene it was…. [When I played and] the whistle blew, there was no more talking. It was we’ve got a job to do because fun in soccer and basketball wasn’t joking around with your friends. Fun was getting out there and making a play, getting out there and winning the game.” Without a doubt, Christopher expects his players to give everything they have out on the football field, just as he expects students to be actively engaged in the classroom. These two roles take considerable time and energy for students as well as teacher-coaches, both of whom must be able to balance academics and athletics.

**Balance**

Prior to the start of the semester, coaching was the role that took up much of Christopher’s time thanks to summer football workouts. “I did feel like I was coming here [to Proctor High School] to do the teaching, but definitely coaching took up more time,” says Christopher. As the semester got underway, his sense of balance improved when he learned how to leave teaching and coaching at school:

I was stretched the first couple of weeks with everything and running myself ragged with football and teaching. I was taking papers home and grading them all the time….I grade at school [now] because if I take it home, I’ll have a meltdown or something.
Christopher also began to realize that he needed to take at least an hour for himself each day (e.g., working out, watching television, playing basketball, visiting his family or girlfriend). This rule not only helped him avoid being “on edge” the next day at school but also improved his ability to sleep at night.

Another key to balance for Christopher is organization and structure. However, while much of the structure found on the football field is set for him by other coaches, he had to learn to create his own sense of organization in the classroom. Two events helped improve his organization and time management in the teaching role. First, using a grade book to keep up with lesson plans, schedules, and grades was the most helpful. Second, having access to a computer in his room after several weeks was beneficial because he could finally respond to e-mails, publish grades, and input attendance without walking across the school.

Christopher also learned the importance of utilizing his planning period:

If I used my time wisely in school, I could actually work less and can still be just as effective as an educator. Football didn’t decrease in time. If anything, football increased in time, especially when we had the playoffs….but [once] I learned how to better use my time in school…it relaxed me enough to where I could actually use my time easier with football, too.

Coaching football may have actually increased Christopher’s productivity as an English teacher as it made him more conscious of using his time wisely. While he admits that coaching can be stressful, he believes it is unfair to say that coaching took away time from teaching because had he not been coaching, he very well may have been engaged in personal activities (e.g., spending time with friends, family, or girlfriend).

Christopher’s general rule is that he reads everything students submit, even if there is a delay in response time due to his busy schedule. During his first semester of teaching, he required on average approximately four essays per class, not to mention his use of readings,
quizzes, and tests. Christopher’s teaching load combined with watching game tape on weekends has left very little free time, which has been compounded by balancing social networks including his family who live several hours away, a long-distance relationship with his girlfriend, college friends who live nearby, and football coaches who enjoy getting together outside of school. The latter is sometimes a matter of contention for Christopher, who remarked, “I don’t know if the other coaches understood that I wasn’t trying to be distant or antisocial; I just had my own stuff to do.”

Mentality

Christopher’s demeanor in the classroom was relatively informal due to his conversational nature and his interest in promoting classroom discussion. As a result, there were times when students did not seem sure whether he was being serious or playful. This demeanor was also reflected in the coaching lexicon that made its way into the classroom. One of the earliest observations of the football season was Christopher’s use of the word ‘son’ to describe his players. While this was a saying often emphasized by the older and more experienced coaches, Christopher picked it up quickly and was routinely heard using phrases such as “I’m trying to teach you something, son,” both on the football field and in the classroom. While this sort of fatherly influence may have a different connotation for older teacher-coaches and/or non-coaching teachers, Christopher believes that coaching may have hurt his ability to communicate with students due to the hostile intensity that accompanied his interactions on the football field.

The very nature of Christopher’s socialization into teaching via coaching created a mentality that did not always represent his generally positive outlook or his initial pursuit of helping students communicate effectively. Particularly for the football players in his classes, separating the roles of teaching and coaching was challenging because the athletic relationship
had been built prior to the academic relationship. As fatigue set in early in the semester, Christopher’s authoritative nature combined with his use of sarcasm made him seem almost confrontational with misbehaving students in the classroom. Instinctively, the football coaching mentality, one in which the first reaction would be “drop and give me ten [pushups],” took over in such circumstances. For the football players in his classes, he could simply warn them of ‘gassers.’ However, this did not work with non-athletes, which was problematic for a novice teacher with few classroom management tools on his belt.

In general, Christopher did find the coaching mentality useful for promoting discipline because “it really puts ownership of the kids’ actions back on the kids.” In this regard, Christopher’s message to his students was clear: “Most of you want to be here….Those of you who don’t, that’s fine, [but] you’re not going to distract the others.” Outside of the classroom, he was also called upon regularly as a male athletic coach to break up fights in the hallway or in other classrooms. These instances became cautionary tales that Christopher seemed to enjoy sharing with friends and colleagues.

Christopher calls the combination of teaching and coaching an “emotional rollercoaster” that at times left him seeking “a good balance between intensity and anger”:

You can go from having a great day in school where you’re feeling great about yourself and go to coaching and the kids are down. They don’t feel like being there, and that pulls you down….Then you go home and come back the next day, and you’re in a bad mood. The kids are still in a great mood because they had a great day yesterday….It’s just all up and down, up and down.

As the end of the football season coincided with fall break, Christopher was given a much needed rest that allowed him to return to the classroom refreshed with a more positive outlook. Although classroom management was always a struggle, the increased use of constructive feedback provided him with more meaningful opportunities to enter into dialogue with students.
Whether in teaching or coaching, Christopher believes that different students need different forms of encouragement to be their best. In his view, this may entail raising his voice or pulling kids aside for a quiet chat. Until the end of the semester, the latter scenario was less often observed in his classroom. With this in mind, Christopher later admitted that football “has shown me a lot of what I don’t want to be like [as a classroom teacher]….I definitely like myself a lot more when I’m not coaching football.”

**Disposition**

**Perception.** Despite the potentially negative impact of the coaching mentality on classroom discourse and interactions with students, Christopher believes that being a coach is beneficial in the overall framework of classroom management. He suggests that this is observable in students who believe, “Oh, he’s a coach, [so] he means business rather than oh, he’s a teacher, and he’s just really angry.” Yet, Christopher also fights against the perception of teacher-coaches as non-academics by pitting himself as a teacher of literature who pushes critical thinking, active discussion, and intensive writing as opposed to teacher-coaches whose pedagogical techniques consist primarily of more passive forms of engagement such as PowerPoints and worksheets. Early in the semester, his department chair recalled Christopher’s reaction to a conversation where it was mentioned that he was the first athletic coach in the English department:

[Christopher] was forthright and upfront about it from the beginning. ‘I know this is the perception of coaches, and I am not that way. Academics are my focus, and I want everyone to know that.’ He just said that to everyone. ‘I’m not going to be one of those coaches.’

**Orientation.** From the time he was hired all the way through his first semester at Proctor High School, Christopher maintained a teaching orientation despite the pressures and time commitment of the coaching role. Members of the English department worried that athletics
might overwhelm him during the football season, but “his focus is definitely on teaching, not the coaching, and he’s excited about it [teaching], and he likes it,” said his department chair. Even on the football field, Christopher is more than willing to discuss teaching when the opportunity arises. On one occasion, when asked about his day during the middle of practice, he quietly replied that it was great because he taught his favorite poem, *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* by T.S. Eliot. He then proceeded to explain some of the more interesting connections made by his students.

Despite his teaching orientation, Christopher did not treat coaching as a career contingency. In fact, he took great pride in improving as a football coach and enjoyed the overall experience of coaching. However, his interest in football may have had more to do with his social interactions with players and coaches than with the actual role of coaching itself. On one occasion, after a long touchdown run early in the season, Christopher was so energized that he left the coaching box to celebrate as football players ran off the field. The incident, a surefire penalty if observed by referees, was caught on tape as it showed Christopher chest-bumping his running back on the twenty yard line. In the coaches’ meeting two days later, several of the coaches joked about the situation while the head coach just smirked before suggesting that Christopher should be happy a penalty was not assessed against the team.

Although Christopher occasionally swayed towards a mixed teaching/coaching orientation, particularly early in the season, his lack of personal investment in the sport of football was perhaps the biggest reason for the preservation of his teaching orientation. However, he is clearly looking forward to coaching soccer, a sport in which he has a much greater personal investment. Soccer will also give him more control over his own squad, the JV
boys’ team, without nearly as many of the requirements of football (e.g., watching film, attending Sunday practice).

At the close of the study, Christopher reflected on his first teaching experience by considering changes he hoped to make in the spring. These changes include moving to a theme-based curriculum instead of simply focusing on literature from various literary periods. In the end, his teaching orientation was perhaps most successfully confirmed by listening to the conversations of other coaches before and after games and practices. The most telling of these conversations was from a group of football coaches late in the season. Sitting around one day after school, a coach inquired as to the whereabouts of Christopher to which another coach replied, “[He is] probably writing lesson plans or grading essays.” The group of coaches laughed, all nodding in agreement, before moving to the next topic of conversation.

**Identity.** In terms of identity, Christopher is probably more identifiable as a teacher based on his lack of responsibility within the football context (e.g., when teachers need help with misbehaving student-athletes, they are more likely to turn to more experienced coaches in the school). In fact, while many teacher-coaches introduce themselves as ‘Coach,’ Christopher rarely does so. During one grammar lesson on subject/verb agreement, he uses his name as the subject of multiple sentences, always referring to himself as Mr. [last name]. When asked, Christopher replied, “Not many students call me Coach. I don’t mind if they do, but I don’t introduce myself as Coach [last name].”

Accepting the label of a coach was not something that came without serious consideration for Christopher. Although he realized that many students build a stronger rapport with coaches, his preference has always been to be “taken seriously as a teacher” in the academic realm. As a result, his classroom walls contain mostly posters of respected authors and poets.
(e.g., Dickinson, Hemingway, London, Poe, Twain, Whitman). When asked about being a teacher-coach, Christopher replied, “I’d honestly like it to be teacher-coach instead of coach-teacher.” Regarding his future plans, Christopher admitted not knowing what the cards hold in store for him except he hopes it involves teaching. “He’s one that will probably be recommended for moving up into higher level—even AP—type classes because he’s that type of teacher,” remarked his department chair. He’s a “world-changer,” said the defensive coordinator, “real teacher of the year material.”
CHAPTER VI:
CASE STUDY RESULTS: BRYANT

Acculturation

Academics

Making good grades was non-negotiable growing up in Bryant’s family. Raised in a single-parent home, Bryant’s father stressed academics despite living in a community that placed a great deal of emphasis on athletics. When Bryant arrived in middle school, he also participated in various clubs and activities such as yearbook, BETA club, MathCounts, and Science Olympiad; yet, his focus was always on his grades. In high school, he turned his extracurricular involvement toward interscholastic athletics (i.e., football, basketball, and baseball). Thus, balancing school and sports forced him to stay organized and taught him how to efficiently manage his time.

After graduating from high school, Bryant became interested in a career as a history professor. While he had an opportunity to play football at a division III college, he was awarded an academic scholarship to a small, regional university, a privilege he considered a “no-brainer.” Over the course of his college career, Bryant finished with close to forty hours in history credits. However, he recalls, “I had a lot of people who were kind of pushing me towards going into the medical field.” Since he also enjoyed biology, Bryant decided to pursue this career path and moved away from teaching altogether. He later graduated with a bachelor’s degree in biology before attending two years of optometry school. When he realized optometry was not his passion, he opted instead for a career as a football coach.
Athletics

As an adolescent, Bryant grew up playing football, basketball, and baseball while helping his father with his lawn service. This lasted through high school until just before his senior year when he gave up basketball to focus more on football, baseball, and college applications. While he enjoyed participating in sports and would have enjoyed playing football in college, Bryant was content with his decision to focus on academics. Only after dismissing the optometry field did he reconsider football as an occupation. The next year, he accepted a position as a volunteer football coach in his hometown while once again working in the lawn care business.

Orientation

Bryant entertained the notion of coaching football after high school on several occasions, but he recalls believing that “because I didn’t play college ball…I wouldn’t have been a good football coach.” After leaving optometry school, Bryant’s positive experience as a volunteer coach served to intensify his coaching orientation. Ultimately, he synthesized his passion for coaching football, his interest in science, and his prior fascination with teaching into a career as a high school science teacher/football coach.

Professional Socialization

Preparation

Coaching. Bryant entered his first year in education with a single year of coaching experience: volunteering at his former high school while coaching offensive line, tight ends, and outside linebackers. Bryant says he learned a great deal from the head coach under whom he worked. Since a number of players were required to play both ways (i.e., offense and defense), he picked up plenty of insights about coaching on both sides of the ball. With his newfound knowledge of the game, Bryant attempted to find a graduate assistantship in college football but
to no avail. When no opportunities emerged, he focused his attention on teaching and coaching at the high school level.

**Teaching.** While Bryant started coaching with limited experience, he came into his first year of teaching with “virtually no experience” whatsoever, says his department chair. In fact, his only prior experience of any kind included teaching guitar lessons to make extra money. As a nontraditional alternative certification teacher with an undergraduate degree in biology, Bryant entered his first year of teaching having three years to complete a requisite number of requirements (e.g., passing a basic skills test, passing the Praxis II, taking twelve hours of education courses, and completing three years of satisfactory employment) to receive certification. Meeting these requirements is necessary for teachers without the preparation, experiences, and initial licensure so often afforded by teacher education programs, a point specifically noted by his department chair:

> If nothing else, when you do your methods [course] and your internship, you are in the classroom, and there is where you learn the most. Well he's doing it [teaching] now, but it's in front of a live audience, and he doesn't have anyone that's got his back [e.g., a cooperating teacher]. But just having that practical experience in the classroom…he missed all that. The two most important things I think about getting ready to be in a classroom, he missed it [methods and internship], and he's having to live it now.

Although Bryant is fully invested in his path to becoming an educator, he did admit towards the end of the semester, “I wish I had done some student teaching; I know that. That way I would have had some experience [prior to my first year of teaching].”

**Orientation**

Bryant originally planned to begin a fifth year alternative master’s program at a local university during his first year of teaching. After realizing the course schedule would conflict with his teaching responsibilities, he began researching different types of certifications as well as various online programs before settling on an alternative certification route through another
university in the state. Due to his demanding work load, Bryant will not begin his required education courses until the summer after his first year of teaching and coaching. Even in the summer, though, there may be challenges in scheduling due to the requirements of coaching (e.g., summer workouts).

**Organizational Socialization**

**Opportunity**

It was made clear to Bryant before accepting a position as a science teacher at Proctor High School that coaching football was a necessary requirement. In fact, the principal was forced to make hiring teacher-coaches a priority despite having “an adequate number of science applicants” with various years of experience. This was seconded by Bryant’s department chair: “You have a school this big, and it [coaching] was a need….We needed a science teacher, and we needed a coach. He could do it….so he got the job.”

