Becoming a coach: reform, identity, and the pedagogy of negation

Jacqueline Cossentino⋆
University of Maryland, USA

This article examines one US high school teacher's attempt to become a coach by enacting what I call 'a pedagogy of negation'. For this teacher, the challenge of becoming a coach is nested within a wider agenda of social and personal transformation. That agenda is symbolized first in words as she constructs 'a language of coaching' to inform her interactions with students and content as well her conception of herself as a teacher. Second, talk is transformed into pedagogical action through, as described by Driver, the 'playful work' of ritualized negation. I argue that the phenomenon of negation is a logical sense-making strategy for teachers attempting to realise transformed pedagogical identities. Negation also reveals a range of uncertainties involved in enacting the practice of coaching. As this case reveals, the pedagogy of negation is constructed as a corrective to restrictive and oppressive forms of schooling. It serves as a mechanism for 'becoming' a different, presumably better, kind of teacher. And though the results are mixed, this portrait of practice in the midst of change illuminates the complex and reciprocal links between identity and practice entailed in becoming a coach.

Introduction: being a coach

Few ideas have achieved such broad appeal among educators as those implied by the aphorism, 'teacher as coach, student as worker' (Sizer, 1984). First articulated as an 'essential principle' of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), the image of the teacher as coach quickly came to stand for the child-centred, performance-oriented, and democratic pedagogical approach endorsed by this prominent engine of US school reform. The idea of coaching, moreover, seemed to tap into a deeper set of assumptions and aspirations related to roles for teachers, the purpose of school, and civil society at the dawn of what has been called the postmodern age. Indeed, coaching, or the idea of being a coach, began to acquire currency at the close of the twentieth century just as the related concepts of 'mentoring' (Little, 1990), 'facilitating' (Conley & Goldman, 1994), and 'organisational learning' (Senge, 1990) were entering the vocabularies of reformers in business and government as well

⋆Department of Education Policy and Leadership, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA. Email: jc381@umail.umd.edu

as in education. Today, the concept is fully visible in popular as well as professional culture (MacFarquhar, 2002). The proliferation of 'life coaches', 'executive coaches', and 'peer coaches' suggests that participation in postmodern life, including education, is likely to involve either having or being a coach. In an age of rapid change, dramatically increasing information, and collapsing political and economic structures, coaching emerges as an apt manifestation of both a culture and a profession marked by uncertainty (McDonald, 1992; Hargreaves, 1994; Friedman, 1997).

This article, drawn from a larger study of US teachers' experience of instructional reform (Cossentino, 2004), examines one teacher's attempt to make sense of what it means to be a coach. I use this single case to make a two-pronged argument. First, I claim that the role of coach implies transformation—of pedagogical identity, of teaching repertoire, and of the purpose of school. Second, I argue that the challenges of such a transformation are characterized by a range of uncertainties associated with both the identity of coach and the practice of coaching. As idealized in contemporary pedagogical discourse, coaching seems to imply an approach to schooling that is experiential, developmental, and democratic (Sizer, 1984; Wiggins, 1993; Costa & Garmston, 1997). Coaching also seems to call teachers to deploy a wide and subtle repertoire. Typically, this repertoire is associated with constructivist learning theory, but less typical are clear directives for enacting specific moves. Being a coach, in other words, implies being a 'certain kind of teacher' (Hacking, 1986; Gee, 2001), but exactly what such being entails remains shrouded in uncertainty (Richardson, 2002).

The uncertainty often surfaces as tension —between tradition and innovation, between showing and telling, between right and wrong— in both the language and practice of teachers aiming to become coaches. The tension is made even more evident in the tendency to depict—both in word and deed—what coaching is in terms of what it is not. In seeking to nullify old ways of interacting with students, curriculum, and ideas of instruction, teachers who aim to become coaches do so, in part, by enacting what I call a pedagogy of negation. In practical terms, negation provides would-be coaches a set of proscriptions for what *not* to do in constructivist classrooms: 'no telling, no phonics, no basal readers, no textbooks' (Richardson, 2002). In symbolic terms, the act of negation (Burke, 1966) serves multiple purposes. It contains the multiple meanings attached to being a coach. It ritualizes disdain for a detestable past or other. It suggests an alternative to that other, if only by negative association.

What follows is a description and analysis of one high school teacher's attempt to become a coach by enacting what I call a pedagogy of negation. For Camille, the teacher in question, the challenge of becoming a coach is nested within a wider agenda of social and personal transformation. Camille's view of coaching mixes utilitarian concerns for success with expressive concerns for freedom, self-confidence, and empathy. When she enacts this view, she symbolizes a mix of intentions in classroom interactions with her students. Camille aims to prepare students to meet 'their reality, whatever that means to them', and her aims are symbolized through both words and gestures that negate her view of a type of teaching that prevents students from realizing their potential.

Drawn from in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and voluminous documentary material (rubrics, lesson plans, assignment descriptions) collected over an 8-month period in 1997 and 1998, my analysis of Camille's language provides a framework for understanding how she constructs her practice (Burke, 1966; Gee, 1990; Freeman, 1996). Camille constructs 'a language of coaching' to inform her interactions with students and content as well her conception of herself as a teacher. I complement linguistic analysis with interpretative treatment of observational data. There I show how talk is transformed into pedagogical action through the 'playful work' (Driver, 1998) of ritualized negation, and I argue that the phenomenon of negation is a logical sense-making strategy for teachers attempting to realize transformed pedagogical identities. I also argue that negation reveals a range of uncertainties involved in enacting the practice of coaching. As this case reveals, the pedagogy of negation is constructed as a corrective to restrictive and oppressive forms of schooling. It serves as a mechanism for 'becoming' a different, presumably better, kind of teacher. And although the results are mixed, this portrait of practice in the midst of change illuminates the complex and reciprocal links between identity and practice entailed in becoming a coach.

The case of Camille

Camille Rogers came to Oakville High School (OHS)[1] in 1994 through an indirect set of circumstances. At the time of the study, OHS was one of only a handful of schools in the state that belonged to the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES). Described by the OHS principal as a 'test market' community (predominately white, mid-western, middle class and suburban), Oakville is a world away from the predominantly African-American 'east-side' of the state's capital city where Camille grew up. Within the walls of OHS, Camille is immensely popular with students. Her classroom exudes laughter, warmth, a constant flow of students and teachers of various hues, the occasional whiff of food brought in from the local Chinese restaurant, and the remarkable sense of conviviality associated with teachers who are loved.

Camille and her teaching partner, Carole,[2] share classroom space, and for 2 years they have co-taught a 12th-grade interdisciplinary elective called Senior Political Studies (SPS). SPS was originally conceived by Carole to be a double-blocked, thematic class that examined political issues from the perspectives of Government and English. Carol is the Government teacher and Camille is the English teacher. As originally conceived, the second semester theme was 'Utopia'. The year culminated in a lengthy project in which groups of students read and critiqued political as well as fictional literature related to the concept of utopia, then presented their work at a final exhibition.[3] My original intention in observing Camille's teaching was to document and analyse the progress of the exhibition. However, once I began the study, its focused changed. In the fall of 1997 the 'Utopia' unit was scrapped, and the exhibition totally reconfigured.

Early in the school year, Camille and Carole noted 'problems with responsibility' in SPS. 'We just weren't seeing the level of maturity we had seen with other groups',

Camille explained. In responding to what she perceived as a need for more 'structure', the reconfigured exhibition requires students to compile and present individual 'portfolios' indicating the completion of a variety of tasks assigned by Carole and Camille. Camille regards the portfolio as a 'kinder' version of an exhibition. 'It's more about process', she explains. As for the content, Camille describes the project largely as 'career exploration'.

In designing the project, Camille explained:

> The intent was for them to see what they're going to be faced with as college students. What they're going to be faced with if they chose not to go to college. What are these jobs? What are they paying? What are the requirements for these jobs? What's the next level that you would move up to in this particular job?