Despite not having certification or preparation for the teaching role, Bryant received eighteen job offers to teach science and coach football prior to accepting the position at Proctor High School. “I got a job interview down here in May of this year. They wanted to pretty much hire me on the spot,” says Bryant, “but I had to go through the [school] board. I got board approved in June.” Soon after, he was named the defensive line coach as a result of his prior coaching experience, and he was charged with teaching four sections of anatomy and one section of zoology. In hindsight, his department chair recognizes that zoology was a difficult placement for a new teacher with a background in biology, although it was necessary to have someone teach a single section due to an overflow of registered students. “Maybe we missed the mark on that,” she said, while acknowledging that giving him a third anatomy section might have been preferable to teaching zoology during his first semester.
Bryant’s daily routine includes being up at 6:15 a.m. before arriving at school between 7:15 a.m. and 7:30 a.m. The thirty to forty-five minutes prior to first period is commonly reserved for preparing lessons or grading tests/quizzes. As the schedule below suggests, this is a critical time for Bryant in terms of academic preparation since he does not have access to a planning period.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st block (A/B)</td>
<td>Regular Anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd block (A/B)</td>
<td>Regular Anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd block</td>
<td>Honors Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th block</td>
<td>Planning/Weight Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the school’s alternating A/B schedule, Bryant sees a total of five classes per week with the first two blocks consisting of different classes each day. Because he only sees his A/B students two or three times a week, and never on back-to-back days, Bryant struggled to learn students’ names early in the semester, particularly those who were absent on a regular basis. As the semester moved forward, he mentioned just how difficult it was to teach his first and second block classes because he had to spend up to half of each class reviewing notes from the previous class meeting. This view of the alternating schedule is supported by several secondary participants who all acknowledge that the schedule has been a challenge for even the more experienced teachers.
After third period, Bryant gathers his belongings and changes clothes before leaving for the athletic field house. During his planning period, Bryant is responsible for monitoring the football players in fourth block weight training while the head coach and the defensive coordinator prepare for the upcoming practice. According to Bryant’s principal, teacher-coaches from core content areas were given only two academic classes, a planning period, and an athletic period in the past. Unfortunately, he says, “We couldn't do that anymore and still have school, so I had to have our coaches teaching three classes and then [I offered them] a planning period [during] fourth period. What they did with that planning period was strictly up to them.”

Naturally, not having a planning period, for all intents and purposes, has negatively affected Bryant’s capacity for lesson planning and student assessment. As a result, the half hour or so prior to first period is probably the most important window of time in his day. While much of his planning is done during this time, Bryant says the majority of his grading is completed at home on weekends or in class when students are working on independent work. At one point, he even mentions that not teaching a class is the only reason he knows it is Saturday.

Towards the end of fourth period, players head out to the practice field for conditioning before skill work begins immediately after school. Bryant works primarily with the defensive linemen and generally plays a more active role than Christopher in the football schematics. Furthermore, other than monitoring the weight room during fourth block, Bryant’s coaching responsibilities also include painting the practice and game fields every Wednesday with some of the other football coaches. On Friday game days, Bryant enjoys a bit of down time during fourth period before passing out Gatorades to football players and either heading to a pep rally or directly to the pre-game meal. The offensive and defensive coaching staffs usually meet around 4:15 before relaxing for an hour or so prior to the first group of players and coaches making their
way onto the football field for pre-game warm-ups. For away games, the schedule is adjusted so players and coaches have time to eat prior to departure.

**Induction**

Mentoring. Whereas mentoring is critical for all first-year teachers, it has been especially important for Bryant who has very little experience in secondary schools. Mentoring has been particularly beneficial in his subject areas of science and football as well as learning the social culture of the school. One thing Bryant has done remarkably well is ask questions of more experienced educators, a trait his principal specifically mentioned as necessary for success as a novice teacher-coach. Just as important as asking questions, however, is finding a mentor with whom one feels comfortable asking such questions. Bryant is fortunate enough to have effective mentoring in both the teaching and coaching roles.

In the teaching role, Bryant’s department chair also serves as his formal mentor, which he finds particularly beneficial since she also teaches zoology. “Anytime I have any kind of question, it’s usually related to zoology just because there’s so much that goes into that class,” Bryant says. Even though the two struggle to find common a meeting time due to Bryant’s hectic football schedule, he confirms that he knows where to find her if he has questions. While his department chair has mixed reviews about hiring core content area teachers based on their ability to coach, she recognizes the importance of extracurricular activities as a former athletic coach and a current SGA sponsor.

This mentoring relationship is even more important because Bryant’s department chair serves as his primary advocate for helping him find the much needed professional development that will better equip him with the pedagogical content knowledge necessary to teach high school science. Specifically, Bryant has absolutely no experience conducting labs, which is a major
concern according to his department chair. “That [science laboratory training] is the most important thing he should get done…because that gives him the labs and materials in the classroom. It’s not even a want. It’s a need.” Most preservice teachers receive this training prior to their first year of teaching, she says, because teachers need to know how to handle labs safely and effectively.

In an interview with Charlotte’s team leader, an experienced science teacher who entered teaching via alternative certification while also coaching athletics and who made himself available to questions related to Bryant’s experience as a science teacher, he mentioned the availability of semester-long lab kits for teachers who have been through a very specific type of professional development: “It’s hard for me to imagine what I would have done [in my first year of teaching] without that [semester-long lab kit],” suggests Charlotte’s team leader. While there have been opportunities for training this semester, Bryant was not able to participate due to conflicts in the football schedule. Even if he had received training, Bryant wonders if he could trust some of his less reliable students to participate in certain labs.

The only time Bryant is really able to interact with teachers from the science department is during a common lunch period. Bryant enjoys eating lunch with these science teachers because he gets to hear very different perspectives than those of the football coaches. One such conversation Bryant vividly recalls is a discussion pertaining to giving students directions and the number of times teachers are forced to repeat themselves every class period. These conversations afford Bryant some peace of mind that he is not alone in his struggles. This period of informal mentoring is also important for two other reasons: (1) the science teachers are much more oriented towards teaching than coaching; and (2) Bryant is usually the only male teacher in
the room. When asked about the science department lunches, his department chair just laughs and says, “He’s great, bless his heart…all women [other than Bryant]. He’s our token [male].”

On the opposite end of the spectrum, Bryant feels right at home with the football coaches as they spend a significant amount of time together both professionally and socially. Similar to his interaction with the science teachers, Bryant says he has learned a lot from the group of coaches as a whole. Although he was never assigned an official mentor for football, the fact that Bryant works directly with his defensive coordinator, who is also as a core content area teacher in social science, provides him some formal mentoring during his first year of coaching.

When asked about the definition of a good mentor, Bryant replied, “somebody who is critical of what you’re doing, but who is…at the same time supportive.” The defensive coordinator fills this role admirably as someone with a reputation of speaking his mind while also being supportive of novice teacher-coaches. Although the defensive coordinator prefers to think of his interactions with Bryant and Christopher in a more collegial manner, his willingness to take time to support these novice teacher-coaches has had a tremendous impact on their initial coaching experiences.

One of Bryant’s greatest challenges during his first year of teaching and coaching has been overcoming his own acculturation. A few of the important differences to note about Bryant’s life experiences and his current teaching situation include his now teaching in a much more culturally diverse setting, understanding classroom management without the threat of corporal punishment, and engaging certain students and student-athletes who hold themselves to lower academic standards. These difficult adjustments were mentioned specifically by his defensive coordinator:

I come from a very rural place [like Bryant]. When Bryant came in, I tried to give him the heads up, as well as Christopher, but going through teacher education probably made
Christopher a little more prepared as to what to expect. Bryant would be like pulling somebody off the street, or off the tractor where I came from, and throwing them in the classroom.

Bryant’s department chair agreed with this assessment, calling his induction into Proctor High School “an eye-opening experience.” As a result, the most useful advice Bryant received in his first semester of teaching and coaching was less about building rapport with students and student-athletes and more about understanding their motivations and decision-making processes.

At one point early in the semester, Bryant walked by after handling a discipline issue and asked, “Is it like this everywhere?” When asked about this moment later in the day, Bryant responded:

We didn’t have as many behavior issues [when I was growing up] because…if you got in trouble, you had either three licks [with a paddle] or were suspended for three days, and then if you did it again, they sent you to alternative school….Some of the stuff the kids have said and done in here [his classroom], and then they’re [allowed] back in here the next day; it’s mind-numbing.

**Coaching.** Like Christopher, Bryant’s introduction to Proctor High School came via football coaching. After being hired and moving to the area in late June, Bryant recalls summer workouts starting at 6:00 a.m. and lasting most of the morning for four days a week. At various points in the summer, Bryant also coached in 7-on-7 tournaments. The defensive coordinator recalls Bryant working hard to learn the team’s philosophy and playbook; “he was always willing to learn but always trying to play catch-up.”

Despite being inundated with his newfound responsibilities of teaching and coaching, Bryant was supported by a sense of family created amongst the coaching staff, particularly on the defensive side of the ball where coaches would often get together outside of school. Regarding these social experiences, the defensive coordinator responded that for coaches without spouses or families in the immediate area, “all we have [is each other] because we spend so much time together. We go out and eat, and we try to get Bryant in there.” As it relates to the teaching role,
his defensive coordinator believes this interaction has made for a smoother transition into the classroom because he has a second support system in place if he needs advice or guidance. More importantly, says the defensive coordinator, “He hears us talk about problems, so he doesn’t feel like he’s on an island alone.”

**Teaching.** Whereas Bryant had a little over a month to prepare for football’s regular season, his preparation for teaching did not begin until he received his textbooks several weeks before the school year began. Bryant felt comfortable with the anatomy curriculum right away but not nearly as comfortable with the zoology curriculum. More concerning, however, was his deficit in understanding the intricacies of pedagogical instruction. A few weeks into the semester, Bryant reflected on his first week of teaching:

As far as like lesson plans, I had no idea how to do them. I didn't realize how much time it took to prepare a lesson, I guess. Another thing that I had trouble with starting out was teaching on the block, 100 minutes, and filling all that time. I still haven't gotten that down yet.

In similar conversations, Bryant said he would have benefited from knowing more about individualized education programs (IEPs), accommodating diverse groups of students, and managing the mountain of paperwork that comes with teaching in a core content area. Locating resources was also difficult until he started finding “good online PowerPoints” for zoology from universities worldwide. He has also received numerous resources (e.g., workbooks, worksheets) from his department chair and other teachers, and he scours the Internet whenever possible for videos related to the topic at hand.

In spite of these concerns, instruction within the framework of classroom management remains Bryant’s greatest challenge. Words of advice from his department chair include how to think of teaching in threes: “One is directional, one is lectural, but one has got to have an activity of some sort.” Implementing this activity portion has been a struggle for much of the semester,
particularly in Bryant’s anatomy classes where he finds a general lack of student motivation to the point that he believes only about half of his students in standard classes are actually motivated to learn.

After an observation early in the semester, his principal encouraged him to utilize several strategies for student engagement; these included the implementation of bell ringers at the beginning of class and the use of PowerPoint instead of the whiteboard for note-taking. Prior to that recommendation, Bryant had no way of consistently structuring the beginning of each class period, and having students copy notes took three times the amount of time necessary. Within the next few weeks, Bryant began noticing small improvements as his classroom management and pedagogical instruction got “a little bit better every week” thanks to the routines he implemented in his classes. Ironically, his principal’s suggestions ran counter to Bryant’s initial notion of effective teaching. In describing some of his own effective teachers, Bryant contrasted the use of two fixtures in secondary classrooms: the chalkboard and PowerPoint presentations:

I had a cell biology teacher who…was a really good teacher, too. He didn’t use any kind of technology; he just wrote on the chalkboard. That’s the kind of what I would like to be…a lecturer instead of someone who uses PowerPoint all the time.

Experiences

Teaching. Bryant’s primary methods of instruction include lecturing, note-taking, and independent book work. When asked about why he chose these particular methods, he replied that they worked best for him as an auditory learner. Says Bryant, “I just try to emulate some of the better teachers I’ve had.” As a result, even the most challenging ideas in standard classes—vocabulary words like epidermis and epithelium from the study of skin in anatomy—utilized lecture as the primary method of engagement. Such methods appear to be the result of his heightened expectations for students, which are partially based on his own previous educational
plans: “With my advanced class, I want to get them ready for college. I spent a lot of time on the cell because, the ones who are going into the medical field, they're going to get the cell to death.”

When asked how students were faring in his classes, Bryant generally points to their overall behavior (e.g., “make sure kids are not tearing stuff off the walls”) or their grades (e.g., “the grades are pretty low this six weeks for whatever reason”) as an indicator of student success. When asked specifically about his view of an effective classroom environment, Bryant responded, “I don’t know if you can use grades as the barometer or not, but I would use classroom management more.” This suggestion, at least from Bryant’s perspective, points to a noticeable contradiction between classroom management and student assessment.

In terms of assessment, tests and quizzes were the primary requirement in Bryant’s classroom for much of the semester, although he did utilize one major project that served as a form of alternative assessment during the final month of school. This project was given to him by his department chair for use in the zoology course. When asked about the project, his department chair responded, “He has everything. I told him to copy it. I'm going to let him watch me to see how it's administered and how it's managed, and I think that will help.” Bryant and his students seemed to become much more invested in zoology as a result of this project. For Bryant specifically, it offered him a better sense of direction, a clearer purpose, and a renewed level of enthusiasm for teaching during the latter stages of a trying semester.

Around the same time, Bryant also began to connect more with his zoology students. During one lesson highlighting a variety of animals such as the Asian Elephant and the Blue Whale, Bryant was overheard joking, “I like animals as much as the next guy, but ostrich boots are cool.” He promised to wear his own ostrich boots the following Friday if students finished their assignments each day for the rest of the week. This increased rapport with students was
primarily observed in third period zoology; it was not as common in the four anatomy classes spread across his first and second periods. This was likely the result of some combination of the alternating class schedule; a lack of interest by students in topics such as the skeletal, muscular, and nervous systems; and Bryant’s limited understanding of learning styles and differentiated instruction.

Throughout the semester, Bryant struggled to keep students’ attention during lectures, although learning classroom management techniques such as proximity and voice inflection did help considerably. A breakthrough emerged over halfway through the semester when Bryant stopped spending as much time grading papers during independent book work and started moving around the room to encourage students to stay on task. While he seems to enjoy engaging students in conversation, a lack of confidence in the area of classroom management as well as the need to accomplish certain administrative tasks (e.g., grading, taking attendance, completing student referrals) prevented him from utilizing a more learner-centered approach to instruction.

Bryant did improve in several areas of classroom teaching over the course of the semester, though. While his initial focus was on the behavior of students, he later recognized that “I was probably a little bit too lax in discipline to start out with, so I had to get a little bit tougher as I went along. I was never as tough as what I needed to be.” Whereas the deficit in which he began his teaching career was far too deep to make up in a single semester, he did make strides. Some of Bryant’s noticeable adjustments are listed in Table 9.
Table 9

*Bryant’s Teaching Adjustments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Activity</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>Higher expectations for students’ attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating arrangements</td>
<td>Less student choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom passes</td>
<td>Fewer passes allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on task</td>
<td>Decreased down time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Approaches</td>
<td>Use of group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Increased structure during assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>Specific time limits on in-class assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>Greater sense of urgency during each lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>More explicit feedback to students questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>Movement towards misbehaving students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Further dialogue with individual students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coaching.** Bryant’s primary practice and game day duties include coaching defensive linemen. During the game, he works closely with the defensive coordinator, although it is Bryant’s responsibility to sub his linemen on and off the field. Bryant’s general philosophy for practice includes getting players plenty of repetitions so they will be well-prepared for game situations. He emphasizes a combination of the necessary intelligence and quickness for players to achieve success (e.g., telling a player to ‘fly to the ball’ requires an understanding of where the ball will be at a given time and necessitates a certain amount of quickness to be in position to make a play).

After practices, Bryant and Christopher handle ‘gassers,’ extra running assigned to players for issues such as discipline referrals and missed practices. This can add anywhere from ten to forty minutes to their afternoon schedules. All coaches are also occasionally required to
work the clock at middle school games as well as coach JV games each week. Once a week, a coach is also responsible for remaining at the field house until every player has been picked up. In general, Bryant has far greater responsibilities than Christopher due to his past football coaching experience. For instance, Christopher is not responsible for ‘grading’ players after each game; this is one of Bryant’s most important tasks. In one of the biggest games of the season, Proctor High School and one of its cross-town rivals both entered the game undefeated. In preparation, Bryant spent three weeks prior to the game helping put together a game plan. Early in the playoffs, Bryant was also asked to take a road trip of several hours to meet a football coach from another school in order to swap game tapes of upcoming opponents.

**Balance**

Bryant calls balancing teaching and coaching “a juggling act” and one that he was glad he did not tackle right out of college; “I don’t think I would have been ready for it,” he said. Being an older first-year teacher (26 years old) has helped him in terms of maturity, time management, and organization, all of which he believes were improved by his time in optometry school. Unfortunately, coaching football has meant missing out on important opportunities in the teaching role such as science conferences and professional development seminars. This is most notably the case given his heightened responsibilities in coaching. When asked about these extra responsibilities at the end of the season, Bryant replied, “I never thought of it as like a burden, but yeah, I did have a lot to do. I kind of embraced it because I knew it was good for me, and I knew it’d make me better at what I was doing [coaching football].”

While the coaching requirements certainly limited Bryant’s ability to spend time in the teaching role outside of classes, an even greater internal struggle was taking place regarding his graduate school requirements. For most of the fall semester, Bryant seemed intent on starting
graduate classes in the spring, but as the semester came to a close and he decided to serve as an assistant coach for the school’s softball team, graduate school and his teaching certification were pushed to the summer. Although he looks forward to having third period planning and only teaching anatomy during the spring semester, the additional coaching role will be enough to keep him busy.

Once football season ended, Bryant regained his planning period while admitting, “I didn’t realize how time-consuming it [coaching] was going to be outside of school.” When asked how he feels now that football is over, he replies that “life’s awesome” and talks about the increased time he has for “preparing lessons and actually thinking about how I’m going to present different things.” However, Bryant does seem to miss certain aspects of coaching. For instance, without football in season, Bryant spends less time with the coaches outside of school. This gives him more time for himself but at a cost of the only social life he has known over the past five months. Come to find out, Bryant did remove himself from this social environment at times, according to his defensive coordinator, as he juggled his multiple responsibilities:

The other night, he didn’t go out with us. We went to get a bite to eat, and he was like I’ve got to get this essay done for my first-year teacher thing. You know….I’ve seen him prioritize, and that’s what it takes. It takes being able to say no to something like that to be sure you get it done. So, his effort is there. His will to become a better teacher/coach [is there] because in the end, they’re [teaching and coaching roles] both the same way.

**Mentality**

Unlike many of the football coaches with whom he works, Bryant has a reputation of being mild-mannered and quiet by nature. This was commonly observed in the classroom as well as on the football field. Interestingly, his rapport with his football players is more reminiscent of a classroom teacher while his management approach in the classroom fluctuated from him being too friendly to having more of the archetypal football mentality (i.e., angry
coach). This rise in emotion was necessary according to his department chair, who suggested that Bryant came in too soft-spoken. However, she saw the football mentality less in terms of football and more in terms of gender. “You’re a man,” she said, “Use that as an advantage. The women here have a disadvantage automatically in that we have to assert ourselves in a different way.” This demeanor seemed counterintuitive to Bryant in the classroom as he tried to avoid conflict, which may have actually provoked some of the disrespect afforded him by certain adolescent males. His department chair summed up this struggle by suggesting that Bryant did not declare his position as the “alpha male” early enough in the semester, although she believes he has made the necessary adjustments and that many of his students have come around to him as a classroom teacher.

Bryant is typically the first to admit that he did not handle every situation as he would have liked, and he understands that the coaching mentality occasionally found its way into his classroom during times of frustration with students’ behavioral issues. When asked about this coaching mentality, he replied, “It’s hard for me to shut it off during the season.” What Bryant is referring to is a form of aggressiveness that he simply calls “brutal honesty.” However, this form of management revealed itself in a very different fashion on the football field than in the classroom as Bryant would correct errors or misbehaviors during football in a way that was indeed aggressive but also constructive in its criticism.

When describing the use of instruction on the football field, Bryant mentioned that “if you can’t tell them in under twenty seconds what they need to know…then you just kind of lose them.” This individual feedback is certainly much easier when you’re focused on six defensive linemen as opposed to a classroom of thirty students, but Bryant believes that in science and in football, the “one-on-one interaction…increases their [students’] learning capabilities.” In
football, this immediate feedback combined with an increased vocal level often brought about the intended results Bryant struggled to achieve in the classroom where his combination of presence, message, and voice did not always triangulate to achieve the desired outcome.

Disposition

Perception. In thinking back on his time as a high school student, Bryant recalls one major difference between teachers and coaches: “The guys who were coaches were more of an authority figure. I was afraid of a lot of them or intimidated by a lot of them who were coaches.” While he respected non-coaching teachers, those educators more likely to be identified by the titles Mr. or Ms., Bryant was not impressed with their motivational styles. When asked about the perception of athletic coaches in his school, he mentioned feeling that a number of teachers were not very supportive of coaches in general. While his department chair has been encouraging throughout the semester, she did ask Bryant one important question that perfectly identifies the skepticism of many non-coaching teachers towards teacher-coaches, particularly those who teach in core content areas: “Are you planning on this being the career or are you doing this [teaching science] just for now [to get your foot in the door of coaching]?”

Orientation. Bryant sums up his general educational orientation in the following statement:

Well, this may not be the answer everybody wants to hear, but I see myself as a football coach first because that’s what I love to do. That’s selfish on my part, and I know it, but I see myself as a football coach first. But, I also want to be as good an educator as I am a football coach.…I mean I’m not the greatest football coach in the world now. There is still a lot I have to learn, but I want to keep progressing everyday in both aspects of it [coaching and teaching].

Bryant leaves little doubt about his greatest passion: coaching football. He also acknowledges that there are days when he cannot see himself teaching for the rest of his life due to the behavioral issues he faces on a daily basis. Once he has a master’s degree, he hopes to become a
football coordinator at the high school level, and he would eventually like to work his way up to coaching football at the college level.

In the end, a number of factors point towards a greater coaching orientation for Bryant. Other indicators include his personal interest in books about coaching, the lack of decoration (e.g., student work, science information) on his classroom walls, his voluntary decision to coach softball, and his goal of someday pursuing an additional master’s degree in athletic administration. However, it is important to consider the following three factors before explicitly identifying Bryant’s orientation.

First, Bryant’s induction into teaching actually began via the coaching role during summer workouts, and thus he has never known teaching without coaching. As a result, Bryant struggled to comprehend his role as a teacher once football season came to an end. In other words, the end of football represented a void in his professional life that he ultimately filled with another sport (i.e., softball). Although Bryant had the opportunity to begin graduate school classes, the idea of essentially doubling his academic load was not appealing to him as he was already overwhelmed by aspects of classroom management and pedagogical instruction. While Christopher started in a similar situation, he also had student teaching experiences to guide him.

Second, Bryant’s lack of professional socialization within the teaching role left him at such a deficit that football was often the only sense of order among the chaos of his life in teaching and coaching. On days when his coaching mentality took over and he began to question his career in teaching, the experience of coaching football allowed him to escape his frustrations while bringing him back to teaching the following day refreshed and rejuvenated. Regardless of any limitations due to the lack of professional socialization, Bryant believes that being “thrown into the fire” was an experience he would recommend to others with a bachelor’s degree in a
core content area and a desire to teach. “I guess the student teaching route would probably…be the best way to go, but…this is a good way to do it, too.”

Finally, there is no denying Bryant’s passion for teaching in his content area. Classroom management issues aside, his struggle to find resources and his lack of any sort of pedagogical foundation seemed to be the culprits behind his disconnection between content knowledge and student engagement. As Bryant suggested late in the semester, “Motivation is not a problem for me because I enjoy what I’m teaching. I enjoyed teaching anatomy, and I really enjoyed teaching zoology as well.” He even went so far as to say that if he ever ended up teaching at a school without zoology, he would be interested in starting a similar program. While a change in his job placement might ultimately be the result of a football promotion, this suggestion certainly demonstrates Bryant’s consideration of a future in teaching.

**Identity.** In reflecting upon his first semester of teaching and coaching, Bryant had this to say about the overall experience:

I’ve enjoyed the challenge, and I feel like I’ve grown a good bit personally. And even if I don’t get hired back next year, I’ll feel pretty good about this experience that I’ve had. I’ve been able to learn a lot of new things and matured a little bit more.

Incidentally, Bryant was the participant who most appreciated the opportunity he was given to teach and coach. While he still has a lot to learn, his overall growth as an educator has been the greatest of the three primary participants in this study.

In listening to how students refer to him in the classroom and on the football field, the common denominator is always the word ‘Coach.’ However, Bryant may have what it takes to bridge the gap between teaching and coaching. When asked about his identity as a teacher-coach, Bryant’s responses were generally noncommittal. In hindsight, his lack of insight may have been symbolic of his search for identity as an educator. While his orientation has pushed
him towards the side of coaching, his search for identity finds him hovering somewhere in the proverbial middle: the hyphen that connects the roles of teaching and coaching in secondary schools.
CHAPTER VII:

DISCUSSION

Overview

This chapter discusses the primary themes of this collective case study while connecting them to the related literature. Similar to the individual cases themselves, the chapter is organized around the three components of occupational socialization: acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. The acculturation section stands on its own while the professional socialization section is broken down into two parts: teacher and coaching education programs and nontraditional alternative certification programs. The section centered on organizational socialization includes the following subsections: 1) opportunity, 2) inductive experiences, 3) balance, 4) teaching/coaching mentalities, 5) connecting social positions, and 6) disposition. This chapter concludes with implications for teaching and coaching preparation programs as well as academic and athletic programs in secondary schools. This is followed by a call for future research and closing remarks.

Acculturation

The preceding case studies supplement the literature suggesting that the acculturative experiences of educators, and specifically teacher-coaches, will affect not only their motivations to enter the field of education but also their future experiences in professional and organizational socialization (Brown & Sieben, 2012a; Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). This is important considering middle and high school students across the country are widely encouraged to participate in extracurricular activities (e.g.,
interscholastic athletics; NASPE, 2008) as a means of becoming more well-rounded citizens. For a number of students, sports are often one of the primary motivations that maintain their interest in the academic side of education (Brown & Sieben, 2012b). Thus, sports may not only broaden students’ horizons while teaching them useful skills and concepts but may also teach them to balance multiple responsibilities and manage their time.

Inevitably, society considers this balance of academic and extracurricular activities requisite for creating the identity of a ‘whole child.’ Therefore, it stands to reason that students who are internally motivated toward specific academic subjects and/or extracurricular activities are more likely to remain committed to their respective roles than those who participate more reluctantly. While focusing solely on teaching may be considered more ideal to some educational stakeholders, this same conjecture holds true for academic teachers and athletic coaches because a personal investment in two or more educational roles may prevent one or more of these roles from becoming what Lawson (1983a) refers to as a career contingency.

This study cannot make claims about the longevity of the primary participants’ careers in education based on a single semester of interaction, but these cases do suggest that educators who are intrinsically motivated and highly interested in pursuing teaching and coaching are more likely to remain committed to these roles over time. Of the three primary participants, Charlotte provides the most fitting example. Her lifelong passion for teaching and American history, not to mention her past experiences with basketball and student government, were all important components of her sustained teaching/coaching orientation (Brown, in press-a). Ultimately, this orientation helped produce a blurring of the lines of teaching, coaching, and club sponsoring. Her personal interest in the sum total of her professional responsibilities was also crucial in
sustaining balance within these roles while performing at a high level over the course of the semester.

On the other hand, while Christopher worked diligently as a football coach, he is clearly more invested in the sport of soccer as a result of his past acculturative experiences. While this may not necessarily account for a greater time commitment in soccer due to the substantial responsibilities of football coaches, Christopher recognizes that he will probably feel more ownership over soccer as well as a more optimistic mentality in the classroom during soccer season. Similar to Christopher’s preference of soccer over football, Bryant showed a greater natural interest in the zoology curriculum than the anatomy curriculum. While his acculturative interest in academics was primarily in the field of biology, much of his enthusiasm for zoology stemmed from a personal interest in animals in general and hunting and fishing in particular.

When asked about the motivations of teacher-coaches, Charlotte’s principal mentioned the necessity for encouraging new teachers to convey not only their academic areas of expertise but also their acculturative interests. Indeed, the diverse roles necessary to help secondary schools function successfully suggests that educators must be willing to utilize the various talents and abilities they consider to be personal strengths. Charlotte’s principal went on to endorse the idea of hiring the ‘whole educator’:

I don’t need ten teachers who are willing to coach [athletics] and teach social studies. I need one or two of those. I need other teachers who are technology geeks and can think about how to incorporate that into effective teaching. I need more people who love writing and can teach their colleagues….I need more people who know how to go out and find grants….I need all my teachers to be great instructors and to have one other thing that they do well and can teach others to do well.

With this in mind, it is imperative to recognize the role that acculturative interests and personal investment play in the induction of novice educators, particularly if school administrators are
willing to build off these strengths by matching teachers with academic, athletic, and extracurricular responsibilities that take into account an individual’s background experiences.