When she talks about the design of the portfolio, her language suggests a utilitarian image of school as a gateway to some other, presumably better, future. But then her tone shifts, and she alludes to a more expressive purpose for education by elaborating a concept of 'vision.' 'We were trying to get them to look *in themselves*. The point of this is to get them to look in themselves and see what they were doing. Look at where *they* want to go.'

During the semester that students were preparing their portfolios, I rarely saw Camille 'teach', at least not in a traditional sense. I rarely saw her stand in front of her class. I rarely saw the entire class assembled in her room. I rarely saw students engaged in what I would have normally called 'curriculum'. The only long-term design for the course was indicated on the 'rubric' designed to guide students' assembly of their portfolios.

On most days students worked independently, and on Fridays they checked in with Camille and Carole in a ritual known as 'portfolio check'. There, students took turns presenting works-in-progress, and Camille, with her grade-book open, gave students a √ for completed work, and a √− for incomplete work. Portfolio checks were brief and relatively private. Fridays were 'double-blocked', which meant SPS lasted for nearly 2 hours, and time not spent in portfolio check belonged to the students. Often students dispersed, but just as often, they lingered. It was during these 'hanging out' times that I saw Camille 'teach' or, perhaps more accurately, 'coach'. On one of these occasions, an afternoon in late April, after a majority of the class had gone to points unknown, a group of six remained to chat with Ms Rogers.

Gill, a loquacious African-American student, sidles up to Camille's desk to discuss the colleges to which he has been accepted. He explains his dilemma: he was accepted to two colleges, but his parents will only contribute financially if he attends their choice. Camille nods then notices another student wandering into the room. 'Suzie, are you working on the computer? Do you want me to do something for you?' Suzie glances over to Camille, smiles—without breaking stride—and says, 'You know I like you Ms Rogers'. Everyone in the room laughs. Camille smiles back then turns her attention back to Gill. But the energy, which had previously been dispersed among the students in the room, now centres on Camille.

Gill's private concern of life after OHS is actually shared by everyone in the room,

and Gill widens the conversation by bringing up a topic everyone can relate to. 'Ms Rogers', he bellows in his 'class clown' voice, 'please tell my mother not to cry when you talk to her'. Camille looks at him, narrows her eyes, and with a mischievous grin, says, 'Who? Me?' One of her hallmarks as a teacher is the frequency with which she calls parents to keep them apprised of student progress. She calls when assignments are incomplete, when students have missed too much school, when their 'attitude' concerns her. Often the call is a gesture—she leaves a message on an answering machine— but it is a powerful gesture, one that students refer to regularly when they talk about Ms Rogers.

On this occasion, she is in the process of calling the parents of all her students who are in jeopardy of not graduating. By late April, students have all received notice from the OHS administration, but Camille follows up with a telephone call. This notice, what the students call the 'jeopardy letter', becomes the subject of the day; and Camille listens as students chime in, each with the story of his or her letter. 'My mother cried.' 'My father woke me up at 5:30 this morning to tell me that my teacher said I wouldn't graduate.' 'Mine came when I wasn't home.' I am struck by their openness. They are almost light-hearted as they reveal this information, wearing it as a badge, not so much of honour, but of belonging. And Camille encourages the exchange, shaking her head at some moments, chuckling at others. Never does her demeanour suggest disapproval. She wants them to tell their stories, to 'express themselves'.

Later, when I share my impressions, she tells me conversations like the one I witnessed are an example of 'What I do versus what I'm supposed to do. They're scared to express themselves. It's more important that they feel competent and confident than that they can analyse *Animal Farm*.'

When Camille talks about the meaning of her teaching, she almost never brings up the specifics of her exhibition. Despite the fact that nearly all of Camille's classes feature some form of exhibition or performance assessment, her teaching revolves around what she considers to be a deeper quest for engagement, expression, and success, 'whatever that means to the student'. When pushed, she links exhibition to her teaching by focusing on the meaning of display, the prideful, public nature of the work of learning. 'I think as a teacher you want to be proud of your kids. I mean, like a parent. This is a product of me. This is someone I've worked with, someone I've helped, someone I've tried to encourage and this is the end result of what they've done.'

Righting wrongs

As one of nine 'essential principles' guiding the CES, exhibition, particularly as it is discussed and practised in CES schools like OHS, both belongs to and contributes to a tradition of schooling and, perhaps less obviously, social reform. This tradition extends and reinterprets progressive reforms of nearly a century ago (Sizer, 1984; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Perrone, 1997). Progressive educational reform is frequently associated with the child-centred, experiential, and democratic philosophies of John

Dewey, and exhibition as promoted by CES alludes directly to this constructivist approach to curriculum and pedagogy. But progressive reforms aimed for much more than curricular change. Although rarely invoked explicitly, the influence of the sweeping social agenda of progressivism, an agenda that included social reconstruction, social efficiency, and vocationalism, hovers over the CES agenda generally, and Camille's understanding of exhibition specifically. It is through this lens that her construction of the identity of coach is most evident. Coaching enables Camille to be a reformer.

Camille's version of reform is fuelled, in part, by a moral commitment to influencing her students' identity; she aims to provide them access to successful lives as adults. But how she defines success helps reveal the construction of her teaching identity and it points to the uncertainty of her practice. Camille's long view of the relationship between schooling and successful adulthood is both critical and utilitarian. Even though she is critical of the system that defines success (the system that characterizes her own experience of schooling), she wants her students to have access to it. Moving back and forth between what Delpit (1991) calls 'home codes' and 'power codes', Camille wants her students to 'look in themselves' and at the same time 'know what they'll be faced with in college'. School is a means to an end. It is not necessarily a logical or fair means, but it is the one that everyone must use and, therefore, her students, she reasons, must get to college, must be poised and confident and expressive, because with those qualities come access to the 'culture of power' (Delpit, 1988). This blending of home and power codes is evident in her language as well as her practice.

She constructs a positive view of the kind of adults her students should become as well as the kind of teacher she aims to be partly from her own experiences coming of age. The daughter of a close-knit, middle-class African-American family, Camille cites the Baptist Church, 'where my whole family went, where we grew up', as a significant influence in her life. 'I think as far as respecting other people's opinions', explaining what she learned at church, 'it was a place [where] you're allowed to express yourself and ask questions'. She came to teaching reluctantly, despite the discouragement of family members who felt that teaching represented professional and economic status beneath Camille. Proving herself in banking, however, emboldened her to pursue what she considered to be a more 'meaningful' career as a teacher.

What makes teaching meaningful? 'My goal is to get students to think on their own. From within.' She recalls her upbringing in the church, and also negative experiences from her own public education. 'In high school, with teachers who spit out this information and all you had to do is memorize, and you never came back to revisit or make any connection with anything. You learn this long enough to take a test and you're done with it.' Throughout the study Camille made it evident that her teaching was, above all, an attempt to right that wrong. 'And so I try always to make these connections, to show just this big picture.'

While the 'big picture', as she called it, emphasizes 'free-flowing expression,' she was also concerned with the little picture, the details that determine what 'impression'

students make and how that impression will influence their future. Again, her own experiences as a student influence this perspective: 'In college, the transition from high school was a struggle for about two years because for you to tell me to write what I think is absolutely foreign. Because I had never been asked what I thought.' Statements like this one reflect her disappointment, even anger, with a version of schooling that restricted expression. Camille, nevertheless, wants her students to participate in schooling. She constructs a 'new' version of schooling as preparation for expressive adulthood that aims toward power but feels more like home. The blending of home and power means primarily two things. First, that students be able to express what they think. Second, and just as important, is what she called 'responsibility'.