**Professional Socialization**

**Teacher and Coaching Education Programs**

While acculturation has a central place in the choice to pursue the roles of teaching and coaching in secondary schools (Graber, 1996; Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky, 2010), this study demonstrates the benefits of a traditional teacher education program, namely the connection between theory (i.e., core content area and education courses) and practice (i.e., clinical placement experiences) in preparing future teachers. Furthermore, the addition of some sort of coaching education program (see Côté & Gilbert, 2009; McCullick, Belcher, & Schempp, 2005) would help ensure that athletic coaches have the basic knowledge and skills described in the national standards for sports coaches (see NASPE, 2006).

Alternatively, a focus group for teacher-coaches (see Brown, in press-b) would also add a layer of expertise related to the social and organizational cultures of secondary schools by addressing topics pertinent to the experiences of novice teacher-coaches. Ultimately, the goal of a teacher/coach focus group would be to engage novice educators in sociocultural and procedural aspects of day-to-day teaching and coaching in hopes that the information garnered would help them balance the two social positions and thus promote a mixed teaching/coaching orientation. The potential for combining teacher and coaching education programs will be further discussed in the implications section.

Unfortunately, future teacher-coaches from core content areas seem less likely to have access to coaching education programs. With this in mind, Charlotte recommends that preservice teachers volunteer as coaches, albeit on a limited basis, during their clinical
placements to help them better understand the time commitment involved in the coaching role. Specifically, she offers this advice: “Go in there to see the inner workings of it [athletics]….Take a more hands-on role when you volunteer. Whatever the coach will let you do, do it,” she says. This belief that professional socialization is crucial for novice coaches is widely supported by the research on coaching education programs (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; McCullick, Belcher, & Schempp, 2005; Wilson et al., 2010).

Ultimately, the more experience future teacher-coaches have in secondary schools, the more prepared they will be during their induction phase of organizational socialization. For Bryant, preparation for the coaching role consisted of volunteer coaching at his hometown high school while deciding whether or not to pursue a career in education. For Christopher, teaching preparation included substitute teaching right out of college while looking for a teaching position. When asked about increased preparation for the coaching role, Christopher specifically mentioned expanding clinical placements to include extracurricular activities in order to better meet the diverse requirements set forth for novice educators in secondary schools.

Increased preparation for these multiple roles may benefit novices who must learn to effectively teach in their content area while also taking on extracurricular assignments. However, a counter argument to expanded preparation is the belief that teacher education programs might end up promoting coaching [or other extracurricular] orientations in preservice teachers. On the contrary, by better preparing students to understand the realities of the extracurricular requirements of secondary schools, teacher education programs would actually be promoting mixed orientations while simultaneously helping to lessen reality shock (Bullough, 1989; Lortie, 1975; Veenman, 1984) among novice teacher-coaches. As long as teaching
orientations remain the highest priority, preparing students to better meet the diverse needs of secondary schools will mutually benefit everyone involved.

**Nontraditional Alternative Certification Programs**

One of the major implications of this study appears to be the benefit of teacher education for first-year teacher-coaches. Although a single case study participant cannot be generalized across populations, Bryant’s case is supported by the literature related to teacher education programs that suggest a lack of training for one or more educational roles can be harmful to an educator’s overall effectiveness (Flores, 2006; Kardos & Johnson, 2007). Research on teacher preparation and certification also supports the claim that teachers with substantial preparation and initial certification (e.g., teacher education) are generally more prepared and better equipped for the classroom than teachers from nontraditional alternative certification programs (see Darling-Hammond, 2003, 2010). In addition, inadequate preparation can also lead to teacher attrition if novice educators have not accumulated the necessary human capital for one or more of their educational roles (Kirby & Grissmer, 1991; Shen, 1997).

With this in mind, while Bryant learned a great deal during his first semester of teaching and coaching, the deficit from which he began his career as a first-year, nontraditional alternative certification teacher was simply too much to overcome as he struggled to comprehend the many aspects of effective teaching commonly acquired in teacher education programs. In contrasting Bryant’s coaching orientation with the higher degrees of teaching orientation of Charlotte and Christopher, it is clear that while Bryant has the potential to become an effective science teacher, this will necessitate greater strides over an extended period of time during the induction stage of organizational socialization.
Despite the limitations of nontraditional alternative certifications programs, research also suggests that teachers from these programs may include an influx of more diverse teacher candidates including older individuals with more life experience, an increasing number of minorities, and candidates with a greater interest in science and mathematics (Good et al., 2006; Johnson, 2004; Shen, 1997; Turley & Nakai, 2000). Bryant fits two of these three descriptors (age and content area) as well as an additional descriptor that is beneficial in the hiring process of first-year teachers: the ability to coach athletics. In fact, the combination of athletic coaching and science teaching is especially beneficial given Charlotte’s team leader’s recollection of his experience as a nontraditional alternative certification teacher and athletic coach:

In alternative certification, there is some pressure there [based on degree requirements that include taking four education courses and teaching for three consecutive years]. Now being a science teacher is good, or a math teacher, because you’re in high demand…. but if I had been a social studies teacher or language arts teacher, I would have been [in trouble].

Needless to say, just as career opportunities at the secondary level have increased for science and math teachers over the years, so too have the opportunities for teachers willing and able to coach middle and high school athletics.

**Organizational Socialization**

**Opportunity**

It is important to remember that two of the three primary participants (Christopher and Bryant) in this study received jobs in part due to their willingness to coach athletics. Meanwhile, the third candidate (Charlotte) was hired for her teaching acumen, although she was quickly asked about coaching based on her acculturative interest in basketball. The need for athletic coaches in secondary schools was mentioned at great length by the principal of Proctor High School, who admitted that hiring teacher-coaches has become “non-negotiable.” “We have to
have excellent classroom teachers,” he says, “but with a [large, public high] school, [there is] no question administrators have to make sure the athletic programs are supported, and there is no one else to coach [athletics] but teachers.” However, both principals who took part in this study admittedly looked for educators to fill teaching roles first and foremost, although they also agree that finding teacher-coaches in core content areas has become a much more valuable commodity than hiring teacher-coaches in physical education. Christopher and Bryant’s principal had this to say about core content area teacher-coaches:

Most of the time it’s easier to find a core content teacher than it is to find an elective content teacher. So we encourage people now that if they are core content teachers, perspective teachers, we can hire them a lot sooner than we can if it’s an elective content [area]. Physical education and health jobs, they’re a dime a dozen this day and age…..If we can find somebody who can teach history or math or English or science, well that’s awesome.

With this in mind, since novice educators from all content areas will likely be asked to take on additional roles in secondary schools, support during the induction phase has become more important than ever.

**Inductive Experiences**

**Mentoring.** The importance of a universal language as well as a common body of knowledge within school settings has long been touted by educators (Lawson, 1993; Lortie, 1975). Professional conversations that integrate first-year teachers into these settings are best accomplished through effective mentoring and induction programs that prevent novices from the feelings of isolation that are so common in education (Brown, 2010; DeWert, Babinski, & Jones, 2003; Flores & Day, 2006; Herbert & Worthy, 2001; Johnson, 2004; Kardos & Johnson, 2007; McCann & Johannessen, 2004; Westheimer, 2008). Mentoring is especially important for first-year teacher-coaches (see Pennington et al., 2004; Stroot et al., 1993; Stroot & Williamson, 1993) who have long struggled to manage and balance time efficiently (Sage, 1987). As a result,
teacher-coaches may become overly self-reliant on producing quick fixes to the most challenging problems instead of looking to their peers for support. While multiple sources call for administrative assistance in allocating time for mentor-mentee interactions (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Scherff, 2008), this is particularly beneficial for first-year teacher-coaches who need support in multiple roles.

Formal and informal mentoring took place with varying degrees of success for primary participants in this study. Despite a lack of common planning time within her split-grade middle school teaching team, Charlotte received formal mentoring for the teaching role while searching out her own informal mentoring for personal and organizational concerns. For Charlotte, mentoring also came in the form of the numerous professional development seminars she attended at the school, system, and state levels, several on her own accord.

Christopher had a formal mentor with whom he interacted primarily in the company of a larger group of informal mentors during his lunch period. This group was made up of his content area colleagues as well as a few teachers from other content areas. However, like Charlotte, mentoring often came in the form of advice about classroom management, parental interactions, and school policies instead of specific methods and approaches for teaching the curriculum. Unlike Charlotte, Christopher found formal and informal mentors to be very helpful in providing content area resources such as lesson planning ideas, texts, movies, and worksheets.

In terms of formal mentoring, Christopher and Bryant both attended a new teacher meeting at Proctor High School once a month. While they each found the sessions generally worthwhile, Christopher pointed out how each meeting felt like a “vent session” and focused more on challenges than practical solutions. Bryant’s interaction with his own mentor centered on one particular academic class, zoology, in which the mentor, who was also his department
chair, taught the other sections. Unfortunately, Bryant’s opportunities to meet with his mentor were limited by the coaching role and the lack of a planning period.

Generally speaking, all three primary participants found formal and informal mentors for the teaching role. The same cannot be said for coaching, however. For Charlotte, not having an experienced basketball coach nearby was a challenge she could not overcome through the informal mentoring she received from the various coaches she contacted outside of school. Although she felt supported by her athletic director, she lacked a consistent adviser to answer questions regarding her deficiencies in the pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986) of basketball coaching. While Christopher had numerous support systems pertaining to football (i.e., other football coaches), he never seemed completely comfortable asking advice from his immediate superior, the team’s head coach. Instead, Christopher often turned to Bryant’s coaching mentor, the defensive coordinator, for a number of reasons: 1) He was more accessible since they all shared a coaching office (the head coach had a separate office down the hall); 2) he was a core content area teacher himself; and 3) he was generally more empathetic to the challenges facing novice teacher-coaches.

**Professional interactions.** Because Christopher and Bryant were both assistant coaches on the varsity football team, they found themselves in a very structured and well-planned environment from the outset. While this structure had its advantages (e.g., they were never responsible for planning practices), Christopher’s lack of pedagogical content knowledge related to football left him feeling like a student himself. Unlike his understandings of soccer with which he felt much more comfortable, there were times when Christopher, similar to Bryant in the teaching role, admitted feeling like “an inferior” on the football field. Due to these feeling of inferiority, Christopher’s interactions with student-athletes as well as Bryant’s interactions with
students in the academic classroom were not always approached with the utmost confidence, particularly earlier in the semester.

Charlotte, on the other hand, felt a sense of control over both her classroom and her basketball team based on the nature of her professional positions (i.e., classroom teacher and faculty head coach). Nevertheless, the coaching role caused her the most worry as she was never afforded the luxury of having a more experienced basketball coach to look up to on a daily basis. Instead, she was left to build a basketball program from the ground up with a mutually inexperienced volunteer coach, a first-year athletic director, and first-year administrators, while simultaneously managing her responsibilities as a first-year teacher.

All three teacher-coaches had interesting game day relationships with their fellow coaches. Christopher found himself in a subservient role during games as he stood listening for plays over the back shoulder of the head coach, who acted as the offensive coordinator. Bryant, on the other hand, was charged with subbing the defensive linemen in and out of games while working in tandem with the defensive coordinator, which allowed for a much more collegial relationship between the two coaches. As the head coach for girls’ basketball, Charlotte rarely had any interaction with the boys’ coach during games. This left her to face critical decisions and interactions on her own. Such interactions included communicating with parents and officials, both common concerns for many novice coaches (Bullough, 1989; Sage, 1987). Over the course of the season, this dialogue included a wide range of positive supports, constructive critiques, and angry outbursts from parents, allowing Charlotte to become far better equipped for interactions with parents in the academic setting. On the contrary, Christopher and Bryant rarely had to deal with parents in the coaching context since the head football coach took on this responsibility, meaning they had little practice for engaging parents in academic conversations.
Balance

Balancing multiple roles in secondary schools presents numerous challenges for first-year teachers (Brown, in press-a; Flores, 2006; Flores & Day, 2006; Frank, 2003), particularly those who lack the necessary preparation for one or more roles (Flores, 2006; Kardos & Johnson, 2007). While Fuller and Brown’s (1975) three stages of teaching and learning (i.e., survival, mastery, impact) are difficult enough within the context of teaching, the addition of supplementary responsibilities can make the induction process all the more challenging. Over the course of this study, several attributes, including grade levels, content areas, and personal obligations, have emerged to impact how first-year teacher-coaches balance their educational responsibilities.

During one interview, Charlotte recalled the middle school teacher-coaches from her adolescence being better able to balance multiple roles than her high school teacher-coaches. While other factors such as acculturative experiences, professional socialization, and orientation may play a part in how effectively these roles are managed, the level of teaching and coaching (i.e., middle school and high school) may certainly have something to do with the challenge of finding an appropriate balance. Ultimately, this viewpoint calls into question the expectations of teaching and coaching for each of these educational levels.

For instance, observations from this particular study demonstrate an increased focus on high-stakes testing (e.g., graduation exam, SAT) and accountability in academics and athletics (i.e., test scores and winning percentages) at the high school level. At the middle school level, there were far greater expectations for collaboration (e.g., teacher meetings, parent/teacher conferences), preparation (e.g., preparing students for high school academics and athletics), and extracurricular involvement (e.g., club days). Thus, the more demanding nature of the high
school football schedule—at least in comparison to middle school basketball—as well as the pressure to prepare students for end-of-course tests foreshadows a possibility that balanced teaching/coaching orientations may be more challenging for those educators teaching advanced courses in higher grade levels.

While a common perception among non-coaching teachers is that the coaching role itself may take away from teaching or that teacher-coaches may retreat from one or more educational roles (see role retretatism; Massengale, 1981), a more critical vantage point suggests that the time teacher-coaches spend learning the basics of coaching their respective sports during the induction stage may become one of the greatest obstacles to classroom teaching. Needless to say, this is especially true for teacher-coaches who lack preparation for or prior experiences with the actual coaching role. Incidentally, all three teacher-coaches in this study learned to balance these roles without ever allowing teaching to become a career contingency (Lawson, 1983a), although Bryant’s lack of preparation and planning made this a much greater challenge for him in particular.

Finding balance was specifically mentioned in Charlotte’s final interview as she discussed lessons learned over the course of the semester:

Towards the end of the season, I think my balance improved. I tended to think ahead a little bit more. I would think, okay, I have games the next three days in a row, and I have a test in four days. Maybe since I only have one practice today, I should go ahead and make the test that’s four days away because the next three nights I’m going to be exhausted.

While Christopher was rarely three or four days ahead, the major focus of his balance had more to do with maximizing time specifically for non-teaching activities such as planning and grading while focusing actual classroom time on direct instruction. As for Bryant, the responsibility of after-school coaching may have impacted his classroom teaching less than the loss of his
planning period, which was spent in the weight room with football players. This loss of preparation time for teaching ultimately forced him to spend more of his instructional time planning upcoming lessons, grading papers, and catching up on other miscellaneous paperwork while also attempting to manage the students in his classroom.

Although Flores and Day (2006) noticed a move towards teacher-centered practices in novice educators’ pedagogical implementation of curriculum while simultaneously attempting to balance multiple roles, this was not necessarily the case for any of the three primary participants in this study. As previously mentioned, Christopher and Bryant both entered their first semester of teaching with a more teacher-centered approach (i.e., lecture) based on their apprenticeships of observation (Lortie, 1975). However, towards the end of the semester, Christopher began giving students greater ownership during classroom discussions while Bryant’s mentor encouraged him to begin a hands-on group project in his zoology class. Meanwhile, Charlotte took her learner-centered classroom approach to a new level during basketball season as she realized she had less time to plan as many individual activities and thus shifted her focus to allowing students to work collaboratively on projects and group assignments.

Overall, there is much more to finding balance than merely managing the roles of teaching and coaching. Table 10 outlines two of the major sources of role stress (Sage, 1987) for each primary participant, all of which were caused by balancing multiple responsibilities inside and outside of school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Participant</th>
<th>Challenge #1</th>
<th>Challenge #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Balancing personal/professional interactions (e.g., school, family, church)</td>
<td>Balancing teaching social science, coaching basketball, and co-sponsoring SGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Balancing social interactions (e.g., football coaches, family, girlfriend, college friends)</td>
<td>Balancing lesson planning and grading papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>Balancing his understandings of the general constructs of the academic classroom (e.g., lesson planning, grading, assessment, classroom management) and the socio-political culture of a public high school</td>
<td>Balancing coaching responsibilities with his need for mentoring/professional development in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several forms of conflict emerged during the first-year experiences of these teacher-coaches. First, interrole conflict, which will be discussed in further detail later in the chapter, was most noticeable in Charlotte who not only taught social science and coached basketball but also co-sponsored SGA. Because none of the three primary participants had overlapping coaching responsibilities, intra-role conflict (Drake & Hebert, 2002) was primarily apparent in the teaching context as Christopher struggled to balance planning and assessment as an English teacher while Bryant was forced to learn how to be a classroom teacher, faculty member, and student mentor at the same time. Finally, the notion of work-family conflict (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Sage, 1987) was evident in the cases of Charlotte and Christopher in particular as they struggled to be everything to everyone at home while managing long hours of academic teaching.
and athletic coaching. Consequently, the fatigue produced through the strain of balancing these conflicts led primary participants to approach teaching and coaching in very different ways.

**Teaching/Coaching Mentalities**

Another fascinating discovery from this study is the psychological impact of coaching on teaching in terms of the mentality that teacher-coaches bring with them to the classroom. Even more interesting is the difference between the mentality of Charlotte, a middle school basketball coach, and Christopher and Bryant, high school football coaches. While the small number of participants calls for further study regarding these various forms of coaching mentalities, the differences between Charlotte and Christopher/Bryant, particularly within their in-season and out-of-season mentalities, are striking to say the least.

According to Charlotte, coaching taught her to be more patient with her students: “I get so frustrated with basketball that it almost allows me to be more positive in the classroom when people do things they’re supposed to do.” Part of this recognition of her frustration in the coaching role has much to do with the challenge of coaching inexperienced basketball players who come to her with a limited skillset. Yet, there were times when the stress of coaching would also lead to increased personal frustration, such as when students would misbehave in the classroom or when parents would question her decisions during games. As a result, Charlotte cautions future teacher-coaches “[not to] do something that is going to completely change the way you want people to view you. That can happen quickly, and once you lose that reputation, it’s very hard to regain.”

Despite these occasional frustrations, Charlotte often used her coaching mentality to produce positive results in the classroom, or what numerous researchers in the fields of teaching and coaching have described as positive psychology (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Korthagen, 2004;
Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), which emphasizes character strengths even in moments without guarantees of future success (e.g., winning basketball games). For instance, Charlotte regularly makes comments such as “I will not allow anyone to fail this test,” and on one occasion, she even held an “anti-failing pep rally” for her students the day before a major assessment. These types of classroom comments are similar to her coaching style as she motivates her players to work hard defensively by yelling, “Hands up; never quit!”

However, the coaching mentality was not as positive for Christopher and Bryant, both of whom spoke of the intensity and anger of football, which is strikingly similar to the research connecting the game of football to the violence it promotes in adolescent males (Kreager, 2007). In fact, despite a winning season, the pressurized expectations of football seemed to negatively impact both Christopher and Bryant’s rapport with students in the academic classroom. Observations of these two teacher-coaches in the classroom and on the football field suggest that the disciplinarian approach commonly used in coaching student-athletes, especially those intrinsically motivated to perform at a high level, was not as effective for teaching students in standard education classes.

Once football season ended, Christopher and Bryant both acknowledged being more patient and less frustrated with minor behavioral issues, which drastically improved their classroom management and overall rapport with students. Nevertheless, the line between positive and negative teaching behaviors is rather fine. While a calmer demeanor in the classroom benefited Christopher in particular, Proctor’s principal has suggested that sometimes academic teachers need to be more demonstrative in their approaches to classroom management:

I think teachers could get fired up, jump up and down like coaches. Show some enthusiasm. Those athletes better not straggle up on a football field late for practice, or the basketball court. Teachers should demand the same thing with them coming in class. No excuses in athletics.
In terms of discipline, Proctor’s defensive coordinator believes that some students will respond well to harsh punishments, such as ones often associated with football. However, observations in this study clearly suggest that novice teachers lack the necessary understandings of when and how to effectively confront misbehaving students while managing the overall classroom dynamic (McCann & Johannessen, 2004). This was certainly the case for Christopher and Bryant whose primary form of discipline in the classroom was similar to the discipline found on the football field where coaches tried to maintain the dominant position at all costs.

**Connecting Social Positions**

**Interrole conflict.** Numerous studies have outlined the conflicts that can arise when educators take on multiple roles (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Hutchinson, 1993; Lawson, 1983b; Locke & Massengale, 1978; O’Connor & MacDonald, 2002; Sage, 1987). Similar to interrole conflict for physical educators, the greatest conflict for core content area teacher-coaches is found when coaching athletics gets in the way of preparation for academic teaching. This is not a new phenomenon for Christopher’s department chair, who has noticed this conflict in a number of teacher-coaches over the years. “Sometimes when [coaching] becomes extraordinarily demanding…they [teacher-coaches] have to balance their duties…which changes the teaching strategies. [It’s] not that the education is poor; it's just that you don't get to do some of the more…innovative things.”

Needless to say, there may be occasions—just as there were for the primary participants in this study—when the implementation of learner-centered teaching strategies takes a back seat to book work and worksheets due to the massive responsibility and subsequent fatigue of teaching and coaching during the athletic season. Christopher acknowledges this point in a
telling observation that outlines not only how the roles of teaching and coaching conflict but also how the stress of these multiple roles can affect the decision-making of novice educators.

Sometimes coaching can get in the way. And to be honest, sometimes teaching can get in the way. It becomes a problem sometimes because when it comes down to me being so tired that I can’t get in here and do this [lesson planning], or I’m tired so I’ll grade my papers tomorrow; kids need those grades back and that’s hurting them. Or maybe my lesson would have gone better if I had made that worksheet or that PowerPoint. Well, other stuff got in the way. I have another job to do [coaching], and I also teach class, but I have to do it a different way because in order for me to teach class, I’ve got to have this coaching job. In order for me to have this coaching job, I have to be here [teaching].

Christopher’s struggle with role stress seems to occur primarily during the athletic season. With this in mind, the question of whether interrole conflict is greater depending on whether coaches are in-season or out-of-season is important (Ryan, 2008). Based on these three cases of first-year teacher-coaches from core content areas, the answer seems to be affirmative that there is indeed more stress during the athletic season. However, this hypothesis must be qualified with the acknowledgement that Christopher and Bryant quickly moved into preparation for their respective spring sports soon after the football season was completed, leaving them with little time to garner an understanding of teaching in the absence of the coaching role. Charlotte’s out-of-season observations, on the other hand, took place prior to the start of her first athletic season. After basketball season ended, however, she confirmed that teaching was much less strenuous without the added strain of coaching basketball.

Interestingly, in-season coaching also had positive effects on teacher-coaches’ productivity and preparation for classroom teaching. Charlotte found that coaching actually increased her productivity during the school day because her multiple responsibilities kept her focused on managing time effectively while increasing her overall efficiency. She credits much of her in-season productivity to making sure her planning period always served its purpose.

“Very rarely do I catch myself on these rabbit trails or checking my personal e-mails or crossing
the halls to have a social conversation with a teacher,” she says. However, it is also important to note that this increased focus on productivity invites opportunities to encounter the isolation commonly found among first-year teacher-coaches (Pennington et al., 2004; Stroot et al., 1993; Stroot & Williamson, 1993), a trait more often observable in the coaching role for Charlotte and in the teaching role for Christopher and Bryant.

While Christopher’s social nature limited the likelihood of him being isolated in either the teaching or coaching role, he also made the connection between coaching and productivity as he was forced to utilize every available moment as an English teacher charged with grading countless essays. Bryant, on the other hand, worked diligently to increase his productivity, although not having a planning period meant less interaction with his fellow content area teachers and that more of his academic and athletic responsibilities had to be accomplished during class time (e.g., while students worked independently) or at home (e.g., nights and weekends). Nevertheless, what all three teacher-coaches have in common is a feeling of accomplishment during their athletic seasons. This general theme of increased productivity due to a heightened sense of urgency is just one finding that supports the notion that coaching may in fact serve as a complement to teaching.

**Interrole complementarity.** Interrole complementarity was first introduced by O’Connor & MacDonald (2002) and later connected to core content area teacher-coaches by Brown (in press-a). While the roles of academic teaching and athletic coaching are rarely synonymous outside of the sports- and health-related curriculums of physical education, many of the skills necessary for effective teaching and coaching are actually quite comparable. This point was confirmed by several of the experienced educators who served as secondary participants in this study. For example, similar to the findings of Wilson et al. (2010), the athletic director of
Proctor High School suggested that “teaching and coaching are very similar. You’re teaching individuals whether you’re in the classroom or on the field.” Proctor’s principal agreed: “A coach’s pedagogy is probably more sound than an average classroom teacher’s. Coaches want to see that something is done right….They practice it over and over and over….And sometimes [classroom] teachers forget to do that.”

Many of the lessons learned by the primary participants in this study take place across the academic and athletic boundaries. While Proctor’s principal acknowledged that “teachers could learn a lot from coaches,” this study bares witness to the fact that the primary participants did indeed learn a lot about teaching from coaching and vice versa. In particular, the defensive coordinator mentioned just how crucial becoming savvier with classroom management was for Christopher and Bryant. In particular, he believes these two teacher-coaches learned a lot about managing a classroom from learning how to manage football practices. He also remarked that the coaching role teaches novices how to effectively manage class time while being flexible enough to adjust their plans as necessary.

On the other end of the spectrum, Christopher mentioned learning a lot about motivating players on the football field as a result of his interactions with students in the classroom (i.e., providing individualized instruction and continuous feedback). Based on a semester’s worth of observations, the following practices (see Tables 11 and 12) stood out after observing teacher-coaches in the academic and athletic contexts. These practices reflect potential lessons that novice teachers can learn from coaches and vice versa (for more on the lessons teachers and mentors can learn from coaches, see Gallimore & Tharp, 2004; Shulman, 2008).
Table 11

*Lessons Learned about Effective Teaching from Coaching*

| Keep the class moving at a brisk pace |
| Establish routines |
| Provide structure |
| Start class immediately |
| Hold students accountable |
| Incorporate learning stations |
| Engage in constant interaction with students |
| Assess student learning on a regular basis |
| Utilize video reflection |

Table 12

*Lessons Learned about Effective Coaching from Teaching*

| Recognize diverse learning styles |
| Connect diverse learning styles to various methods of instruction |
| Offer positive feedback as well as constructive criticism |
| Model effective practices/appropriate behaviors |
| Engage students in structured group interactions |
| Teach communication techniques |
| Utilize higher order, reflective questioning |
| Encourage students to think critically about their own experiences |
| Create various forms of assessment |

**Interrole symbiosis.** For teaching and coaching to truly complement one another, the relationship must move beyond these mere roles to reflect the larger social positions from which they are a part. It was with this in mind that the Sizemore principal said, “It's hard to underestimate the power of connecting with students outside the classroom and carrying that
Christopher’s department chair agreed with this sentiment, suggesting that getting involved in extracurricular activities can help orient first-year teachers to the overall school culture, which can positively affect their interactions with students and faculty alike. In Christopher’s words, the relationship between these two social positions “can sometimes be great; it can [sometimes] be symbiotic.”

Symbiosis can have multiple meanings depending on the field of study, although it is generally defined as a close association of two or more distinct social positions (e.g., teaching and coaching) that are mutually beneficial to one another. In biology, symbiosis occurs when two dissimilar organisms live together in close proximity. In psychiatry, symbiosis involves a dependent relationship between two people, both of whom can serve to reinforce one another beneficially or detrimentally. Based on the phenomenon of first-year teacher-coaches from core content areas as described in this study, the term interrole symbiosis has been coined and applied to an adaptation of Sage’s (1987) framework (see Appendix A) that was originally created to illustrate how interrole conflict can affect the social positions of teacher-coaches.

For this adaptation of Sage’s framework, the primary alteration has been to address the possibility of interrole complementarity among the social positions of teaching and coaching. Within this collective case study, interrole complementarity was most noticeable in the case of Charlotte, the teacher-coach most able to maintain a mixed teaching/coaching orientation throughout her first semester as an educator. Her ability to balance these multiple roles comes in direct contrast to the general perception of social science teacher-coaches as poor academic teachers.
Disposition

Perception. The common perception of teacher-coaches outside of physical education is that they are often found in the content area of social science and have considerable coaching orientations (Brown, in press-a; Chiodo et al., 2002; Hill, 1997; Weller, 2002; Young, 2007). Recent survey data from Brown and Sieben (2012a) supports this notion that preservice teachers in social science are the likeliest core content area teachers to engage in athletic coaching, although future research on this topic should look more specifically at the influence of orientation. Interestingly, while Charlotte went through her professional socialization with the preconceived notion that social science teachers, particularly males, enter teacher education programs with coaching orientations, her mixed teaching/coaching orientation demonstrates the potential for teacher-coaches from the social science content area to be identified as effective classroom teachers.

The negative stereotype of a male social science teacher-coach is a struggle Christopher and Bryant’s defensive coordinator, a social science teacher himself, faces on a daily basis: “[The perception is] this guy’s a coach. He comes in here, here’s a worksheet; here’s a book; do the vocabulary; turn it in; we’ll have a test in two weeks. That’s the perception of a coach.” While Brown and Sieben (2012a) did find a significant relationship between the male gender and interest in coaching athletics, Christopher and Bryant’s cases demonstrate that many factors (e.g., socialization, opportunity, induction) must first be considered before tying coaches, regardless of gender or content area, to teaching and coaching orientations.