She emphasized the importance of students 'taking responsibility' for their success. Exhibition, she explained at our first meeting, appealed to her because 'it makes students more responsible. All of these kids want to go to college. And so the fact that you can't turn a paper in late in college meant nothing to them.' She taught students to be more responsible by both modelling and demanding empathy and account-ability. Using what Swidler (1979) calls a 'therapeutic' model of teaching, Camille cared (Noddings, 1984) for her students, aiming to 'break down barriers' preventing students from developing into adults (Dennison, 1969). In describing the importance of modelling responsibility, she emphasizes the public display of compassion, 'My thing is, I understand. I'm here full-time', referring to the fact that she was enrolled in a master's programme in education, 'I bring my books in … And I think it makes it more real to them. They know I'm not bluffing them.' Similarly, she offers her students access to power (as signified by higher education), in part, by linking home and school. When she encourages students to tell their personal stories, she is bringing home to school. When she calls parents to apprise them of student progress, she is reaching into the private sphere of home. But, always there is the coda—'I'm not gonna be there in college to call your parents'.

In seeking to shape her students' futures, Camille establishes coaching as an identity focused on reform and imbued with moral authority. She aims to right the wrongs of her own schooling through the enactment of empathy and expression, and through modelling responsibility. In so doing, she joins reform and identity in a complex construction of practice that emphasizes the moral and stylistic over the technical dimensions of her teaching. The complex construction of practice and identity is filtered through Camille's involvement with exhibition and made manifest in how she talks about as well as practices being a coach.

A language of coaching

My interest in links between reform, identity and language grows out of a growing trend in research on instructional reform that asserts that practical change must be tied to conceptual change (Ball, 1993; Thompson & Zeuli, 1999; Holt-Reynolds, 2000). Increasingly, scholars are turning to language data as a means of analysing teacher thinking (Elbaz, 1991; Munby, 1990; Freeman, 1996), classroom inter-actions (Cazden, 1988; Ballenger, 1992), and the culture of reform (Burroughs *et al*,

2000; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001). Analysis is drawn from interview data, in which I focus on the content of Camille's speech. I attend primarily to diction and theme, and focus on the manner in which she weaves together themes related to constructivism and transformation in order to dramatize her understanding of what it means to be a coach. In regarding language as action (Austin, 1975 [1962]; Searle, 1969), I focus on how Camille 'talks into existence' (Page, 1991) a pedagogy of coaching.

The pedagogy of coaching is a pedagogy of construction, expression, and transformation. And because it is a practice significantly different from that which marked her own education, Camille strained to construct an interpretation of coaching based more on ideology than on experience. Here, terms that have few referents in practical experience, terms like 'critical thinking', 'co-operative learning', 'student centred-teaching' and the ubiquitous 'teacher-as-coach' often functioned as jargon. Which is to say, the terms alternately revealed and camouflaged uncertainties associated with enacting a constructivist, expressive and transformative pedagogy.

Much of the talk concerned strategies aimed at motivating students to, as she put it, 'do the work'. Motifs such as choice and change appeared repeatedly, and those motifs were linked, alternatively, with moral fervour—talk about what students 'need' and what is 'right'—and practical commitments—keeping students 'on-task', getting them to 'keep up', and managing '18 different projects'. This concern with personalized, student-centred learning, in which the teacher is a facilitator rather than a transmitter of knowledge, corresponds with one of two overarching themes of the language of coaching: constructivism.

Since well before the term entered common usage, theories of teaching based on experience (Dewey, 1938) and expression (Parker, 1896) have been a feature of American education. Adherents assert that all knowledge, from infancy on, is constructed by learners themselves rather than transmitted by some outside intervener, such as a parent or a teacher. The construction of knowledge takes place in social and cultural context, and individuals such as parents, teachers and peers are important determinants in how knowledge is built; but when all is said and done, the learner is the primary agent (Vygotsky, 1978). Most advocates of pedagogies aimed at responding to the constructivist impulse acknowledge the importance of teachers in 'scaffolding' the development of understanding. Still, they emphasize that the role of the teacher in constructivist classrooms is significantly different from that of the teacher who believes that knowledge is something to be transmitted from teacher to student (Cohen *et al.*, 1993; Gardner, 1991; Sizer, 1984; Wiske, 1998). From constructivism flows the theme of transformation (Freire, 1970; Jackson, 1986; hooks, 1994). A transformative pedagogy is one in which learners change or transform their understandings and perceptions through the construction of new knowledge and skills. Transformation (both individual and social) is enabled by construction (both cognitive and social). The themes of constructivism and transformation are both mirrored and conflated in the language of coaching.

Camille defines a coach 'as someone, who's there to help and guide [students]'. Elaborating on that definition, she veers into the topic of 'critical thinking':

> And one of the things … we always talk about is critical thinking. And how you don't just take things off the surface. You gotta look beyond the surface information. And so, in writing, 'why are you saying this?' Ya know, 'where is your evidence of this?' And so [I'm concerned with] discipline in that sense, in that I don't go in the classroom and at the end of every class day say, 'OK, this is your homework for tonight.' I give them a class schedule for the whole grading period. And unless something changes, they know when they're gonna have quizzes. They know when they're gonna have tests. They know when papers are due … But they kind of kick it in gear as they get used to that process.

Camille uses talk to translate the abstraction of 'critical thinking' into meaningful practical knowledge. As she free-associates around the themes of discipline and guidance, Camille orients her comments toward the act of learning (more than teaching) as she provides a thumbnail definition of critical thinking: looking 'beyond the surface'. She indicates that critical thinking is related to discipline, but seems less certain about how. She attempts to make the link using the examples of writing and self-mastery. First, she equates thinking critically with 'evidence', the ability to back up statements. When she shifts her attention to discipline, she indicates a relationship between students' developing capacity to self-monitor and the ability to 'look beyond the surface information'. This link between critical thinking and self-mastery (as evidenced by the ability to keep a schedule) alludes to one of Camille's central pedagogical goals: teaching students to be more responsible.

The themes of constructivism and transformation, while implied whenever Camille used the language of coaching, were never explicit features of her language. That is, she never used the terms themselves. Rather, she alluded to constructivism when she linked coaching with topics like critical thinking, and expressed her conviction that this 'new' way of interacting with students and subject matter was better than the old ways in which she had been taught. 'Newness' or 'change' were more overtly linked to distinctive discourse patterns. I call this pattern 'negation' because of the manner in which Camille attempted to articulate her understanding of what it means to coach by negating or 'denunciating' (Burke, 1966; Freire, 1970) old ways of teaching. She characterized the 'old' ways as 'lecturing', 'reviewing', 'giving quizzes', and 'showing videos'. Alternatives to these strategies included 'journaling', 'co-operative learning', 'conferencing' and, of course, exhibiting.

In her quest to understand what coaching actually is, Camille frequently turned to what Kenneth Burke (1966, p. 268) called a language of 'the all important negative'. When she lacked concrete examples of what she was doing, she focused on what is not a feature of coaching pedagogy. Camille exemplifies the act of negation when she says, 'I think there is more to school than standing in front of a class … reading information or just lecturing off of notes, and giving a test or a quiz every Friday.' As a 'peculiarly human' (Burke, 1966, p 19) act of symbolization, negation nudges language use away from the purely discursive and toward a denser, more layered mode of communication. Here, Camille uses talk as constructive, symbolic action. Not only does she conceptualize her coaching practice in opposition to traditional, transmission-oriented teaching, but her use of the negative structure communicates disappoint-

ment with and rejection of 'old' ways of teaching. Negation introduces the rhetorical tool of the dialectic.

The dialectic of old versus new (along with good versus bad, and right versus wrong) is enabled by the act of negation. 'New' coaching practice is conceived as an alternative to 'old' and inadequate techniques:

> And, not all students test well and so you may have to write some essays, you may have to have students create a notebook or you may have students create a portfolio showing their work. You may have to have students do an exhibition. Um, you may have to have students give a presentation and use visuals to show what some of the key points were so that you can address everyone's style of learning. And, expose them to some different ways of learning.