Orientation. Teaching and coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson 1983a, 1983b) have been discussed primarily in relation to physical education teacher-coaches. While Christopher (teaching orientation) and Bryant (coaching orientation) both take the roles of
teaching and coaching seriously and devote significant time to each role, their orientations do reflect their initial motivations for entering the field of education. The same can be said for Charlotte, whose acculturative experiences as well as her professional socialization paved the way for a mixed teaching/coaching orientation. While Charlotte’s orientation also suggests that educators with mixed teaching/coaching orientations may be better able to balance these two roles over time, this consideration is more likely a symbol for the quality, not the quantity, of time focused on each particular role.

One indication of the general orientation of each of these primary participants is the physical environment of their classrooms. Reflecting Charlotte’s teaching/coaching orientation, the walls of her classroom are covered with student work while the floor in the back part of the room is filled with basketball equipment. Although her balance would certainly be improved through acquiring a separate space for her coaching supplies, it is clear that she never loses sight of either role. Christopher’s walls similarly characterize his general teaching orientation as they primarily contain posters from literature (e.g., quotations from famous authors and poets) and education (e.g., school policies and procedures). While a few small science posters hang from Bryant’s wall, his classroom environment stands mostly barren, which underscores his view of the academic classroom as more of a home away from his coaching home.

One of the most important factors influencing the primary participants’ orientations is apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). Ironically, how these three teacher-coaches were taught during their acculturative experiences in education seemed to have a lesser impact on orientation than did their perceptions of how effectively they felt they were taught. The positive perceptions each teacher-coach held often highlighted academic teachers and athletic coaches who appealed to their preferred learning styles. In the classroom, apprenticeship via secondary
and university educators was evident in the preferred teaching strategies of all three primary participants: Charlotte (learner-centered pedagogical approaches), Christopher (whole-class discussion), and Bryant (lecture/notes).

In their respective athletic venues, apprenticeship of observation was more fluid. For Charlotte, her lack of mentoring and preparation for the coaching role forced her to rely on her own past experiences as a high school basketball player. This was compounded by not having the opportunity to serve as an assistant coach, which would also be considered an apprenticeship of sorts (Sage, 1989). Christopher had no prior experience with football, so his apprenticeship took the form of on-the-job training through his observation of colleagues’ routines. Bryant, who came into coaching with a year of volunteer experience, worked to blend his previous coaching experience into a new system. All-in-all, the three primary participants were forced to pick up bits and pieces of knowledge required of athletic coaches while relying on lessons from whatever past and present experiences they could muster to support their overall induction into coaching.

The other major factor influencing orientation was the timing of the athletic seasons. Christopher and Bryant were first socialized into the social environment of Proctor High School through its summer football workouts. In contrast, Charlotte was able to establish a teaching foundation prior to taking part in the coaching role. Whereas Charlotte had the opportunity to focus on academic teaching from the outset, Christopher and Bryant began their educational careers as football coaches. While such an initiation never swayed Christopher’s passion for teaching, and thus his overall teaching orientation, the initial focus on football seemed to strengthen Bryant’s coaching orientation. However, had the school year started with soccer (Christopher) and softball (Bryant), it is possible that these orientations would have looked
markedly different, which might have drastically affected how these educators identified themselves and were identified by other educational stakeholders in the roles of teaching and coaching.

**Identity.** As previously mentioned by Brown (in press-a) whose primary participant’s wardrobe seemed to reflect her general orientation, something as simple as clothing can provide a lens for viewing how educators identify themselves in certain roles. Christopher spoke to this point by suggesting that identities may be altered as quickly as Clark Kent transforms himself into Superman:

> For the most part, when I'm in school, I am one hundred percent teacher mode. And then when I go out on the [football] field, when I take off my button-up, and I put on my shorts and my dry-fit or whatever, I go out there, and I'm coach. It's not English class anymore. You know, I don't talk the same way....It's almost like I went into the telephone booth and switched identities. It's not necessarily that I got any better, but I just switched identities.

All three coaches in this study were used to changing quickly from their teaching to coaching attire in the bathroom of a nearby teacher workroom or a corner of a coaching office. With this in mind, one central question that emerged early in the study was whether or not these teacher-coaches viewed one particular role as more important and, if so, did they personify this preference in some form or fashion?

For Charlotte, the majority of her coaching experience—practices and games—was spent in the same clothing she wore during the school day, thus promoting an aura of expertise befitting a professional educator, albeit one who is as confident in the classroom as on the basketball court. Christopher was the most at ease in his combination of teaching and coaching attire as he would seamlessly transition from one professional identity to the other on a daily basis. While his orientation leant itself to academic teaching and his mentality often swayed towards athletic coaching, Christopher generally seemed the most comfortable in both the
button-up (teaching) and dry-fit (coaching) shirts. On the other hand, perhaps due to his lack of preparation for the teaching role or the challenge of adapting to the expectations of secondary education, Bryant’s classroom demeanor gave the impression of a caged animal just waiting to be let loose. With his khaki pants and collared shirts mirroring what he wore to Friday night football games, Bryant clearly identified with the coaching role despite his best efforts in academic teaching.

Based on the diverse nature of these identities and the understanding that teaching and coaching are both crucial to academic and athletic success, one of the more significant possibilities to emerge from this study is the need for a transformative identity that presupposes value in the roles of academic teaching and athletic coaching while connecting any mutually beneficial traits across multiple contexts. This conception of a transformative identity was first developed during the aforementioned single-case study of a core content area teacher-coach (Brown, in press) and later fleshed out during conversations with Charlotte’s principal. In a similar vein to the old adage that teachers must prepare to wear many hats in the secondary school setting (e.g., advisor, counselor, disciplinarian, motivator), findings from this study confirm that separate identities may exist within distinct social positions (e.g., teachers, coaches; see Sage, 1987) or they may merge to create a more unified persona. Ultimately, these identities may or may not reflect the actual orientations of teacher-coaches.

For example, despite the general consensus of Charlotte’s teaching/coaching orientation from other educational stakeholders, her principal was the first to suggest that she might actually have a teaching orientation simply because teaching was her primary focus in both the academic and athletic settings. In considering this possibility, it became clear that orientations can be viewed through multiple lenses and may be affected by diverse experiences (e.g., socialization,
motivation, perception), all of which can alter the landscape of an individual’s identity. As a result, how teacher-coaches self-identify their own orientations may differ drastically from an outsider’s view of their physical interactions within individual roles.

Alsup’s (2006) notion of a borderland paints a fitting portrait of this intersection, especially given the personal struggles of identity described by Feiman-Nemser (2003). Needless to say, such a space can be difficult to navigate considering the gravitational pull from each role. Yet, this same struggle to obtain balance may also offer teacher-coaches the opportunity to bring together these multiple identities into a single transformative identity that views teaching and coaching as central components of the learning that takes place in both the academic and athletic environments of secondary schools. This was seconded by Charlotte’s principal, who suggested that “there shouldn’t be a line between athletics and academics. We should see them as two parts of the same thing…school.” He went on to say that “when you see them [athletics and academics] as intrical to each other, each [one] strengthens the other.”

For academic teaching and athletic coaching to be seen as two parts of the educational process of secondary students, the perception of teacher-coaches must begin to reflect only the most effective educators who value learning in diverse contexts and successfully utilize aspects of teaching and coaching in the academic and athletic environments. For this shift to occur, a redefinition of the classic identities of teaching and coaching must begin to take form, and a newfound expectation that teacher-coaches should be well-prepared to tackle both roles must become the norm. Table 13 offers a glimpse into how such a redefinition might appear.
Table 13

*Transformative Identities Connecting Academics and Athletics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classic Identity</th>
<th>Transformative Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Educational institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic classroom/Athletic venue</td>
<td>Learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content area/Sport</td>
<td>Subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Coach</td>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Athlete</td>
<td>Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test scores/Winning percentages</td>
<td>Byproducts of effective teaching, learning, and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basic premise behind the transformation of a teacher-coach into an educator is that learning the subject matter is the primary goal of students in all educational environments (e.g., academics, athletics). Achieving this goal of transformation would be the first step towards making test scores and winning percentages merely byproducts of effective teaching, learning, and development. However, this transformation would also necessitate a number of changes not only in how teacher-coaches are prepared for and inducted into secondary education but also how academics and athletics are viewed in middle and high schools across the country.

**Implications**

Findings from this collective case study have implications for the following groups: teacher education programs, nontraditional alternative certification programs, coaching education programs, and academic and athletic programs in secondary schools. These implications are described in the following sections.
**Preparation Programs**

**Teacher education programs.** Teacher education programs are charged with the difficult task of preparing preservice teachers for the multiple realities they will face in the classroom environment (Brown, 2010). However, it is less clear who will prepare future educators for the numerous responsibilities they will face outside of classroom teaching, particularly if future teachers rarely see teacher educators with diverse orientations themselves (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Such roles may include coaching athletics, sponsoring clubs, interacting with parents and colleagues, counseling and advising students, and balancing personal and professional obligations. As a result, teacher education programs might begin to consider opportunities for allowing students to take elective coursework relative to their own acculturative or extracurricular interests. For students interested in athletic coaching, this additional coursework might include kinesiology courses. For students interested in student government, this might include civics courses. For students considering starting a book club, this might entail young adult literature courses. Certainly, even for students who do not harbor these specific interests, it would be advantageous for them to consider how additional coursework in these areas as well as numerous others (e.g., counseling, special education, English as a second language) might make them better prepared for future employment and more marketable to future employers.

This approach for pushing students toward elective coursework related to their own extracurricular interests would not only support first-year teacher-coaches during their induction stage of organizational socialization but also help curb teacher attrition that is currently plaguing the educational system in the United States (see Darling-Hammond, 2003; Gold, 1996; Scherff, 2008; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004) by reducing the reality shock (Bullough, 1989; Lortie, 1975;
Veenman, 1984) and the initial burnout (Bullough, 1989; Drake & Hebert, 2002) of novice educators. This approach might also help teacher education programs compete with nontraditional alternative certification programs in recruiting students who are typically underrepresented in public education: candidates with teaching/coaching orientations, minority candidates, candidates willing to teach in high-need schools, candidates interested in math and science, and female candidates interested in coaching (see Brown, in press-b).

Nontraditional alternative certification programs. Bryant’s experience as a first-year teacher-coach in a nontraditional alternative certification program offers a glimpse into the challenges inherent in walking into a classroom without any preparation for the teaching role (Darling-Hammond, 2003, 2010). Aspects of teacher education that would have been beneficial for Bryant include understanding diverse learning styles, planning classroom lessons, providing alternative assessments, and implementing classroom management strategies. Although Bryant’s teaching practices did improve over the course of the semester, the deficit from which he started, compounded by his general coaching orientation and his lack of a planning period, made it even more challenging for him to engage students in the curriculum. While one could criticize Bryant for not starting the education courses required for certification during his first semester of teaching, it is important to remember that he was hired based on his ability to teach science and coach football. This combination of responsibilities left him little time or energy to pursue other avenues. In his second semester, the coaching orientation fostered during football season seemed to be the culprit for not pursuing his required education courses. As a result, Bryant was forced to rely on past educational experiences to guide him through his first year of teaching and coaching.
**Coaching education programs.** Apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) was also prevalent in the coaching role as Charlotte and Christopher had relatively few opportunities to learn about athletic coaching within their teacher education programs. For Christopher and Bryant, the grueling nature of their inservice schedules also offered little time for professional development. Although Charlotte attended numerous meetings of a teacher-coach focus group and had a few volunteer coaching experiences during her student teaching placement, and while Bryant had a full season of coaching experience under his belt prior to his first year of teaching, the bulk of the coaching development for all three teacher-coaches was the result of on-the-job training.

With few exceptions (e.g., Christopher’s background in strength training), none of the three teacher-coaches had extensive knowledge of the eight domains of coaching outlined in the national standards for sports coaches: philosophy and ethics, safety and injury prevention, physical conditioning, growth and development, teaching and communication, sport skills and tactics, organization and administration, and evaluation (NASPE, 2006). While numerous studies have mentioned that coaching education programs may only play a minimal role in overall preparation of athletic coaches (Gilbert, Côté, & Mallett, 2006; McCullick et al., 2005; Trudel et al., 2010), some experience is generally better than no experience, particularly for preservice teacher-coaches outside of physical education who may rarely know about opportunities to increase their knowledge of coaching.

As previously mentioned, the separation between university teacher education programs and coaching education programs may further divide the roles of teaching and coaching (Jones, 2006) in secondary schools by creating an atmosphere that is unconducive for establishing a shared technical culture (Lortie, 1975) among teacher-coaches. One possible solution to this
dilemma is the establishment of a teacher-coach education program (see Brown, in press-b), even if such a program merely consists of teacher education programs allowing interested preservice teachers in core content areas to sign up for classes or attend seminars in departments such as health, human performance, kinesiology, leisure studies, physical education, or recreation. Ultimately, this connection between teacher education and coaching education may go a long way towards bridging the gap between academic and athletic programs in secondary schools without decreasing the actual focus on teaching and learning in the academic classroom.

**Academic and Athletic Programs in Secondary Schools**

The role of sports in secondary schools has increased to the point where many middle schools and high schools are commonly known more for athletic success than academic prowess. While Christopher and Bryant both mentioned the pride they took from teaching at a school with a good academic reputation and multiple National Merit Scholars, Christopher has begun to recognize the conflict that many schools are currently facing regarding the roles of academics and athletics:

> It’s not necessarily that sports are what the school is centered around; it’s more that sports have now become this thing that your intellectuals, your valedictorians, your salutatorians don’t do. It’s the things…that the C student does or the B student does or even the D or F student does. And it’s because…they’re not excelling at school, so they’re going to excel on the field or on the court. I think a lot of times, unfortunately, sports serve as a way out…That’s great that we have a kid who works hard in academics and then goes to sports and finds something he can excel at because honestly everyone needs something they can excel at. But, it’s also sad that sometimes you have the kid who sits there with his head down because he knows that he’ll get passed, or he’ll go to credit recovery [to stay eligible], and he’s going to be allowed on the field on Friday night. That’s the sad part, and I feel that sometimes that’s the role of sports [in secondary schools], and I don’t feel like it should be. I feel like it should be an extracurricular activity.

Whether interscholastic sports have surpassed their rightful place as an extracurricular activity and exceeded their authority in the social culture of schools is certainly beyond the scope
of this study, although future researchers would do well to consider this point specifically. What should be noted is that while a percentage of non-coaching teachers and educational stakeholders bemoan the fact that some teacher-coaches pay more attention to athletics than academics, the reality that athletic coaching offers a more publicly scrutinized evaluation process and a much higher level of time commitment than classroom teaching alone—particularly in high revenue sports such as basketball and football—cannot help but add pressure to the coaching role. The Proctor High School principal echoes this sentiment by acknowledging that coaching requires much more than it has in years past: “These coaches are breaking down film on Saturday mornings; Sundays [are spent] watching film. They don't have a lot of time for themselves, but they knew that coming in. They signed up for it.”

However, while the three primary participants in this study all entered the profession with an interest in coaching at least one of their assigned sports (e.g., Christopher was interested in coaching soccer and willing to coach football to get a teaching position), secondary schools must begin to consider the potentially damaging impact of hiring teachers with coaching orientations or requiring teachers with teaching orientations to coach athletics. This is not to say that educators without a mixed orientation should not be hired; on the contrary, induction programs must begin searching for additional approaches for providing mentoring, professional development, time for planning, access to resources, and opportunities for reflection for the diverse roles required of novice teacher-coaches in core content areas.

In the twenty-first century, coaching athletics has become a primary role in secondary schools, as Bryant’s department chair can attest: “It’s a double whammy. If you say you’re not going to [coach], you’re probably not going to get the [teaching] job….That’s the way education is.” Ultimately, this truism may necessitate that school systems and administrators reconsider
the emphasis placed on athletics. After all, as interscholastic sports continue to gain popularity, the divide between academics and athletics has the potential to grow wider over time, particularly if schools cannot attract more educators with mixed teaching/coaching orientations who are willing to help student-athletes balance their own academic and athletic orientations. In the end, Charlotte’s principal said it best: “Athletics as an institution has to understand that it is irreplaceable and invaluable as part of the culture of the school….But, it can never supersede the importance of why we’re here [to teach academics].” Nowhere is this more apparent than in core content areas where students’ academic growth may well rest in the hands of teacher-coaches. We can only hope these hands are not too busy drawing up offensive formations or defensive schemes to plan lessons and grade papers, tasks that are necessary for promoting student learning and engagement in the academic classroom.

Future Research

Due to the limited nature of research on core content area teachers/athletic coaches, educational researchers should consider future studies in several diverse areas. For instance, the potential for teacher education programs to combine with coaching education programs to offer opportunities for future educators interested in the roles of teaching and coaching, which has been discussed in Brown (in press-b), deserves further exploration. Also mentioned in Brown (in press-b) is the potential for sports to attract highly motivated educators into the profession. Thus, looking at how teacher education programs and nontraditional alternative certification programs identify and recruit future teacher-coaches also has merit given the current organizational needs of secondary schools.

While this study was focused on first-year teacher-coaches from core content areas, case studies or ethnographies of teacher-coaches from other demographics would also be worthwhile.
For instance, studies of novice teacher-coaches in other environments (e.g., urban, rural), of other races (i.e., the three primary participants in this study were all white), in sports outside of basketball and football (e.g., soccer, softball), in other content areas (e.g., math, foreign language), and in other professional roles (e.g., administrators, special educators) should all be considered. Due to the brief nature of this study (i.e., a single semester), ethnographic studies spanning longer periods of time would be beneficial. Researchers may also want to consider the addition of students, student-athletes, parents, and spouses to future research.

Within secondary schools, the processes of hiring and terminating teacher-coaches in core content areas as well as the impact of mentoring and induction on novice teacher-coaches warrants further examination. Future research may also take into account comparisons to teachers who sponsor other extracurricular activities (e.g., school clubs). Finally, quantitative research should be considered for measuring interrole symbiosis, burnout, and attrition of past and present teacher-coaches.

**Conclusion**

The findings of this multiple-case study confirm that while the expectations of coaching may not always have positive effects on the preparation and implementation necessary within the teaching role, there are multiple factors outside of coaching (e.g., testing, committee work, paperwork, other extracurricular responsibilities) that may also lead to interrole conflict. More importantly, the social positions of teaching and coaching may also serve to complement one another in a relatively symbiotic relationship that promotes increased motivation and productivity, greater rapport with students, further interaction with parents, and professional engagement in the multiple roles commonly found in successful secondary schools.
When asked about advice for future teacher-coaches in core content areas, Charlotte replied, “Don’t lose yourself in the titles and the responsibilities [of teaching and coaching].” Indeed, no matter which roles educators undertake in secondary schools, they must always remember that they are educators first and foremost. This may come more naturally for individuals with mixed teaching/coaching orientations who strive to be identified as effective facilitators of academic and athletic knowledge, although teacher educators and school administrators also have a responsibility to help ensure that all positions in secondary schools are filled with competent and skillful practitioners. In the end, schools need teachers and coaches to be good at what they do, and what they need educators to do is engage students in learning, teach them the skills and concepts necessary for future success, and coach them up to be their very best. No matter how you define effectiveness, the formula likely applies to both academics and athletics.
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Principal's Name
Title
Name of School

Dear Principal’s Name:

My name is Alan Brown, and I am doctoral student at The University of Alabama. As part of my dissertation research, I would like to conduct a case study of teacher’s name of school name during the fall semester of the 2011-2012 school year. My primary objective is to describe the lived experiences of a novice educator who teaches in a core content area and who coaches one or more athletic teams. Teacher’s name fits each of these criteria (teaching content area and coaching athletic team), and he/she has expressed a willingness to participate in this study.

This research will fill a void in the existing literature concerning the actual experiences of core content area teachers/athletic coaches. The hope is that this study will also provide an understanding of (1) how teacher-coaches become socialized into the profession; (2) how the perceptions of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches’ professional experiences; (3) how the relationships between the roles of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches’ professional experiences; and (4) how the daily experiences of teaching and coaching influence teacher-coaches’ identities as educators.

Four sources of data will be utilized: participant interviews, teaching and coaching observations, journals, and artifact analysis. The primary participant in the study, teacher’s name, will be interviewed and observed in the acts of teaching and coaching throughout the semester. To better understand the expectations of the teaching and coaching roles and to help ensure trustworthiness, I would like to request that interviews (n = 3) take place with three secondary participants: you (the principal), a department chair or mentor, and an athletic director or head coach. These interviews will take place in early August, mid-October, and early January. All participants will be invited to participate in the member checking of interview transcriptions and during the data analysis and editing phases.

Teacher’s name will be asked to maintain a brief weekly journal using one of the following journaling methods: microblogging, e-mail messaging, Facebook messaging, blog/wiki messaging, or a written journal. Artifact analysis will be used to enhance, support, and/or refute data analysis from interviews and observations. Artifacts will include journals, unit plans, lesson plans, practice and game coaching plans, teaching and coaching evaluations, information from the school’s web site, and other relevant information. Artifacts will only be reviewed with the consent of all associated participants.

This study will officially conclude at the end of the fall semester, although member checking and any necessary follow-up questions may not conclude until early in the spring semester. Participation is completely voluntary, and information about the study, as well as
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issues of confidentiality and privacy, will be provided in the attached consent forms all participants will be asked to sign. Furthermore, participants have the right to withdraw their participation at any time without penalty. Permission to undertake this study has been obtained from the University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (IRB) and will further be obtained from your school system and all primary and secondary participants.

The only conceivable risk associated with this study is that conflicting viewpoints or critical feedback from participants during member-checking could cause distress. If at any time the researcher perceives this study to have any detrimental effects on participants or causes a conflict of interest in any way, the case study will be discontinued immediately. Otherwise, there are no foreseeable risks for participants in this study. Pseudonyms will be used for all schools and participants to protect their identities. The school itself will only be identified by its general location—a middle/high school in the southeastern United States—and general demographic information gleaned from the state department of education.

Although students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents will be present during observations, and while their interactions with the teacher-coach will be observed, these educational stakeholders will not be the focus of any case study, any further research, or any resulting publications, nor will these individuals ever be personally identified. Interactions with students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents will be limited to observations (which will be recorded solely through the researcher’s written field notes). These individuals will not take part in any interviews, nor will they be audio-taped. Furthermore, student work is not considered an artifact in this study.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the following e-mail address: mabrown5@crimson.ua.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor for this study, Dr. Liza Wilson at ewilson@bama.ua.edu, or Ms. Testa Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at 205-348-8461 or toll free at 1-877-827-3066. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Alan Brown
Doctoral Student
The University of Alabama

I have read this letter. I have had a chance to ask questions, and my questions have been answered. I give permission to conduct this study.
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Dear Superintendent's Name:

My name is Alan Brown, and I am doctoral student at The University of Alabama. As part of my dissertation research, I would like to conduct a case study of teacher's name of school name during the fall semester of the 2011-2012 school year. My primary objective is to describe the lived experiences of a novice educator who teaches in a core content area and who coaches one or more athletic teams. Teacher's name fits each of these criteria (teaching content area and coaching athletic team), and he/she has expressed a willingness to participate in this study.

This research will fill a void in the existing literature concerning the actual experiences of core content area teachers/athletic coaches. The hope is that this study will also provide an understanding of (1) how teacher-coaches become socialized into the profession; (2) how the perceptions of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches' professional experiences; (3) how the relationships between the roles of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches' professional experiences; and (4) how the daily experiences of teaching and coaching influence teachers-coaches' identities as educators.

Four sources of data will be utilized: participant interviews, teaching and coaching observations, journals, and artifact analysis. The primary participant in the study, teacher's name, will be interviewed and observed in the acts of teaching and coaching throughout the semester. To better understand the expectations of the teaching and coaching roles and to help ensure trustworthiness, I would like to request that interviews (n = 3) take place with three secondary participants: the principal, a department chair or mentor, and an athletic director or head coach. These interviews will take place in Early August, mid-October, and early January. All participants will be invited to participate in the member checking of interview transcriptions and during the data analysis and editing phases.

Teacher's name will be asked to maintain a brief weekly journal using one of the following journaling methods: microsharing, e-mail messaging, Facebook messaging, blog/wiki messaging, or a written journal. Artifact analysis will be used to enhance, support, and/or refute data analysis from interviews and observations. Artifacts will include journals, unit plans, lesson plans, practice and game coaching plans, teaching and coaching evaluations, information from the school's web site, and other relevant information. Artifacts will only be reviewed with the consent of all associated participants.

This study will officially conclude at the end of the fall semester, although member checking and any necessary follow-up questions may not conclude until early in the spring semester. Participation is completely voluntary, and information about the study, as well as issues of confidentiality and privacy, will be provided in the attached consent forms all participants will be asked to sign. Furthermore, participants have the right to withdraw their
participation at any time without penalty. Permission to undertake this study has been obtained from The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (IRB) and will further be obtained from all primary and secondary participants.

The only conceivable risk associated with this study is that conflicting viewpoints or critical feedback from participants during member-checking could cause distrust. If at any time the researcher perceives the study to have any detrimental effects on participants or causes a conflict of interest in any way, the case study will be discontinued immediately. Otherwise, there are no foreseeable risks for participants in this study. Pseudonyms will be used for all schools and participants to protect their identities. The school itself will only be identified by its general location—a middle/high school in the southeastern United States—and general demographic information gleaned from the state department of education.

Although students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents will be present during observations, and while their interactions with the teacher-coach will be observed, these educational stakeholders will not be the focus of any case study, any further research, or any resulting publications, nor will these individuals ever be personally identified. Interactions with students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents will be limited to observations (which will be recorded solely through the researcher’s written field notes). These individuals will not take part in any interviews, nor will they be audio-taped. Furthermore, student work is not considered an artifact in this study.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the following e-mail address: nabrown@crimson.ua.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor for this study, Dr. Liza Wilson at ewilson@bama.ua.edu, or Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at 205-348-8461 or toll free at 1-877-820-3066. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Alan Brown
Doctoral Student
The University of Alabama

I have read this letter. I have had a chance to ask questions, and my questions have been answered. I give permission to conduct this study.

__________________________ Date
Signature of Superintendent

__________________________ Date
Signature of Investigator

LA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 7/13/11
Expiration date: 7/13/12
Appendix C
Consent Forms

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM

Consent to Take Part in a Research Study

You are being asked to be in a research study.

The name of this study is

The occupational socialization of novice, core content area teachers/athletic coaches

This study is being done by

Alan Brown
Doctoral Student
The University of Alabama
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

What is the purpose of this study—what is it trying to learn?

The primary objective of this study is to describe the lived experiences of novice educators who teach in core content areas and who coach one or more athletic teams.

Why this is study important—what good will the results do?

This research will fill a void in the existing literature concerning the actual experiences of core content area teachers/athletic coaches. The hope is that this study will also provide an understanding of (1) how teacher-coaches become socialized into the profession; (2) how the perceptions of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches' professional experiences; (3) how the relationships between the roles of teaching and coaching affect teacher-coaches professional experiences; and (4) how the daily experiences of teaching and coaching influence teacher-coaches' identities as educators.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?

You have been asked to participate in this study because you are a novice teacher-coach or a principal, department chair/mentor, or athletic director/head coach who works with a novice teacher-coach that has been invited to take part in this study.

Prospect Initials ___________
How many other people will be in this study?

Teacher-coaches from local secondary schools are the primary participants in this study. There will be a total of three secondary participants for each teacher-coach (primary participants): a principal, a department chair/mentor, and an athletic director/head coach.

Although students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents will be present during observations, and while their interactions with the teacher-coach will be observed, these educational stakeholders will not be the focus of any case study, any further research, or any resulting publications, nor will these individuals ever be personally identified. Interactions with students, student-athletes, faculty members, and parents will be limited to observations (which will be recorded solely through the researcher’s written field notes). These individuals will not take part in any interviews, nor will they be audio-taped. Furthermore, student work is not considered an artifact in this study.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

Four sources of data will be utilized: participant interviews, teaching and coaching observations, journals, and artifact analysis. The primary participant will be interviewed and observed in the acts of teaching and coaching throughout the study (minimum of eight occasions).

To better understand the expectations of the teaching and coaching roles and to help ensure trustworthiness, interviews will also take place with three secondary participants for each primary participant: a principal, a department chair or mentor, and an athletic director or head coach. All participants will be invited to participate in the member checking of interview transcriptions and during the data analysis and editing phases. Below is the tentative schedule for interviews and observations:

- Formally interview each primary participant:
  - Early August (Topic: Biographical Information, Acculturation, Orientation Scales)
  - Mid-September (Topic: Professional Socialization, Orientation Scale)
  - Late October (Topic: Organizational Socialization, Orientation Scale)
  - Early December (Topic: Organizational Socialization, Orientation Scale)
  - Early January (Topic: Review of Research Questions, Orientation Scale)

- Observe each primary participant teaching/coaching (at least once during the following time periods):
  - Late August, early September, late September, early October, late October, early November, late November, and early December.
Interview each principal, department chair/mentor, athletic director/head coach

- Early August (Topic: Biographical Information)
- Mid-October (Topic: Organizational Socialization of teacher-coach)
- Early January (Topic: Organizational Socialization of teacher-coach)

The primary participant will be asked to maintain a brief weekly journal using one of the following journaling methods: microsharing, e-mail messaging, Facebook messaging, blog/wiki messaging, or a written journal. Artifact analysis will be used to enhance, support, and/or refute data analysis from interviews and observations. Artifacts will include journals, unit plans, lesson plans, practice and game coaching plans, teaching and coaching evaluations, information from the school's website, and other relevant information. Artifacts will only be reviewed with the consent of all associated participants.

How much time will I spend being in this study?