In this case, the dialectic is set up between traditional testing and alternative assessments. The 'better' practices associated with coaching are framed as alternatives to testing, which is introduced as a negative, something that 'not all students' can do. In wanting to 'expose' students to 'some different ways of learning' in order to 'address everyone's style of learning', Camille evokes the ideological value of constructivism, which here she links to personalization. She also gestures toward a technical interpretation of constructivism when she emphasizes the variety of performances students 'can do' in order to 'show what they know'. The repetition of the phrase 'you may have to' implies the personal, pedagogical metamorphosis experienced by teachers aiming to become coaches, and the construction of the phrase as a tentative imperative suggests the desirability, if not certainty, of such a metamorphosis.

Her language also suggests uncertainty regarding exactly what is involved in incorporating 'notebooks', 'portfolios', and 'exhibitions' into her repertoire. Clearly, there is more to constructivist teaching than 'exposure'. Similarly, 'giving a presentation' involves more than showing 'key points'. These strategies seem to function as markers, providing counterpoint to moves—'standing in front of class, lecturing off notes'—she associates with the kind of teacher she does *not* want to be. In straining to make the link between these strategies and her pedagogical identity, she relies on the concrete image, a negative image, to say what coaching is.

Camille also uses negation to address the moral, as opposed to technical, dimension of coaching. The moral, in this case, refers to the 'shoulds' or 'whys' of Camille's pedagogy, while the technical refers to the 'hows'. One of her convictions with regard to being a coach is that choice should be a hallmark of interactions between coaches and students. Here she articulates what Fenstermacher (2002) terms her 'manner' of coaching. Noting her tendency to rearrange the desks in her classroom, she tells me that the room set-up is, in fact, one of her trademarks as a teacher. Even more, it is one of the ways she is disposed to influence her students' transformation into successful and expressive adults. She describes this disposition as 'being spontaneous'.

> To have a sense of creativity, to know that you can be in different places and still get things accomplished. That it doesn't have to be this structured setting. You can still learn with desks all over the place as opposed to them in these nice neat straight rows. You know, I sit in with them. I've sat on the floor. I sit on the desktops. I mean, I just try to fit,

to blend in with them so that they're not intimidated that I'm standing behind that podium up there or that I'm sitting behind this desk talking to them. It's like, you want to be in the mix and you want them to know that you're right there with them.

For Camille, being spontaneous is one of the signatures of her coaching style. But the organization of her room goes beyond the particular toward more universal values. When she sits on the floor or the deskstops she symbolizes her value of expressive individualism (Bellah *et al.*, 1985). Having desks 'all over the place' negates what she considers to be a symbol of restrictive and oppressive schooling, 'neat, straight rows' of desks. When she talks about getting 'in the mix' so that students 'know she is right there with them', she is also symbolizing an identity constructed in opposition to traditional teachers who 'stand behind podiums' and 'intimidate' students.

In foregrounding the moral values of care and spontaneity (which, here, are extensions of expressiveness), Camille's talk about her room highlights the manner as well as style of her coaching. That is, care and spontaneity are both hallmarks of her personal style and dispositions she regards as generic 'shoulds' of good teaching. Notably absent in this passage is any substantive reference to the technical dimension of her practice. Because so much of her manner is constructed in opposition to what she considers bad teaching, her talk seems to negate the need for technique altogether.

The linguistic phenomenon of negation highlights the power of language as a tool for representing as well as constructing the complexity of what it means to be a coach. Teachers construct similarly dense symbolic patterns when they teach. When Camille, in particular, enacted what I call her pedagogy of negation, she wove together the themes of power and change as she acted out the challenges of becoming a coach.

The playful work of ritualized negation

In analysing Camille's enactment of the pedagogy of negation in classroom interactions, I turn to another aspect of symbolic action: ritual. Like the linguistic performance of symbolization, ritual activity is a both a ubiquitous aspect of life in schools, and a potentially powerful instrument in the enterprise of reform (Cossentino, 2001). Humans in all cultures enact rituals for the express purpose of constructing and signifying complex meaning, particularly the meaning of change or transition. Rites of passage—both religious and secular—such as baptisms, bar mitzvahs, inaugurals, and commencements do not simply mark transition; they effect the change itself (Eliade, 1965; Van Gennep, 1960). Similarly, interaction rituals (Goffman, 1967), such as greetings or table manners, punctuate daily activities, inscribing meaning and order in inchoate behaviour. When theologian Tom Driver (1998) refers to ritual as 'work done playfully', he is highlighting the creative, improvizational, and often-festive character of ritual activity. When participants 'act out' tensions related to change, they create symbolic space in which to work through the complex, sometimes uncertain, meanings of reform. Social anthropologist Victor Turner (1969) referred to this symbolic space as the 'liminal' or in-between state. The liminal is a state in which prevailing social arrangements and meanings are

temporarily suspended; and within this state, tensions are eased and possibilities expanded. In the example of ritualized negation that follows, Camille and her students act out a version of teaching that addresses some of the tensions of constructivist teaching, and highlights both the playful and purposeful work of reform.

Camille's pedagogy of negation was a practice guided largely by images of what she did *not* want to occur in her classroom. She would not stand up and lecture. She would not check to see that students were completing assignments every day. She would not tell students what and how to think, because these teacherly behaviours had left a negative imprint on her own education. In the wake of the void left by all that she would not do, Camille relied on a simple, but persistent, approach to teaching: she would be with them. She would communicate her expectation, her faith, that they could do it. She would comfort them in adversity, and celebrate their success.

But in this vignette she turns the tables, and together with her students acts out the very pedagogy she aims to negate. Arriving with a small package of cookies, Camille begins the ritual by asking, 'Are you ready for me?' to no one in particular. 'Where am I sitting?' Immediately, she establishes through both posture and language that something is different. She suspends the normal social arrangements by asking students where she should sit. She further signals the start of a ritual by addressing a student:

> Camille: Gill, Are you teaching me today?

Gill is scheduled to 'teach a lesson to Ms Rogers' as part of an alternative assignment for his portfolio. Six weeks prior to this date, students were offered the opportunity to 'teach Ms Rogers' about US government. About six students elected to do this assignment. Today Adrienne and Nichole are the teachers.

> Gill: No, but I have some homework for you.
>
> Camille: Homework?!
>
> Gill: You didn't do the assignment. So you better do it by the end of the period or I'm gonna call your mother.

The room erupts in laughter. Meanwhile, Adrienne and Nichole are writing notes on the board.

> Adrienne: Ms Rogers, you need paper and a pencil to take notes. Just make sure you have a lot of paper.
>
> Camille: Can I write in purple pen?
>
> Adrienne: No. Blue or black.

Adrienne and Nichole take their places, standing in front of the board, while Camille sits in one of the student's seats. Nichole initiates a formal start of the 'lesson'.

> Nichole: OK, we're learning in this lesson what a bill is.
>
> Camille: Today's my mother's birthday. [giggling] See, I'm gonna do like you do to me.
>
> Nichole: I'm giving the definition of a bill. [Camille raises her hand] You need to write this down. A bill is a proposal presented to a legislative body for possible

> enactment as a law. There are two different types of bills, a public bill and a private bill.

Nichole and Adrienne take turns lecturing while Camille takes notes silently. While one lectures, the other writes on the board:

> Take Home Essay:
>
> Explain a bill that you might want to change. Tell if it is private or public, whether you think it will pass or not, and the process it goes through to pass. Front/back of paper. Blue/black ink. Due Wednesday, May 20, at 2 PM
>
> Camille: Can I go to the rest room?
>
> Adrienne: No. Breaks are when the bell rings.
>
> Nichole: Actually, since you did so good on writing notes, I'll give you until Thursday.
>
> Camille: Ohhh. Thank you!
>
> Nichole: And you have a test Friday. You can't procrastinate in our class.
>
> Camille: If it's [take home essay] not a full two pages, do I lose points? What if it's late?
>
> Adrienne: It won't be late. 50% off for every day late.

This ritualized mockery of traditional transmission-oriented teaching dramatizes the uncertainty Camille experiences relative to the pedagogical reform implied by coaching. At first glance, it appears to be little more than a silly interlude from the real work of the class. But, viewed within the larger reform context of constructivism and transformation, it is a vivid enactment of a complex pedagogy in which Camille blends power, empathy, and uncertainty.

Adrienne, Nichole and Gill consciously and playfully mirror Camille's teaching persona, which focuses almost entirely on comportment and accountability. In allowing her students to play teacher, Camille is not attempting to redefine authority relations in her classroom. Rather, the ritual embodies a lesson about 'the culture of power' (Delpit, 1988). Camille is torn between an ideological desire to resist that culture and a pragmatic desire to provide her students access to it. The ritual accommodates both desires.

It is clear to all concerned that this is indeed play, good-natured and willing play, but at no point does Camille suggest that this arrangement will be anything but ceremonial. There is little, if any, critique embedded in her or her students' action. In fact, much of the punch of the send-up comes from how closely it resembles Camille's actual classroom behaviour. The insistence on meeting deadlines ('you can't procrastinate in our class'), the threat to call a parent, the equation of rigour with volume ('just make sure you have a lot of paper') and the easing of standards as reward ('since you did so good at taking notes, you can have until Thursday') are all discernible features of her teaching. These behaviours reveal an abiding concern with control rather than her stated commitment to freedom and expression. Instead of revising the structure of teaching and learning, Camille allows her students to practice being quite traditional authority figures by acting out the symbols of power that define the culture of her classroom and allude to what Camille understands as the wider

culture of power. The temporary reversal of roles offers students access to power: they need to know what it feels like if they are ever to possess it.

To note that Camille's pedagogy is complex is not to claim that it is effective. The impulse to negate traditional forms of instruction arises, in part, out of her desire to transform her teaching. But another purpose for this ritual is to accommodate the uncertainty Camille experiences as she grapples with the technical demands of coaching. Camille is attracted to the rhetoric of coaching, and when she talks about her teaching in a discursive context she professes to value freedom, choice, and expression, and she seeks ways to enact those values in interactions with her students. Yet the ritual belies her limited, and quite traditional, repertoire. Although Camille is eloquent in expressing her belief that confidence is more important than analytic mastery, I suspect that part of her certainty about what she should emphasize is determined by what she is able to emphasize.

An uncertain blend of method, manner and style

Fenstermacher's (2002) recent research on expertise provides a useful framework for thinking about Camille's attempt to become a coach. In articulating a tripartite typology of method, manner, and style, Fenstermacher aims to distinguish both the technical from the moral and the universal from the particular. He defines method as the skill or technique a teacher deploys in order to convey subject matter. Manner entails the dispositions or traits that reveal the teachers' character as a moral and intellectual being. Style, by contrast, refers to conduct that reflects the teacher's personality. Where method and manner describe behaviours that Fenstermacher calls 'candidates for universalization' (2002, p. 9), style remains the unique province of the individual teacher. A teacher's style is his/her personal signature rather than a skill or trait that may be recognized as 'good' and therefore applied to more global definitions of 'good' or effective teaching.

All teachers' practice may be analysed in terms of method, manner, and style, although no teacher will exhibit equally developed versions of these dimensions of pedagogy. Nor will any teacher blend these three dimensions in exactly the same way. 'Virtuoso teaching', however, demands a 'seamless and elegantly coherent integration' (Fenstermacher, 2002, p. 10) of all three dimensions. Coaching, at least the ideal of the coach as a facilitator, motivator, and organizer of constructive, expressive, and transformative learning, honours manner and style as much as method in teaching. In Camille's case, the integration favours style and manner over method, and in the process reveals some of the challenges of enacting a constructivist methodology as well as the importance of achieving an effective balance among method, manner, and style.

Camille claimed that one of the chief ways in which exhibition was meaningful in her teaching was that it both represented and demanded a 'different' kind of teaching. That 'different' kind of teaching pressed her to teach in ways that were more 'student-centred', 'discussion-oriented', 'co-operative', 'discovery-based', 'hands-on', and 'critical'. While she purported to embrace the identity of coach, her practice suggests uncertainty about exactly how to conduct discussions, supervise cooperative or

discovery-based learning, or stimulate critical thinking. Such uncertainty is no surprise given that she is a product of a tradition of teaching that emphasized transmission over discovery, breadth over depth, and control over engagement. If coaching means discovery, depth, and engagement, Camille was left largely on her own to discern both the meaning of those concepts and their application in the classroom.

In the wake of such uncertainty, the need for concrete descriptions of what coaching entails seems clear. In seeking to clarify some of the 'hows' of coaching, I sketch three categories of teaching action: designing, managing, and critiquing. These actions correspond to what I observed as three distinct elements of teaching behaviour associated with the practice of coaching. And although designing (often called planning), managing (often equated with coaching), and critiquing (often called evaluation) are discernible features of traditional pedagogies, when enacted in the context of coaching they seemed to call Camille to teach in 'different' ways. Within each of these categories, Camille sought to construct a repertoire that incorporated method, manner, and style in ways that reflected her idea of what it means to be a coach. In contrast to the playful work of ritualized negation, in which the tensions between old and new and right and wrong were temporarily eased, here Camille's interactions with students, content, and a colleague suggest strain and frustration.

Designing

The act of design is, perhaps, the least visible element of coaching. Yet it is a foundational activity critical to the effectiveness of constructivist practices. Designing entails envisioning outcomes of instruction as well as all of the performances students must complete in order to meet those outcomes. Designing calls teachers to activate their knowledge of their disciplines as well as the multiple ways in which students may develop and display understanding. In this sense, designing or 'curriculum-making' (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Cossentino, 2004) requires expert deployment of skills associated with the technical dimension of pedagogy. Tensions between Camille's method, style, and manner surfaced in her interaction with the rubric of SPS.

Rubrics, documents that align performances with standards, are increasingly associated with performance-based and constructivist classrooms (Zessoules & Gardner, 1991). Rubrics serve multiple purposes. They are curriculum tools that link design to assessment. They are evaluation tools that make standards explicit. And they are teaching tools that function as performance 'targets' for both teachers and students. As design tools, rubrics invite teachers to both articulate and represent their goals for student understanding. When Camille articulated 'big picture' aspirations for her students, such as 'looking inside themselves' or developing 'their sense of integrity', she emphasized the moral dimension of her teaching. Yet, she remained uncertain about how to set up her class so that both its content and its organization led toward those goals.

When she and Carole redesigned the second semester of SPS to revolve around a 'portfolio' of career exploration, Camille told me that she and Carole wanted their

students to have a variety of experiences and 'get a sense of the reality' of life after high school. The portfolio, as conceived by Carole and Camille, would consist of a variety of tasks: shadowing a professional in the field to which they might want to enter, attending a college class, attending a local government meeting, researching five websites, setting up their own website. Each of these was attached to a point value. Students could, in effect, determine their grade by deciding not how well, but how many of the tasks to complete. Camille and Carole referred to this list of tasks as a 'rubric' and distributed it to students at the start of the semester (see Appendix 1). As students completed tasks, their portfolios grew thicker; and each Friday the teachers checked on students' progress.

   Near the end of the semester, as Camille was anticipating the final exhibitions, I asked her if she was pleased with the rubric. On the plus side, she told me, 'I think it's a wonderful activity … I mean, because it exposes them to so much. It, it gives them a lot of opportunities to see a lot of things and experience a lot of things, which I think is great'. Here the portfolio and the rubric seem to represent Camille's goal of exposure and variety of 'experiences' and 'opportunities' rather than a tightly-aligned sequence of performances and assessments built around skill development and understanding. But she also recognizes the need for coherence, and she shared her frustration with the design of SPS (as represented by the rubric) when she said:

> You can't just throw this paper [rubric] at these kids and say, 'this is what you want, [I] want you to do'. … If you've got things you want them to learn and develop, skills you want them to develop, you've gotta plan in your day somewhere with them how you're gonna teach them how to do this.

Camille acknowledges that mostly 'kids figured out how to do things like create a website' on their own. 'This is not how it should be', she told me. And she chalks it up to experience. Her view of herself as teacher in the midst of reforming her practice is evident when she refers to 'revising' and 'fine-tuning' the rubric so that it provides more support for students and also, so students 'understand the purpose.' While these insights indicate that Camille, in fact, aspires to do more than merely 'expose' students to a variety of disconnected 'experiences', her descriptions suggest uncertainty as to how to go about 'revising' and 'fine-tuning' her curriculum. In highlighting the 'big picture' goals, goals she is able to address through affective interactions with her students, she tries to compensate for what appears to be a lack of clarity regarding how to design or use a rubric. Still, her uncertainty about the relationship between goals and performances challenges Camille's efforts at designing her curriculum, which strains her teaching even before she steps into the classroom.

Managing

When teaching and learning revolve around individual 'projects', meaning most students are working independently, familiar challenges of classroom management assume new dimensions. Traditional measures of successful classroom management—time on task, productivity, civil interactions between students and teachers—

are undermined when the teacher is no longer the primary source of knowledge. Authority relationships between teacher and students are altered when discovery replaces transmission. And new learning environments as well as increased emphasis on student performance demand a new and expanded repertoire for teachers. Where designing constitutes what may be called the 'invisible' work of constructivist teaching, the management skills associated with mentoring and motivation are more frequently equated with coaching. Here, method, manner, and style most visibly merge as dimensions of the pedagogy of coaching.

Like many teachers attempting to enact constructivist pedagogies, Camille concerned herself with the challenge of cultivating the consent of her students to 'do the work'. And she experimented with a variety of interpersonal stances—as ally, as rule-setter, as therapist—in an attempt to persuade or to coerce students to perform. As Pace (2004) notes in her study of authority relations in diverse high school settings, the quest for civility often dominates teachers' interactions with students. Camille, like many teachers, was often hesitant to challenge students overtly; she either found covert ways to persuade students to comply or she exchanged the goal of academic performance for that of intimate rapport with her students.

When Camille talked about the 'attitude' problem of SPS, she was referring not to rude or disrespectful behaviour. Rather, she was concerned about students' failure to get assignments in on time, if at all. Before 'scrapping' the original plan for the second semester 'Utopia' unit, Camille and Carole attempted to reason with their students, appealing to their sense of right and responsibility:

> With the class. Um, we're … OK, its like, 'you want us to go back to the way we were doing things but, what are you willing to do to get that back?' And so, we had a list on the board of the things the students wanted and what their expectations were. We even went back to the beginning of the school year. 'What did you think you were signing up for when you signed up for Senior Political Studies. How has this class met your expectations? How has it not met your expectations?' And, … 'if you like the way we were doing things before, ya know, these past three weeks, what do you as students have to do? What's your responsibility and accountability in that for us to be willing to go back to that?'

In response to students' lack of 'responsibility' regarding work in SPS, Camille and Carole punished the class by reverting to a more 'traditional' format. When students complained about the punishment, Camille used their engagement as an occasion to cultivate consent. She identified what she thought was an incentive, freedom, and offered it in exchange for 'responsibility'. Ultimately, this bargain was unsuccessful. That is, Camille and Carole continued to adjust their expectations as well as the curriculum to conform to the limits set by the students rather than persuading the students to meet the demands set by the teachers.

The use of assessment as diagnosis, the ability to tolerate chaos and also to reign in 'off-task' behaviour when necessary are functions largely of individual teacher judgement. And they are examples of the subtle ways in which teachers blend method, manner, and style to form a management repertoire (Richardson & Fallona, 2001). Split-second decisions about how to respond to student questions, how to address

disruptive behaviour, or when students need to be shown rather than told how to do something demand command of a subtle set of knowledge and skills (Doyle, 1986). Schön (1983) called this use of judgement 'reflection-in-action', and characterized it as professional 'know-how' demonstrated by practitioners in a range of settings from medicine to design to business to teaching. This sort of 'know-how' falls into the category of method in teaching, but it impinges on the moral and stylistic dimensions as well. In Camille's case, what was identified as students' failure to respond responsibly to the demands of the course may be more accurately viewed as uncertainty about how to design an engaging curriculum. Although Camille acknowledges the design flaws of SPS, she does not seem to realize fully that no amount of freedom, empathy or coercion will, on its own, induce students to 'do the work'.

Criticism

McDonald opens his 1992 study of the 'uncertain' profession of teaching with a brief description of coaching:

> As soon as I finished teaching the first class I ever taught, I asked my supervisor what he thought. He told me he thought I had taught as if speaking from the next room through a tube. He was a good coach. With a single sentence, he oriented me toward the real thing. (1992, p. 1)

The capacity to provide criticism that, by design, generates stronger, more masterful performances is a signal skill of coaches, and it is the element of coaching most frequently elaborated by researchers and theorists (Stiggins, 1992; Wolf, 1992; McDonald *et al.*, 1993; Wiggins, 1993; Cossentino, 2002). Usually referred to as 'feedback', formative or generative assessment is distinguished from more traditional, summative approaches to criticism by virtue of its pivotal role in instruction. Feedback describes a technique, a stance, as well as a learning emblem, and as such, it is an example of how method, manner, and style merge within a single move. Evaluating student work in generative as well as summative contexts also presented dramatic challenges to Camille's practice as well as her identity.

Criticism demands expertise in description, analysis, and interpretation, and it also assumes expertise in design (Eisner, 1994). The critic, as McDonald's account suggests, must not only be able to make a coherent judgement about a given performance, he/she must be able to communicate that judgement in a way that is intelligent as well as compassionate. A teacher who is inexperienced in the art of appraisal or who misunderstands the necessary link between performance and assessment in his/her curriculum will be uncomfortable in the role of critic. Perhaps more important, however, is the cultural expectation that teachers' judgement—often referred to as bias—be checked. The rubric, once again, illustrates the technical, stylistic, and moral tensions inherent in this 'reformed' approach to teaching.

Rubrics were the primary strategy for mitigating discomfort in the role of critic. All three teachers relied on them as organizing mechanisms for their courses and also as

tools to make their evaluation of student work more 'objective'. In laying out as precisely as possible the feature of 'distinguished' versus 'satisfactory' work, these teachers aimed to clarify, and in the process legitimate, the process of criticism. While the rubric was used, primarily, to ease strains caused by lack of expertise in criticism, at times it was also a source of tension.

Because the rubric for SPS was constructed to label and quantify completed tasks rather than quality of work, this guideline actually distracted Camille from the goal of appraisal. It also misled students, which troubled Camille. She told me she had 'a problem' with saying, 'well, if you've done this amount of boxes on the rubric, it's an "A" and if you've done this amount of boxes on the rubric, it's a '"B"'.

Even a detailed and descriptive rubric offers limited assistance in the actual act of criticizing student work. Ultimately, the teacher applies knowledge drawn from a variety of sources, including intuition, to assign value to a piece of work. Kordalewski (2000) calls the process of factoring multiple sources of knowledge about a student and his/her work the 'co-construction' of standards. Mabry (1995) calls it 'inferred achievement'. Whether negotiated or inferred, this blend of method, manner, and style is a constituent feature of all work with exhibitions, and by extension any instructional strategy that implicates the teacher in defining outcomes. I call this element of expertise 'local knowledge'. Drawing on Geertz' (1983) understanding of the nuanced and complicated nature of 'insider' knowledge borne of participation in a culture, I argue that appraisal of student work occurs within the highly 'localized' context of the classroom culture. Local knowledge entails the deployment of skills such as reflection-in-action. It also assumes the moral value of caring for one's students. Finally, because of its local, contextualized nature, criticism based on local knowledge is a stylistic move. Despite efforts to standardize that context through the use of instruments like rubrics, ultimately the teacher draws on local knowledge of the culture of the classroom as well as the individuals who inhabit it in assuming the role of critic.

Near the end of the semester, in a moment of exasperation triggered by a disagreement with Carole, Camille revealed to me that it was Carole, rather than she, who was the primary designer for the 'portfolio'. When I asked her what she thought Carole was thinking when she put the rubric together, she replied, 'I wish I knew'. I interpreted this late revelation concerning authorship of the rubric as manifestation of the tensions she experienced in the role of coach. Partly, her comment suggested uncertainty about the quality of the portfolios. I also read the comment (along with its tone) as an indicator of Camille's uncertain relationship with technical knowledge— where she gets it, how she assesses it, and her perception of its value in her teaching.

Camille identified her partnership with Carole as a primary source of her developing knowledge base about teaching. Throughout my time in her classroom, she identified Carole as a role model, as someone who had taught her 'a lot about teaching'. Camille admired Carole's 'hands-on' approach, and even when she had reached a breaking point of frustration with Carole, she still referred to her as 'a great teacher'. Up to the point at which she revealed that Carole had created the rubric 'very quickly', Camille also insisted that she and Carole shared credit for the re-design of

SPS. But throughout the field study, there were hints that Camille was uncertain of her own expertise and also nervous of the impression she would be giving me as I studied her teaching.

Her insistent focus on the affective, therapeutic aspect of her teaching ('what I do versus what I'm supposed to do') and her tendency to 'forget' to turn over student work to me as part of my data collection were, I concluded, attempts to emphasize her manner and style over her method of coaching. Because Camille received notable praise from all corners of the school for her popularity with students, her healthy collegial relationships, her work ethic, and her enthusiasm for 'student-centred' pedagogy, Camille felt pressure to uphold her reputation by preserving the illusion that all was well with her class. That is until it was apparent that all was not well.

In revealing her frustration with Carole as a colleague, Camille was also expressing disappointment in Carole as a teacher. She relied on Carole to show her how to develop a repertoire based on a constructivist knowledge base; but in the end, for a variety of reasons mostly related to Carole's own uncertainty about method, Camille was left on her own to interpret the rubric and to try to apply it to her work with students. Her dissatisfaction with the rubric and her willingness to 'revise' and 'fine-tune' it also suggests that Camille is trying to learn to teach with it; she is trying to become a coach. But without a reliable method and source of pedagogical content knowledge as well as a laboratory in which to experiment with and develop it, she is adrift in a sea of incoherent abstractions with only her intuition to guide her.

Conclusion: becoming without being[4]

I have argued in this paper that the idea of being a coach offers great appeal to teachers aiming to make sense of reforms aimed at constructivist and transformative teaching. I have also argued that the practice of coaching reveals an array of tensions faced by teachers aiming to enact constructivist and transformative pedagogies. Both the appeal and the tension, what I characterize as a range of uncertainties related to the content as well as context of the current climate of reform, are vividly expressed in the idea of becoming a coach. Coaching, I conclude, is an apt metaphor for the habit of becoming that has come to define reform in education.

Coaching as an act of becoming appeals to teachers, in part, because it embraces the moral and stylistic as well as technical dimensions of teaching. Here is a pedagogy that embodies potentiality. It invites teachers to stand beside their students, to care for them, to guide them, to assist them in their own becoming. When the act of coaching reflects and elaborates the act of becoming, the moral dimension of a teacher's identity and practice takes centre stage. Camille typifies the aspect of becoming that infuses the meaning and practice of coaching. In the foregoing description and analysis, she leads emphatically with the moral and stylistic dimensions of her teaching.

Her manner reveals tensions related to the 'shoulds' of her teaching. Should

she empower her students by encouraging them to express themselves or should she view her teaching as an initiation into the dominant culture of power? Should her stance project empathy or accountability? Should she teach students to be poised and confident or to learn to analyse *Animal Farm*? Throughout, Camille's attempt to resolve these tensions is visible in both her talk and her practice. The way in which the 'shoulds' interacted with the 'hows' of her practice illustrates the dynamic relationship between method, manner, and style. This interaction is most prominent in the symbolic act of negation, which for Camille is a principal instrument in the enterprise of becoming a coach. Through negation, the tensions surrounding what she should do as a teacher are subsumed in a set of certainties about what she should not do. The emphatic list of 'should nots' helps her cope with the vagaries of technical knowledge and skill that vex her practice. The 'all important negative' is a powerful instrument for becoming. Within the dialectic of denunciation and annunciation (Friere, 1970) lies, at least symbolically, the potential for change.

But potentiality, as Aristotle stressed, is not a substitute for being. And the act of becoming a coach does not always lead to being a coach. For denunciation must be accompanied by annunciation or the dialectic is incomplete. Such was the case with Camille. Being a coach, like being a virtuoso teacher, requires a skillful and elegant blending of method, manner, and style. And while Camille projects a degree of certainty relative to her manner and style, her technical command of the method of coaching is, understandably, uncertain.

Camille's uncertainty about how to design and use a rubric represents much more than her strain to master the technical dimension of coaching. It illustrates the complexity—technical as well as moral and stylistic—of the enterprise of becoming a coach. The repertoire of skills and knowledge related to teaching in constructivist classrooms requires the teacher to do much more than step aside so that student expression may take centre stage. It demands mastery of a subtle and, for many teachers, new set of technical capacities related to the creation of coherent and engaging curricula, the supervision of complex learning environments and relationships, and the appraisal of student work.

Although manner and style cannot serve as substitutes for method in teaching, Camille's persistent focus on the whys and shoulds of her teaching suggests that efforts to teach in more 'meaningful' ways may serve as starting points for teachers aiming to master the hows of constructivist teaching. And in regarding manner and style as dimensions of pedagogy distinct from method may help clarify the technical as well as moral challenges of learning to coach. One of the challenges of changing practice lies in clearly articulating the nature as well as the purposes of change. Policies aimed at instigating instructional change by invoking principles or ideologies have often fallen into the trap of emphasizing the whys or the shoulds rather than the hows of reform. The case of Camille suggests that teachers attempting to implement such reforms would benefit from more precise vision of what a 'changed' version of teaching would look like as well as how they might go about the task of transforming their practice.

Notes

1.   All names of people and places have been changed to protect the anonymity of the participants in the study.
2.   Although Camille is the subject of this article, I include discussion of Carole's role as Camille's teaching partner, both because Carole was described by Camille as a significant influence and because the organizational ideal of 'teaming', exemplified in this case, suggests another dimension of the collaborative, facilitative thrust of the practice of 'coaching'.
3.   Exhibition refers to the practice of preparing and presenting a culminating performance to an audience of critics. This constructivist-oriented practice is closely aligned with the CES, which since 1984 has been one of the principal proponents of the ideal of 'teacher as coach'.
4.   I am grateful to Philbert Aaron, a graduate student in Educational Policy and Curriculum Theory at the University of Maryland, who assisted in the preparation of this article in numerous ways, including penetrating reviews of the literature and perceptive critiques of my argument. This phrase, which he used to describe Camille's incomplete pedagogical metamorphosis, is only his most obvious contribution.

Note on contributor

Jacqueline Cossentino is Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Maryland, College Park. She studies teachers' experience of educational reform, focusing especially on the role of language and ritual in helping teachers confront the conceptual challenges of change. Her work appears in the *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, the *Journal of Aesthetic education*, *Reflective Practice*, and in *Talking about a revolution: the languages of educational reform* (SUNY, 2004).

References

Austin, J. (1975 [1962]) *How to do things with words* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

Ball, D. (1993) With an eye on the mathematical horizon: dilemmas of teaching elementary school mathematics, *Elementary School Journal,* 93, 373–397.

Ballenger, C. (1992) Because you like us: the language of control, *Harvard Educational Review,* 62, 199–208.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R. Sullivan, W. Spindler, A. & Tipton, S. (1985) *Habits of the heart* (New York, Haper & Row).

Burke, K. (1966) *Language as symbolic action* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press).

Burroughs, R., Schwartz, T. & Hendricks-Lee, M. (2000) Communities of practice and discourse communities: negotiating the boundaries in NBPTS certification, *Teachers College Record,* 102, 344–374.

Cazden, C. (1988) *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning* (Portsmouth, NH, Heinemann).

Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, M. (2001) Sticks, stones, and ideology, the discourse of reform in teacher education, *Educational Researcher* 30(8), 3–15.

Cohen, D., McLaughlin, M. & Talbert, J. (Eds) (1993) *Teaching for understanding: challenges for policy and practice* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).

Conley, D. & Goldman, P. (1994) Ten propositions for facilitative leadership, in: J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds) *Reshaping the principalship* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin).

Connelly, F. & Clandinin, D. (1988) *Teachers as curriculum planners: narratives of experience* (New York, Teachers College Press).

Cossentino, J. (2001) Ritualising reform: how teachers transform policy into practice. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Seattle, WA.

Cossentino, J. (2002) Importing artistry: further lessons from the design studio, *Reflective Practice,* 3, 39–52.

Cossentino, J. (2003) Curriculum under construction: confronting the challenge of engagement in an era of reform. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 35(3), 281–302.

Cossentino, J. (2004) *Talking about a revolution: the languages of educational reform* (Albany, NY, State University of New York Press).

Costa, A. & Garmston, R. (1997) The process of coaching: mediating growth toward holonomy, in: A. Costa & R. Liebmann (Eds) *The process centered school: sustaining a renaissance community* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press).

Delpit, L. (1988) The silenced dialogue: power and pedagogy in educating other people's children, *Harvard Educational Review,* 58, 280–298.

Delpit, L. (1991) A conversation with Lisa Delpit, *Language Arts,* 68, 541–547.

Dennison, G. (1969) *The lives of children* (New York, Random House).

Dewey, J. (1938) *Experience and education* (New York, Macmillian).

Doyle, W. (1986) Classroom organisation and management, in: M. C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd edn) (New York, Macmillan), 392–431.

Driver, T. (1998) *Liberating rites: the transformative power of ritual* (Boulder, CO, Westview).

Eisner, E. (1994) *The educational imagination: the design and evaluation of school programs* (Philadelphia, PA, The Falmer Press).

Elbaz, F. (1991) Research on teacher's knowledge: the evolution of a discourse, *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 23, 1–19.

Eliade, M. (1965) *Rite and symbols of initiation* (New York, Harper and Row).

Fenstermacher, G. (2002) *Pedagogy in three dimensions: method, style, and manner inclassroom teaching.* Invited lecture at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Freeman, D. (1996) To take them at their word: language data in the study of teachers' knowledge, *Harvard Educational Review,* 66, 732–761.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (rev. edn) (New York, Continuum).

Gardner, H. (1991) *The unschooled mind: how children learn and how schools should teach* (New York, Basic Books).

Friedman, V. (1997) Making schools safe for uncertainty: teams, teaching, and school reform, *Teachers College Record,* 99, 335–370.

Gee, J. (1990) *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses* (Philadelphia, PA, Falmer Press).

Gee, J. (2001) Identity as an analytic lens for research in education, in: W. Secada (Ed.) *Review of research in education* (vol. 25) (Washington, DC, American Educational Research Association).

Geertz, C. (1983) *Local knowledge: further essays in interpretive anthropology* (New York, Basic Books).

Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face behavior* (Garden City, NY, Anchor Books).

Hacking, I. (1986) Making up people, in: T. C. Heller, M. Sosna, D. E. Wellbury, A. I. Davidson, A. Swidler & I. Watt (Eds) *Reconstructing individualism: autonomy, individuality, and the self in Western thought* (Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press).

Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing teachers, changing times: teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age* (London, Cassell).

Holt-Reynolds, D. (2000) What does the teacher do? constructivist pedagogies and prospective teachers' beliefs about the role of a teacher, *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 16, 21–32.

hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching to transgress* (New York, Routledge).

Jackson, P. (1986) *The practice of teaching* (New York, Teachers College Press).

Kordalewski, J. (2000) *Standards in the classroom: how teachers and students negotiate learning* (New York, Teachers College Press).

Labaree, D. (1997) *How to succeed in school without really learning: the credentials race in American education* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press).

Little, J. (1990) The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching, in: C. Cazden (Ed.) *Review of research in education* (vol. 16) (Washington, DC, American Educational Research Association), 297–351.

Lortie, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher: a sociological study* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).

Mabry, L. (1995) *Performance assessment and inferred achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

MacFarquhar, L. (2002, April 22 and 29) The better boss: how Marshall Goldsmith reforms executives, *The New Yorker, pp. 114–136.*

McDonald, J. (1992) *Teaching: making sense of an uncertain craft* (New York, Teachers College Press).

McDonald, J., Smith, S., Turner, D., Finney, M. & Barton, E. (1993) *Graduation by exhibition: assessing genuine achievement* (Alexandria,VA, Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development).

Munby, H. (1990) Metaphorical expressions of teachers' practical curriculum knowledge, *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,* 6, 18–30.

Noddings, N. (1984) *Caring: a feminine approach to ethics* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press).

Pace, J. (2004) Using ambiguity and entertainment to win compliance in a lower-level US History class, *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 35(1), 83–110.

Page, R. (1991) *Lower track classrooms* (New York, Teachers College Press).

Page, R. (1999) The uncertain value of school knowledge: biology at Westridge High, *Teachers College Record,* 100, 554–601.

Parker, F. W. (1896) *Talks on pedagogics* (New York & Chicago: E. L. Kellogg & Co).

Perrone, V. (1998) Why do we need a pedagogy of understanding?, in: M. Wiske (Ed.) *Teaching for understanding: linking research with practice* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).

Richardson, V. (2002) Finding a center for research on teaching. Vice Presidential Address presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, LA.

Richardson, V. & Fallona, C. (2001) Classroom management as method and manner, *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 33, 705–728.

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

Searle, J. (1969) *Speech acts* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

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

Sizer, T. (1984) *Horace's compromise* (Boston, MA, Houghton-Mifflin).

Swidler, A. (1979) *Organization without authority* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

Thompson, C. & Zeuli, J. (1999) The frame and the tapestry: standards-based reform and professional development, in: L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds) *Teaching as the learning profession: handbook of policy and practice* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).

Turner, V. (Ed.) (1969) *The ritual process: structure and anti-structure* (Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995) *Tinkering toward Utopia* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

Van Gennep, A. (1960) *The rites of passage* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).

Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

Wiggins, G. (1993) *Assessing student performance: exploring the purpose and limits of testing* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).

Wiske, M. (Ed.) (1997) *Teaching for understanding: linking research with practice* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).

Wolf, D. (1992) Assessment as an episode of learning, in: R. Bennett & W. Ward (Eds) *Construction versus choice in cognitive measurement* (Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum).

Zessoules, R. & Gardner, H. (1991) Authentic assessment: beyond the buzzword, in: V. Perronne (Ed.) *Expanding student assessment* (Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development)