This study will officially conclude at the end of the fall semester, although member checking and any necessary follow-up questions may not conclude until early in the spring semester.

Interviews of primary participants will generally take place during the teacher-coach's planning period or after school. Each interview will consist of two parts. First, each of four formal interviews will have a structured aspect: biographical information, acculturation, professional socialization, organizational socialization, and teaching/coaching orientation scales (1-10 scales used to demonstrate whether the teacher-coach feels more oriented towards teaching or coaching at a particular moment in time). Second, each interview will include guided conversations, which will be driven by the data analysis of previous observations, interviews, and artifacts. Interviews will last approximately forty-five minutes to an hour and will be audio-taped and later transcribed.

Interviews will also be conducted with three secondary participants for each primary participant: principal, department chair/mentor, and athletic director/head coach. Similar to the interviews with primary participants, interviews with secondary participants will be audio-taped and later transcribed. Interviews will include discussions pertaining to, but not limited to, biographical information, the organizational socialization of the teacher-coach, and data analysis of observations and artifacts.

Informal discussions involving primary and secondary participants will also be utilized as a less-structured type of interview. These discussions will be documented in the form of jottings and will be transcribed later in more detail in the form of in-process memos.
Direct observations of each teacher-coach will take place on a minimum of eight occasions within the school setting and at various athletic venues (e.g., fields, gyms). Observations will include the instructional day (e.g., teaching, planning, and other duties) as well as extracurricular activities (e.g., practices, games, study halls, team meetings). A minimum of two hours per teaching and coaching role will be observed per observational period, and observations will usually take place on the same day. The researcher reserves the right to divide up teaching and coaching observations depending on the availability of both the researcher and primary participants.

**Will being in this study cost me anything?**

This study will not cost you anything except the time you spend being interviewed. The primary participants will also spend a short amount of time each week engaged in journalling.

**What are the benefits of my being in this study?**

There are no specific benefits for taking part in this study.

The significance of this study is that it provides a lens through which to view the development of individuals who take on the roles of teachers and coaches in hopes of better informing not only current and future preservice teachers interested in these multiple roles, but also the institutions who prepare them and the school systems who employ them.

In general, this study intends to contribute to the field of educational research by offering a better understanding of the experiences of novice educators who teach in core content areas and who coach athletic teams. This information has the potential to inform future teacher-coaches about the responsibilities and challenges of each role, thereby making them more effective as both teachers and coaches.

**What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?**

The only conceivable risk associated with this study is that conflicting viewpoints or critical feedback from participants during member-checking could cause distrust. If at any time the researcher perceives the study to have any detrimental effects on participants or causes a conflict of interest in any way, the case study will be discontinued immediately. Otherwise, there are no foreseeable risks for participants in this study. Pseudonyms will be used for all schools and participants to protect their identities. The school itself will only be identified by its general location—a middle/high school in the southeastern United States—and general demographic information gleaned from the state department of education.
How will my privacy and confidentiality be protected?

The privacy and confidentiality of all participants will be protected in several ways. Consent forms, transcriptions, field notes, copies of artifacts, and other relevant paperwork will be safely secured in a locked file in the researcher’s home. All audio tapes will be deleted immediately after transcription, and transcribed data will be kept on the home computer of the primary investigator, which remains locked when not in use. All data will remain securely in the possession of the researcher for three years, after which time it will be destroyed.

The researcher may use the data for presentations or articles related to this study, but pseudonyms will be used for all participants in order to maintain their anonymity. As previously mentioned, the school will only be identified by its general location and demographic information gleaned from the state department of education.

Do I have to take part in this study?

No. You can refuse to be in the study now or at any time in the future. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty if you choose not to participate.

If I don’t want to be in the study, are there other choices?

If you do not want to be in this study, the other choice is to refuse. If a primary participant refuses to take part in the study, all involvement with secondary participants will cease. If a secondary participant refuses to take part in the study, another secondary participant will be invited to take part.

What if new information is learned during the study that might affect my well-being or decision to continue in the study?

If any new information is learned during this study, the researcher will inform you and offer you the option to withdraw consent.

What if I have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints?

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the researcher at the following e-mail address: mbrown6@crimson.ua.edu. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty advisor for this study, Dr. Liz Wilson, at ewilson@bama.ua.edu, or Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at 205-348-8461 or toll free at 1-877-420-3066.
What else do I need to know?

You do not give up any of your legal rights by signing this consent form. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep. Save it in case you want to review it later or you decide to contact the investigator or the university about the study. The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (IRB) is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The IRB may review study records from time to time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and the study is being carried out as planned.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. My questions have been answered. I understand what is required of me by taking part in this study. I freely agree to participate.

_____________________________ Date ____________
Signature of Participant

_____________________________ Date ____________
Signature of Investigator

Audio Taping Consent

As mentioned above, all formal interviews will be audio-taped by the primary investigator for research purposes. These tapes will be stored in a locked file cabinet in a locked room only available to the primary investigator. Tapes will be destroyed immediately after transcription and will be kept for no more than one year.

I understand that part of my participation in this research study will be audio-taped, and I give my permission to record the interview.

☐ Yes, my participation during formal interviews can be audio-taped.

☐ No, I do not want my participation in formal interviews to be audio-taped.
## APPENDIX C

Biographical Profiles of Primary Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Charlotte</th>
<th>Christopher</th>
<th>Bryant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Major</strong></td>
<td>Social science education</td>
<td>English education</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decided to Pursue Teaching</strong></td>
<td>During adolescence</td>
<td>During college</td>
<td>After college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Socialization (PS)</strong></td>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>None*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-PS Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-PS Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Teaching/Coaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Teaching Experiences</strong></td>
<td>Clinical placements</td>
<td>Clinical placements</td>
<td>Guitar lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL tutor</td>
<td>Substitute teaching</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Teaching Level</strong></td>
<td>Middle school (MS)</td>
<td>High school (HS)</td>
<td>High school (HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>First year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Levels</strong></td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>10/11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Area (Teaching)</strong></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorite Subject</strong></td>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Areas</strong></td>
<td>Geography (7)</td>
<td>Early American Literature (10)</td>
<td>Anatomy (10/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World History (8)</td>
<td>Modern American Literature (11)</td>
<td>Zoology (11/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time in Coaching</strong></td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>Second year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Coaching Interactions</strong></td>
<td>Basketball/Softball (internship)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Football (volunteer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport (Coaching)</strong></td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Levels</strong></td>
<td>Girls’</td>
<td>Varsity (V)</td>
<td>Varsity (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th/8th grade boys’**</td>
<td>Junior Varsity (JV)</td>
<td>Junior Varsity (JV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Coaching Duties</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>JV boys’ soccer (spring)</td>
<td>Girls’ softball (spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorite Sport</strong></td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Teaching/Coaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Extracurricular Duties</strong></td>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to Intervention (RTI)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Paid Jobs</strong></td>
<td>Church childcare***</td>
<td>Personal trainer****</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Bryant will begin classes for his alternative certification in the summer of 2012. He has no prior preparation for the teaching role.

** Charlotte coaches the girls’ basketball team while also serving as the ‘faculty head coach’ for the 7th/8th grade boys’ teams.

*** Charlotte works as a nursery coordinator at her church on some Wednesday evenings/Sunday mornings and afternoons.

**** Christopher maintains employment as a personal trainer in order to work during his summer/winter break.
APPENDIX D

POTENTIAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Teacher-Coach

Biographical Information and Introductory Teaching/Coaching Information

1. How old are you?
2. Where were you born?
3. Where did you grow up?
4. What is your current relationship status?
5. Do you have any children?
6. Where will you teach?
7. What will you teach?
8. Have you had any previous experiences in teaching?
9. What will you coach?
10. Have you had any previous experiences in coaching?
11. What other educational responsibilities will you have (if applicable)?)
12. Where did you attend college?
13. What is the highest degree awarded to you?
14. What was your area of study in college?
15. Did you participate in any sports in college?
16. What is your teaching philosophy?
17. What are your goals as a teacher?
18. What is your coaching philosophy?
19. What are your goals as a coach?
20. How do you perceive the relationship between the teaching and coaching roles?

Acculturation

1. Describe your interest in sports and/or physical activity as a child (12 and under).
2. Describe your interest in sports and/or physical activity as a teenager (13 – 19).
3. Describe your interest in sports and/or physical activity since high school.
4. Describe your parents’/guardians’ interest in sports and/or physical activity.
5. Describe your siblings’ interest in sports and/or physical activity.
6. Describe your closest friends’/relatives’ interest in sports and/or physical activity.
7. Describe your interest in school as a child (12 and under).
8. Describe your interest in school as a teenager (13 – 19).
9. Describe your interest in school after high school.
10. Describe your parents’/guardians’ interest in education.
11. Describe your siblings’ interest in education.
12. Describe your closest friends’/relatives’ interest in education.
13. When did you choose to pursue a career in education?
14. Did a core content area teacher influence you to pursue a career in education?
15. Did an athletic coach influence you to pursue a career in education?
16. Why did you decide to become a teacher-coach?
17. Were you first attracted to education because of teaching and/or coaching?

**Professional Socialization**

1. Describe your experiences in your teacher education program.
2. How well did your teacher education program prepare you to be a teacher?
3. How well did your core content area classes prepare you to be a teacher?
4. How well did your teacher education program prepare you to be a coach?
5. Did you take part in a coaching education program?
6. Do you feel prepared to be an effective teacher?
7. Do you feel prepared to be an effective coach?
8. Did you have professors who inspired you to become a teacher?
9. Did you have professors who inspired you to become a coach?
10. Approximately how many of your professors were former teachers?
11. Approximately how many of your professors were former coaches?
12. Describe your clinical experiences within your teacher education program.
13. Did you have opportunities to teach during these clinical experiences? Explain.
14. Did you have opportunities to coach during these clinical experiences? Explain.
15. Upon completing your teacher education program, what type of job did you hope to find?
16. Did you plan to teach in your current content area?
17. Did you plan to coach one or more athletic teams?

**Organizational Socialization**

1. Were you hired primarily to teach, coach, or a combination of the two? Explain.
2. Describe the transition from professional socialization to organizational socialization.
3. Describe the school in which you teach.
4. Describe the culture of the school in which you teach.
5. Describe the students in the school in which you teach.
6. Describe the athletes in the school in which you teach.
7. Describe your teaching position and responsibilities.
8. Describe your coaching position and responsibilities.
9. Describe your content area department.
10. Describe your athletic department.
11. Describe your relationship/interactions with the administration.
12. Describe your relationship/interactions with colleagues in teaching and coaching.
15. Does your role as a coach affect your relationship/interactions with students?
17. Describe your involvement in the community surrounding the school.
18. Do you have an official or unofficial mentor teacher? Describe these interactions.
19. Do you have an official or unofficial mentor coach? Describe these interactions.
20. How many other first-year teachers-coaches are in your school? Describe your interactions.
21. Do you find yourself associating more with your fellow teachers or coaches?
22. What are your greatest challenges in teaching?
23. What are your greatest challenges in coaching?
24. How do you perceive your role as a teacher?
25. How is your role as a teacher perceived by others?
26. How do you perceive your role as a coach?
27. How is your role as a coach perceived by others?
28. How do you perceive the relationship between the teaching and coaching roles?
29. How does coaching impact your teaching?
30. How does teaching impact your coaching?
31. Describe an effective teacher-coach.
32. Describe a successful teacher-coach.
33. Would you rather be identified as a teacher or as a coach?
34. How would you describe the daily experiences of being a teacher-coach?
   a. Academic experiences
   b. Athletic experiences
   c. Emotional experiences
   d. Pedagogical experiences
   e. Personal experiences
   f. Physical experiences
   g. Professional experiences
   h. Social experiences
35. Describe your future plans in education.
36. Describe your life goals.
37. What advice would you give someone getting ready to walk in your shoes?
38. In hindsight, would you have done anything differently?

Some questions borrowed from Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin (2008) and Pagano (2004).
Principal, Department Chair/Team Leader, and Athletic Director/Coordinator

Biographical Information

1. Where are you from originally?
2. How long have you been in education and in what capacities (teaching, coaching, and/or administration)?
3. How long have you been at this school and in what capacities (teaching, coaching, and/or administration)?
4. What other educational responsibilities do you have?
5. Where did you attend college? Describe your academic/athletic endeavors.
6. What is your teaching philosophy?
7. What are your goals as a teacher/administrator?
8. What is your coaching philosophy (if applicable)?
9. What are your goals as a coach (if applicable)?

Organizational Socialization of Teacher-Coach

1. Describe the school in which you teach.
2. How would you describe the culture of this school?
3. How would you describe the students in this school?
4. How would you describe the faculty in this school?
5. Was the respective teacher-coach hired primarily to teach, coach, or a combination of the two? Explain.
6. Describe the hiring process of this particular teacher-coach.
7. Was this hiring process any different than normal?
8. Describe the teacher-coach’s teaching position and responsibilities.
9. Describe the teacher-coach’s coaching position and responsibilities.
10. Describe the teacher-coach’s content area department.
11. Describe the teacher-coach’s athletic department.
12. Describe your relationship/interactions with the teacher-coach.
13. Describe the teacher-coach’s relationship/interactions with students/athletes.
14. Describe the teacher-coach’s relationship/interactions with the administration.
15. Describe the teacher-coach’s relationship/interactions with the faculty.
16. Describe the teacher-coach’s relationship/interactions with parents of students/athletes.
17. Does the role of coach affect his/her relationship/interactions with students?
18. Describe the teacher-coach’s involvement in the community surrounding the school.
19. Does the teacher-coach have contact with other first-year teachers/coaches?
20. Does the teacher-coach interact more with fellow teachers or fellow coaches?
21. What are his/her greatest challenges in teaching?
22. What are his/her greatest challenges in coaching?
23. How do you define his/her role as a teacher?
24. How is his/her role as a teacher defined for him/her?
25. How do you define his/her role as a coach?
26. How is his/her role as a coach defined for him/her?
27. How do you perceive the relationship between the teaching and coaching roles?
28. How does coaching impact his/her teaching?
29. How does teaching impact his/her coaching?
30. Describe an effective teacher-coach.
31. Describe a successful teacher-coach.
32. Would the teacher-coach rather be identified as a teacher or as a coach?
33. How would you describe the daily experiences of the teacher-coach?
   a. Academic experiences
   b. Athletic experiences
   c. Emotional experiences
   d. Pedagogical experiences
   e. Personal experiences
   f. Physical experiences
   g. Professional experiences
   h. Social experiences
34. In your opinion, what does the future hold for the teacher-coach?
35. What advice would you give someone going into his/her first year as a teacher-coach?

Some questions borrowed from Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin (2008) and Pagano (2004).
APPENDIX E

OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Case Study Participant: _______________ Date: _____ Time: _____ Location: __________

Check One:  Teaching: ___ Coaching: ___ Planning: ___ Other: ___ ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:  To Do List: