

On the place of pedagogy in the induction of early career teachers

Jennifer Gore, Cheryl Williams and James Ladwig
The University of Newcastle

Paper prepared for presentation at
Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference
Adelaide, November 26-30, 2006

This paper explores the potential of a pedagogy model in supporting the professional learning and pedagogical success of early career teachers. Much of the literature and many policies focus on matters other than pedagogy in teacher induction. Given the low retention rates for early career teachers (Strong & St John, 2005; Ingersoll, 2001; Ramsey, 2000), we argue that attention to pedagogy is not only critical to supporting new teachers and ensuring their classroom success, but is also in the public interest.

This paper discusses the induction and mentoring experiences and the pedagogical performance of a small group of teachers who undertook substantial studies in pedagogy in their teacher education program and entered NSW public schools in a context of heightened focus on pedagogy through a state-wide pedagogy initiative (Cohort 1). The paper also draws on data from a longitudinal study to explore the experiences and performance of early career teachers who may not have had a strong grounding in the pedagogy model but who are in schools where a focus on pedagogy is expected (Cohort 2). The data from both studies highlight the need for a clear and substantial focus on pedagogy to better support the professional growth of early career teachers.

This paper explores factors in the professional learning and pedagogical success of early career teachers. The induction of early career teachers has been widely acknowledged for decades as critical to their success and retention in teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Eddy, 1969; Ewing and Smith, 2002; Hatton and Harmon, 1997; McCormack, Gore and Thomas, 2004; Williams 2002a), and yet attrition rates in Australia and elsewhere remain high (Ingersoll, 2001; Ramsey, 2000; Strong and St John, 2005). For instance, in New South Wales (NSW), Australia, one in five new teachers leaves the profession in their first five years of professional practice (Manuel, 2003). It is our argument, in this paper, that insufficient attention is given in teacher induction to supporting early career teachers in the most fundamental aspect of their work, the quality of their pedagogy.

We construct this argument with reference to the academic literature on teacher induction and teacher socialisation as well as through two empirical studies of the experiences of early career teachers. The first study followed a group of teacher education graduates through their first year

of teaching, gathering both classroom observation measures of the quality of their pedagogy and interview data about their induction experiences and the type of support they received. These graduates had experienced an intensive study of pedagogy in their final preservice year and began their teaching appointments at a time when public schools in one Australian state¹ were placing renewed emphasis on pedagogy. As such they represented a group of early career teachers for whom pedagogy was more likely to be at the forefront of their minds than it is for early career teachers in general.

The second study identified early career teachers within a larger sample of teachers for whom data were collected on the quality of their pedagogy, as well as interview and survey data on their professional learning experiences, among other issues. These early career teachers were teaching in schools that were selected for the study in part because there was a greater probability of finding a focus on pedagogy in them. Hence, this group of teachers also represented a cohort of early career teachers who were more likely to experience induction involving pedagogy than is typical. Represented diagrammatically then (Figure 1), our interest was in studying early career teachers who at least had a higher than usual focus on pedagogy preservice (Cell B) or a higher than usual focus on pedagogy inservice (Cell C), and who preferably had a higher than typical focus on pedagogy in both preservice and inservice contexts (Cell D).

		Focus on pedagogy	
		<i>Lower inservice</i>	<i>Higher inservice</i>
Focus on pedagogy	<i>Lower preservice</i>	A	C
	<i>Higher preservice</i>	B	D

Figure 1. Possible groups by degree of focus on pedagogy, preservice and inservice

The analyses presented in the final section of this paper confirm that there is a significant neglect of pedagogy during induction, even in these contexts where we anticipated that pedagogy would form a more substantial part of teacher induction. We also found that the quality of pedagogy

¹ For reporting at AARE 2006, direct references to the Australian state have been removed to preserve a degree of anonymity.

produced by the early career teachers in these two studies was not significantly different than that of their more experienced colleagues. These findings have major implications for teacher induction which will be addressed in the final section of the paper.

Reconceptualising induction

Decades of research into the phenomenon of beginning to teach has highlighted the importance of providing support that meets the different demands of early career teachers. The support needs of early career teachers have frequently been characterised as personal and institutional (Martinez, 1994; Page, Marlow and Malloy, 2000) or as emotional, physical, social and psychological (Britzman, 1991; Ewing and Smith, 2002; Lortie, 1975; Rogers and Babinski, 2002; Wang and Odell, 2002), but rarely as pedagogical. The privileging of personal support that characterises many conceptualisations of teacher induction is clearly evident in a recent Australian report on effective programs for early career teachers (DEST, 2002). The report was titled “An Ethic of Care” which, according to its authors, “reflects the fact that the teachers surveyed and interviewed . . . consistently attached highest priority to the need for personal support” (p. 8). Moreover, a study undertaken by Williams (2003) involving a group of early career teachers (n=26) in their first year of practice in rural areas, reported that, while they moderately valued induction strategies such as kits and meetings, they highly valued the informal personal support of their colleagues (Williams, 2003). In short, personal support is wanted and given.

The ‘reality shock’ that Veenman (1984) described twenty years ago, and that continues to be experienced by many early career teachers in their first year of experience in schools (Ramsey, 2000, Danielewicz, 2001), exacerbates this need for personal support. For many early career teachers, moving from supported preservice practicum experiences to the task of taking full responsibility for a class or classes of students is a giant leap, often compounded by moving to a new geographic location to take up their appointment, teaching outside their subject areas with limited resources, and coping with the extremes of school and community contexts with which they have no prior experience (Ramsey, 2000; Johnson, 2004; Danielewicz, 2001; Williams, 2002a; Williams, 2002b).

As a consequence, however, in both academic and organizational teacher induction literature, ensuring that teachers are welcomed to their new schools, have the appropriate resources, know how to carry out the many and varied administrative tasks associated with professional

practice and have the capacity to manage and control their students, often takes precedence over whether they are able to practise quality teaching in their classrooms. Survival is often the primary (spoken and unspoken) goal, and even where teacher development is built into induction and probation processes, the quality of pedagogy is rarely an explicit or specific focus. This lack of focus on pedagogy within induction processes can be seen to consolidate views about teaching that defray teachers' own responsibility for their students' outcomes. As Wang and Odell (2002) put it,

For novices the dominant picture of teachers' work is either of caring and nurturing or of managing: they regard pedagogy and students' academic learning as less important. They attribute student learning to teachers' personalities or management, or to the individual student's innate abilities or background, rather than to teachers choosing appropriate teaching content and strategies. (p.513)

Certainly ensuring that children are safe and happy in an organised environment that encourages and supports learning is an essential and important role of schools and teachers. However, we argue that unless early career teachers develop (or are shown) a different picture of teaching during induction, little is likely to change in terms of the quality of teaching or levels of achievement found in many schools.

In summary, while we do not wish to undervalue or trivialise the importance of personal support for new teachers as an important component of any induction program, we argue that it is important to reconceptualise the notion of providing personal support as being as much about the details and specifics of classroom practice as it is about the social and psychological needs of early career teachers. Given the low retention rates for early career teachers (Colbert and Wolf, 1992; Manuel, 2003), such attention to pedagogy during induction is not only critical to supporting new teachers and ensuring their classroom success, but is also in the public interest. That is, a focus on pedagogy during induction might not only assist with the retention of teachers who deliver good teaching, but also improve learning outcomes and school experiences for all students. Gray and Smith (2005) put the issue succinctly: "improving working conditions and salaries might be helpful steps toward recruiting an adequate number of teachers, but *giving them chances to learn and practice their craft* is the best way to retain quality teachers" (p. 9, our emphasis).

Methodology

This paper draws on data from both case studies of teachers in their first years of appointment and a longitudinal study of the relationships among professional learning, the quality of pedagogy and student outcomes, involving teachers at all career stages. Both studies are located within a context of pedagogical reform. In an attempt to lift the quality of pedagogy in this state's public schools, the state Department worked with academics, to develop a model of pedagogy. The model draws on the significant work of Newmann & Associates (1996) on Authentic Pedagogy, as well as other elements of classroom and assessment practice that have been linked through empirical research to improved learning outcomes for students across the spectrum of social backgrounds.

A central aspect of the pedagogy initiative is professional development based around materials designed to support teachers in developing their understanding through dialogue about classroom and assessment practices. Teachers are encouraged to apply the processes outlined in the materials to their own lessons and assessment tasks, with a view to improving practice.

It is worth noting that the state in which this initiative is taking place is one of the most populous states in Australia, with several hundred public schools governed by a single state authority. As such, the pedagogy initiative is perhaps one of the world's largest systemic attempts to improve the nature and quality of pedagogical practice. Examining the critical point of induction into teaching in this context thus has significant ramifications both for scholarship in the fields of induction and teacher development and for policy development and pedagogical reform attempts in Australia and elsewhere.

The case study – Cohort 1

The smaller case study was designed to examine the impact of the pedagogy model on the socialisation of early career teachers (Gore and Williams, 2003). Given that the pedagogy initiative aims to impact positively on pedagogical practice, and ultimately on student outcomes, our specific concern in this study was with how preservice preparation in the pedagogy model intersects with these teachers' early experiences in schools to support their development in pedagogy. Several authors have documented the common mismatch between aspects of teacher education and what graduates encounter in schools (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Gore, 2001; Lortie,

1975; Zeichner and Tabachnik, 1981). We predicted that the pedagogy initiative would produce greater congruence between the university and the schools, at least for this group of graduates, thus bringing into the spotlight the potential of a focus on pedagogy in teacher induction for supporting teacher development.

During their preservice program, the 7 graduates who were the subject of the case studies (Cohort 1) undertook a substantive university course in the pedagogy model. (Note that the sample available for the case studies was small, given that there were a small number of students enrolled in the course). This course took the form final preservice year (2003) course of 14 weeks, 28 hours duration, during which the students developed a deep understanding of the elements of the model through a range of experiences that centred on designing and coding lesson plans, units of work, and assessment tasks and examining student work. At the completion of the course, these graduates could readily explain the concepts of the pedagogy model, as was evident both in their written assignments and in class discussions. Each of the participants in the study had achieved good results for the course (credit, distinction or high distinction), which suggests that they developed deep knowledge and understanding of the model during their studies. We wanted to see whether this preparation helped these graduates to sustain a focus on pedagogy in their first year of teaching, 2004, within the educational and community contexts in which they were placed and in relation to the workplace socialisation processes operating in their school sites. Moreover, we speculated that, in the context of system-wide renewed interest in pedagogy through the pedagogy initiative, these early career teachers might even be encouraged to provide leadership in relation to the pedagogy framework, in the schools to which they were appointed.

Data were gathered through lesson observations, using the same materials with which the graduates were familiar and semi-structured interviews, conducted during the second half of 2004. The interviews focussed on early career teacher expectations and the reality of teaching, forms of support (pedagogical or otherwise), the capacity of intensive preservice teacher education in pedagogy to sustain good teaching and assessment practice, and the effects of school culture and context on teaching and teacher efficacy (Gore and Williams, 2003). One observation of each teacher was made, for a class nominated by the early career teacher, and coded using the instruments developed for the pedagogy initiative.

The longitudinal study – Cohort 2

An ongoing longitudinal study, using a multi-method approach to explore the relationships among professional learning, the quality of pedagogy, and student outcomes, provided a second source of data for our analysis. In this paper, we make use of assessment task and classroom observation data as measures of the quality of pedagogy, as well as the survey and interview data for demographic information about the teachers and their perceptions of their work and their professional learning.

These data from the longitudinal study complement the case study with a larger and more generalisable sample of 206 teachers in the first three years of appointment forming what we refer to as Cohort 2 and with comparative data involving teachers at different points in their careers. The triangulation of findings across the multiple data points of these two studies – rich case study data from the first and second years of appointment for a small number of teachers, cross-sectional data from a larger sample of early career teachers, and comparisons with more experienced teachers – contribute to the veracity of our claims.

Pedagogy and induction: Cohort 1

We focus here on the experiences of three of the teachers from Cohort 1, selected because these are the only three (of seven) who reported in their interviews that state's pedagogy model had received any substantive attention in their schools since they had started teaching. That is, the other graduates in Cohort 1 reported in their interviews that there had been very limited mentions of the pedagogy model during beginning teacher or general staff development sessions or staff meetings, and that they had received little or no specific feedback on their pedagogy, from colleagues, supervisors or mentors, since they had started teaching (typically between six and ten months prior to the interviews). These numbers, in and of themselves, provide evidence that, to date, pedagogy is not a substantial focus during induction for at least some early career teachers. The lack of attention within their schools to the pedagogy model might also be explained by the nascence of the initiative and the changing context for professional learning and for early career teachers. That is, in 2004 a new professional learning policy was applied to the state's public schools and an Institute of Teachers was formed. These developments in pedagogy, professional learning and teaching standards should provide the conditions for a greater focus on pedagogy

than was the case in 2004 and 2005 when the data for both of the studies reported here were gathered.

The teachers referred to in this section (using pseudonyms) are: Cody, a PE teacher at Green Flats High School, Karen, a music teacher at Jade High School, and Will, a PE teacher at Sandy View High School.

Cody

Cody's major characterisation of his induction is that he has been left alone to get on with the business of teaching:

I've been dealt with as if everyone sees me as competent, you know "he's alright, he doesn't need any help". If you do your job they (the other teachers) respect you and if you don't do your job they don't talk to you.

Cody reports that he has been accepted into the school community and is finding it easy to socialise with the other staff. He claims to have no major management issues in class "just normal run of the mill stuff." However, although he says he would like more input into his teaching, he is finding it difficult to get constructive criticism and guidance about his classroom practice during his first year. Indeed, Cody's experiences of supervision (from his Head Teacher) and mentoring (from a designated teacher mentor, whose role is to support early career teachers) portray an alarming lack of induction support.

When he asked for feedback about his teaching, Cody's Head Teacher replied "No, no, I stick my head in every now and then and I can see you're doing your job, so I don't worry about it". The message he has received is that formal support is only offered from supervisors "when the kids muck up". Although the teacher mentor did provide advice to Cody after observing two lessons during a ten week period, he did not find her support to be at all useful, and views her as having little credibility. His reaction to the feedback given was:

That's a load of crap. It was basic stuff I already knew. Like, it wasn't very in depth or anything; she just gave me useless feedback. No help at all. When she's in class she makes it worse. She doesn't have a rapport with the kids, they run around the place, jumping out the windows. The other beginning teachers have agreed with me that it doesn't help at all.

When asked if he would go to the Principal and say that the mentoring was not working, Cody commented that he would rather not "rock the boat":

I don't think it is my place to complain about it, being a first year out teacher.
... It's not a good way to be respected on the staff, whinging about others
when I've only been teaching three terms. Everyone knows about it but no one
is willing to do anything about it. I'm just doing my job and if other people
can't do their job, well that's their problem. I don't know ... I feel like I
haven't got much support, but I feel like I'm supported if I've got a problem.

These statements provide further evidence of the lack of support for pedagogical development experienced by early career teachers. Those who are seen to be coping adequately are too often left to develop on their own. Cody's deep understanding of pedagogy gained through his preservice experience might have contributed to his perception that the only feedback provided about his teaching was shallow and not useful. Without that firm grounding, it is possible that the shallow feedback from the teacher mentor would have been accepted. However, the result for a recipient of such feedback, if received uncritically, is likely to be pedagogy poorly understood and practised.

The teacher mentor strategy could have been extremely useful and timely in terms of sustaining the pedagogical knowledge Cody gained at university, but in this case it has not been effective, in part, we surmise, because of the teacher mentor's own limited knowledge of pedagogy. The weak knowledge base for teaching and teacher education has long been recognised as a factor in teaching preservice students how to teach well (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Gore, 2001; Shulman, 1987) but, as can be seen in Cody's case, also contributes to difficulties experienced by graduates as they make their transition into professional practice. The pedagogy model, as a framework for teacher learning, provides educators with a common language and set of concepts with which to engage in professional dialogue about pedagogy and should assist in addressing this gap.

The pedagogy model has been on the agenda since Cody arrived at Green Flats High School, but in a very minimal way. Cody described his experience in a School Development (pupil free) Day workshop as follows:

It was a half hour session where a coding sheet was handed out but nothing explicit or specific was addressed about quality pedagogy. It's hard to digest [the model] in half an hour. I mean, I struggled with it and I did a semester of it at uni.

It would appear that a focus on pedagogy in the development of teacher quality for either experienced *or* early career teachers is not a priority in professional learning programs at Cody's school.

Instead of focussing on his teaching, Cody has now volunteered to learn how to do timetabling as "it will look good on my CV", and he is also on the technology committee and organising a personal development program for students, all in his first year at the school. Whilst Cody may well benefit from being involved more fully in the corporate life of the school, none of these activities will directly develop or sustain the quality of teaching and learning that go on in Cody's classroom. Hence, Cody's developing perception of teachers' work centres on his relationships with students and on administrative tasks. These perceptions have been further entrenched by the extra load Cody has taken on as a result of the attitude of the colleague with whom he works most closely. Cody reports that this colleague does the minimum and has said quite bluntly "I am happy with being a shit teacher. I just want my money". Cody copes with his colleague by picking up the slack and resigning himself to the situation:

We get along well, but he's kind of slack and lazy, and whenever stuff comes around that has to be done it gets left on my desk because he doesn't want to do it, like organizing sport and ... all the stuff I'm doing. He's just keen to get out of here. He doesn't like the job. He hates being here. The kids don't like him. It's pretty disheartening when you are a first year out teacher and you come to a school and work with a guy who is not motivated. If there was someone there that was keen to help me out and discuss things I think I would have come a lot further than what I have. Like, I've just stagnated a bit.

Cody himself names the difference that could have been made with support for pedagogical development during his first year. Instead, he is aware that he has "stagnated" – in less than a year. We view the consequences for Cody as profoundly sad, not because he's sad – he's not, or at least, not especially – but because his first year could have been so much better. The consequences for the provision of education, if Cody's experience is not atypical, and for the students of such teachers, who will get a lower quality education than was possible, are deeply troubling.

Will

Will reports having a more formal induction experience than Cody, including a special staff development day organised for early career teachers at his school and a meeting for early

career teachers from around the district run by the teachers' union at a nearby town. But there was no focus on pedagogy in general or the pedagogy model in these early induction sessions.

The main issue for Will during his first year has been “coping” in the classroom with extreme levels of violence, bad language and behaviour, low levels of literacy and numeracy, and high levels of absenteeism, none of which he was prepared for -- “it [teaching] was like starting all over again”. Will pragmatically observed:

You do have your bad days every now and then when you just . . . I haven't had a bad day for a while actually. Everyone does have their bad days when they want to move, quit, or whatever [laughs]. A few people can't wait to get out but . . . I wouldn't say there have been any major dramas [for me].

Will said that he has often found it difficult to “do teaching and learning” because of the culture of the school, and he finds it hard to reconcile that some teachers don't really care if students are not involved in a lesson or do not learn. “It's often hard to get the kids motivated if you are the fourth lesson after they have watched three lessons of DVDs”, he wryly observed. Despite all of these difficulties, Will remains remarkably positive about his first year of teaching.

The pedagogy model is better known at Will's school than it was at Cody's, with Sandy View High School making pedagogy a regular and explicit focus at fortnightly staff meetings. During these sessions, Will's Head Teacher and others refer to the pedagogy materials and lead activities whereby the staff code lessons. Will reports that because he knows about the model from his university studies, “they expect me to get it right”. These sessions, on the surface, would appear to set up the conditions for a greater focus on pedagogy in the school in general, and in the induction of its early career teachers in particular. However, Will reports that the impact of daily school life and the difficult circumstances in his school affect teacher attitudes to learning about the model: “sometimes it's hard to focus at the end of a long day when you just want to go home. People groan about it and a lot of staff members just don't want to change”.

In terms of specific support, Will's school also had the benefit of a designated teacher mentor and yet, like Cody, Will did not find the teacher mentor to be of much assistance in developing or sustaining his professional practice:

The teacher mentor program has been ‘so-so,’ but if we had problems we could see the teacher mentor. We had regular meetings in the first part of the year on different policies and stuff like that.

Note that pedagogy is not mentioned. Support from the teacher mentor was, as seems to be more typical during induction, for policy, institutional, and administrative matters.

The teacher mentor had offered to watch Will teach, but that was yet to happen when he was interviewed, three quarters of the way through his first year. It appeared to Will that the teacher mentor was often occupied with other school initiatives, that demanded a high level of attention and support, rather than for the purpose she was employed, namely to support the early career teachers.

After three terms in the school, Will’s Head Teacher had observed one lesson and written a report on the lesson, but Will had not seen or read it at the time of the interview. The Head Teacher spoke to Will after the observed lesson. The verbal feedback was that the lesson was “fine” but that “he needs to walk around the classroom a bit more”. Given Will’s preparation in the details of the pedagogy model, and awareness of the depth of feedback that might have been given by using the details of the model, it is clear that the advice to “walk around the classroom more” will do little to develop Will’s pedagogical skill or repertoire. As the only specific feedback on his teaching that Will has received during his first year, the imperative to move around the classroom more is stark evidence of inadequate support in pedagogy for an early career teacher. Indeed it can be seen as professionally reprehensible. While these case studies do not represent the experiences of all early career teachers in the state, Cody’s and Will’s cases are too similar, *in their neglect of pedagogy*, to suggest that they are simply isolated instances. Nor are they, in our view, likely to be specific to one state or indeed unique to early career teachers in Australia.

Karen

Karen’s tale is different, yet not different enough. On her first day at Jade High School the new teachers gathered in a room, separate from the other teachers, for an orientation. Karen describes it thus:

The orientation was not very well organised. [We were] given maps that weren’t up to date, and they talked about climate allowances and serial numbers. We weren’t shown around the school . . . [We] just sat back in a seminar about

communicating with kids . . . and how to teach . . . [The session drew on the pedagogy model] which was good but not very well informed.

According to Karen then, neither the orientation to the school nor the introduction to the pedagogy model was very well done.

Although pedagogy was not completely neglected during Karen's first year at Jade High, it was addressed poorly, at least from Karen's perspective as a graduate with a deep understanding of the pedagogy model. She reports that she felt much more informed and knowledgeable about the model than her colleagues, including those running the introductory and subsequent sessions on it. In her view:

There was no depth. If you didn't get anything, that was all right. [Members of] the school staff were doing the training. It was pretty bad I thought. The presenter passed a PowerPoint presentation off as his own. There was no narrative, or stories relevant to the teachers. . . . In terms of support for pedagogy, it's not informed enough. They have all the information, but they haven't read it right, interpreted it right, or something.

Karen acknowledges her school leaders' attempts to provide professional learning experiences in the pedagogy model, but her preservice preparation enables her to recognise weaknesses in their efforts – "I just don't like things being presented wrongly and people going away saying . . . 'yes, I do [that kind of pedagogy]' and not having any firm understanding of it".

Karen is an early career teacher with a very clear idea of what the pedagogy model is and a strong sense that most of her colleagues have a very superficial understanding of it. Her confidence in these perceptions was so strong that she made the bold move of speaking to her Principal and offering to share her knowledge of pedagogy and specifically of the pedagogy model with other staff. According to Karen, the reply was "that's excellent Karen. I'll use you sometime." But she has heard no more from him. Karen may well have over-stepped the bounds of an early career teacher whose place, it may be seen, is to learn from colleagues rather than teach them. The trouble for Karen was that she wasn't learning much from her colleagues, and recognised that she had knowledge and experience (in relation to the pedagogy model) to offer them.

In terms of any supervision or mentoring in pedagogy, Karen received even less formal support than Cody and Will. She did not have the benefit (or otherwise) of a designated

teacher mentor and while she says her Head Teachers are mostly supportive, and “good to bounce ideas off”, she finds support meetings are mostly about administrative matters. In terms of any pedagogical support, Karen talks of the “comrade support” which she receives from a young colleague with whom she team teaches occasionally. But, she says, “it is not like the formal support, like mentoring, you would get from a more developed teacher.”

While making every effort to bring her strong grounding and knowledge of the pedagogy model to her everyday practice, it is mostly carried out in professional isolation. With little formal support or encouragement from school leadership through supervision or mentoring, Karen is effectively working on her own, with a little help from a “comrade”. She is insistent that having a firm understanding of quality pedagogy is “what it is all about”. She regularly refers to the pedagogy resources in her lesson planning and classroom practice, and believes that “it does have an impact [on her students’ learning]” when she consciously includes elements of the framework in her lessons. If pedagogy *has* been a focus of Karen’s first year of teaching, it is because *she* has made it a focus, based on her preservice preparation. Support for pedagogy as part of her induction has been sorely lacking.

The quality of pedagogy

Through classroom observations of Cody, Will, Karen, and the other teachers in Cohort 1 (n=7 for whom we had observation data) we gained measures of the quality of their pedagogy, using the pedagogy model materials. Our results indicate that these early career teachers, with a strong preservice grounding in the model, and with little inservice support for their pedagogy, produced pedagogy scores that are consistent with those of experienced teachers in other studies of pedagogy using the same instruments (within one Standard Deviation). The pattern of mean scores per dimension also followed that for another cohort of final year teacher education students who had undertaken the same kind of preparation in pedagogy as these graduates. Individual differences on specific dimensions did vary, but not significantly. While these data are limited by the small number of early career teachers and a single observation of each teacher, they give some indication that Cohort 1 teachers were at least doing comparatively well in terms of the quality of their classroom practice.

One year later

We interviewed these three teachers again during the second half of 2005 and found few changes. Karen reported that formal support in terms of supervision or mentoring was “not there at all” and

that professional development at her school has focused on “a range of different things, like Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences. . . but not [the pedagogy model].” She reported that she is still using the model and that it has “helped in assessment a lot”, but the main difference from her first year is that she has “taken on new jobs throughout the school” . . . including “looking after the web page at the moment.”

Will reported being a lot busier in his second year, with a significant reduction in the number of PE teachers at his school and taking on the roles of Sports Organiser and Year Advisor. He said he asks his Head Teacher “for advice on a lot of things all the time . . . whether it be assessment task examples that I’m setting . . . or just little things on sports organization that I do . . . [I] just double check with him.” Pedagogy remains a regular focus of staff meetings, where “we’re on to scoring assessment tasks.” Interestingly, when asked if he would change anything about the mentoring of beginning teachers, Will said,

I don’t like lesson observations too much, but I’d probably make it compulsory for the teachers to come in and watch more lessons . . . I would hate it, but looking back on it, I reckon the more advice you get from your experienced teachers the better . . . To be a better teacher, I think it is probably better for them.

This statement is a clear call for more support *with pedagogy* than Will received. He admits early career teachers might not like, or seek, such support, but that he can see its longer term benefits in terms of teacher development.

Like Karen and Will, Cody also reports being a lot busier, saying “I found the second year a lot harder, because I’ve picked up so many extra things to do”. Upon reflection, he says, “I was in cloud nine for the whole of last year. It was just so much easier . . . I was just teaching PE and now I’m teaching Science and doing Sports Coordinating. I just don’t have any lesson prep time.” He says “I’m just barely keeping my head above the water, which I didn’t want to do.” “It disappoints me that I can’t do [any of] it the way I want, because I just don’t have the time.” Cody is still working closely with the same colleague who made his first year difficult and says “we always got along well, but professionally we get along a lot better now, because I do most of the stuff he was meant to be doing last year.” Cody comments that his colleague is happy to get stuck in and help out with organization and the like; he just didn’t “have the drive to do it himself.” Still, says Cody, “every time I join a class with him, he sits on the stage and I do everything.”

Cody has not received any more support in pedagogy than he did in his first year. He comments “now that I’m not a beginning teacher, I’m not expected to get any help, but the new teacher mentor is my old Head Teacher from last year, so he’s aware of what I do. . . . I haven’t needed any help, but I know that he’s there and that he’s willing to help”. Cody says “it’s better this year because I know I’ve got support there, but I haven’t had to use [it].” As part of the same response, he says “I know how everything works at the school now and I know what’s expected of me.” Note that there is no mention of pedagogy among these statements. Cody is no longer a beginning teacher; he now knows how things work at the school.

The school has continued to provide inservice sessions on the pedagogy model during his second year, but, says Cody, “I kind of tune out on them, because I pretty much know more than what they are telling me, because I did the [course] at uni[versity].” “They do it really quick. They go, ‘blah, blah, blah, this is it, this is it’ and I don’t think anyone really learns anything from it . . . it all seems a bit tokenistic.” When asked to describe good teaching at his school, Cody says that:

good teaching here would be having the kids in the classroom and working. Good teaching anywhere else would be senior kids enjoying the subject, being enthusiastic, turning up on time—not so much getting good results, but just being interested and instilling my passion for PE and Health . . . Here, it’s more just keeping them busy so that they don’t muck up. . . It’s more like survival, which is disappointing.

He concludes about his short teaching career that he’s “not complaining . . . I expected it to be this way, but you always dream of [it] being better.”

In summary then, our analyses reveal that although pedagogy has been largely neglected during both their first and second years in their schools, a substantive preservice understanding of the pedagogy model might have assisted this small group of early career teachers in Cohort 1 (Cell B, Figure 1) to sustain what they have learnt about good pedagogy as they begin their teaching practice, even in some very difficult schools. We can only imagine the quality of pedagogy they might have produced if, for example, the teacher mentors for Will and Cody had been more effective in their first year, or any of them had received more specific and detailed feedback on their teaching, or any of them had been in schools where pedagogy was a deep focus, or if they weren’t so busy with non-teaching matters and taking on so much responsibility in their second year. In the following analysis of the Cohort 2 teachers, located in schools where the pedagogy model was expected to be an explicit focus, we were hopeful of finding stronger pedagogy support for early career teachers.

Pedagogy and induction: Cohort 2

In this section of the paper we explore the experiences and performance of Cohort 2 early career teachers, who may not have had a strong grounding in the pedagogy model as part of their teacher preparation but we expected would be receiving some input on pedagogy during their induction year (Cell C, Figure 1) in schools involved in the longitudinal study. Data were collected from Cohort 2 teachers during the second half of 2004 and first half of 2005.

The data were analysed for patterns in the quality of pedagogy, comparing the following three groups:

- a. teachers in their first year (n=67)
- b. teachers with 1-3 years of teaching experience (n= 139)
- c. teachers with 4 years or more teaching experience (n= 775).

The most striking finding from these analyses was the lack of statistically significant differences between the three groups. This similarity between the three groups on measures of the quality of pedagogy runs counter to dominant perceptions of the time it takes for early career teachers to develop competence (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; DET, 2003d; Wang and Odell, 2002). Indeed, many sets of teaching standards, are built around a developmental presumption, which might hold for the standards, but does not appear to hold for what matters most—the quality of pedagogy.

On the types and amounts of professional learning experienced, as reported by teachers through the survey, there were virtually no differences. There were no significant differences between the groups in the amount of time spent in professional learning on the Pedagogy Model, Curriculum, Pedagogy, Assessment, Welfare/ Discipline/ Behaviour, Administration and Leadership, or Technology. The conclusion to be drawn from this result is that the early career teachers in the study were not receiving any special support in pedagogy or the pedagogy model – a result which highlights both a lost opportunity, and further evidence of the neglect of pedagogy in the induction of early career teachers.

Another set of survey items addressed how often teachers received useful input from colleagues on a range of indicators. Statistically significant differences found were that the fewer the years of teaching experience (comparing our three groups), the more teachers reported that they had: received useful feedback on their performance from supervisors, executive or peers ($F=18.67$ [2,

952], $p < 0.01$); received useful suggestions for teaching practice or learning activities from colleagues ($F = 4.86$ [2, 959], $p < 0.01$), and; received useful suggestions for curriculum materials from colleagues ($F = 2.97$ [2, 958], $p < 0.05$). No differences were found in how often they had visited another teacher's classroom to observe and discuss teaching, had a colleague come to their classroom to observe a lesson, met with colleagues to discuss specific teaching strategies, or received useful suggestions for assessment materials from colleagues. These results indicate that suggestions and feedback might be more readily provided for early career teachers than more experienced teachers, but that these forms of support were infrequently based on classroom observations or focused on specific teaching strategies. Hence, despite the support for early career teachers implied in these findings, when examined closely they actually contribute further to a picture of inadequate support *in the specifics of pedagogy* for early career teachers.

From our survey data, we also found no differences among the three groups on our measures of professional learning satisfaction, the importance of the pedagogy model, the potential effect of the pedagogy model, support to engage with the pedagogy model, the coherence of their professional learning with the pedagogy model, or the coherence of the professional learning with their schools. The only survey scales that produced statistically significant differences were: Teacher Responsibility, with higher scores as teachers accrue more teaching experience ($F = 6.60$ [2, 823], $p < 0.01$) and Teachers' Belief in Student Capacity to learn, with lower scores as teachers accrue more experience ($F = 3.37$ [2, 956], $p < 0.05$) (see Appendix 1).

We also analyzed the 50 interviews that were conducted with Cohort 2 teachers, that is, those teachers in the longitudinal study who were in their first three years of teaching. These interviews revealed patterns similar to those found in our case studies. Their inservice professional development had given some attention to the pedagogy model but often in a superficial way, their induction experiences had little to do with the model or pedagogy in general, and the support they had received in pedagogy had, in general, been very limited. A few early career teachers in Cohort 2 reported positive support for pedagogy in their first years at their schools, but the pattern of results did not meet our expectations of stronger support for pedagogy in schools involved in the study.

Among the professional development opportunities reported by Cohort 2 teachers was a clear focus on personal (psycho/ social/ emotional) and practical (administrative/ management/ behavioural) aspects of teaching with a limited focus on pedagogy or the pedagogy model. The following examples are illustrative of this point.

There are a lot of Professional learning opportunities at this school and unfortunately not many are on curriculum. ... We've been to David Langford, like I said, the Australian Quality Council, so I've been to his course and the Masters course. We had Stephen Colby come here and do the Seven Habits. We also had that Boys and Education thing, we've been to a [rural schools] thing a couple of years ago, and things like that. I went to the Smartboard course just a couple of weeks ago. I've only had it for a bit over a week and a half now so it's quite exciting for the kids.

I haven't done a whole lot, I've been to a bullying course, non-violent crisis intervention course, a maths day, not a whole lot. It has been varied for what I've done. We've done a lot of stuff on our Staff Development days obviously, but the non-violent crisis intervention training was at the school.

I put in to go to a Computer course later in the year. We have been involved in a . . . project with other schools preparing lessons in mathematics. On staff development days we discuss different issues, but not related to [the pedagogy model] to date.

When the early career teachers were engaged in professional development about pedagogy in general and the pedagogy initiative in particular, some of them were very positive about what they had experienced, as illustrated in the following interview excerpts :

The Department . . . had a Beginning Teachers' Conference up at [a nearby town] and we did some pedagogy model stuff there that I really enjoyed with ...one of the [area] consultants.

We have a staff meeting once a fortnight and we spend 15 or 20 minutes of that going through a section of the book and reading up and doing an activity . . . I think there's a few teachers that are pushing it and seem fairly enthusiastic about it. . . . Everyone's quite aware of it and what it is, so there's a lot of awareness brought about because of it [the pedagogy model].

Our school's pretty positive about the whole [pedagogy model]. We do it in staff meetings and it sort of just rolls off your tongue now. . . It creates more focus in your

teaching. I think professional development-wise it makes you grow a lot quicker, like as a beginning teacher . . . because I was doing it straight away.

Other Cohort 2 teachers were either confused about the model or had experienced weak forms of professional development that left them with little knowledge of the details of the framework.

Basically we've gone through the... I don't know if they're called the strands of subjects. Significance of the environment and things and we've just basically gone through the [components] and we did that in groups by getting 6 groups and having about 3 in each group and then one group would be focused on one [component] and then report back to the whole group, so basically I think I did background knowledge.

To tell you the truth, my teaching isn't based on the [pedagogy] model; I take things out of there that I can remember, like the Haberman Theory and some aspects of his theory – I can't remember the term – but the Haberman Theory – he's got critical thinking, higher order and some of the other terms and they belong to the [pedagogy] model as well.

The Teachers' [Union] Conference last year...didn't have any[thing about the pedagogy model], but had a lot of [things of good teaching] – implementation ideas and discipline things and so forth, which is good union men of course (teaching you well about keeping them in line and getting the message across).

Support from colleagues, supervisors or mentors for Cohort 2 teachers had also been patchy, according to our interview data. One teacher said that support has come “mostly from a colleague in the English faculty who attended the [longitudinal study] coding days”. This colleague had been the one who has thus far “built up” the new teachers in relation to the pedagogy model. “The head teacher of the faculty has not said much about it yet.” Another teacher, like Will and Cody, is located in a school with a teacher mentor, but the focus has not been pedagogy, at least not in any depth:

I was a beginning teacher last year and we had a fairly high beginning teacher rate at our school, so I think there were about 6 or 7 of us last year, we all go on the beginning teacher program. Basically we have a full-time teacher mentor, who is in our class but he floats throughout classes and has meetings with us and just basically helps us along with our first year of teaching and we have a meeting for an hour each week to go over things like

department policies, all that sort of thing, and that was very good. . . . That also involved a weekend . . . where beginning teachers from all around the . . . area go [for] a weekend. It was like a beginning teachers' conference and it was run by the . . . [union] that one. I found it fairly helpful and they get people . . . like they get the Credit Union down, the Health, Education and Health and things like that, but it was good and actually our teacher mentor did a thing on planning and programming; that was quite good. [It] gave us a chance to see other teachers in the region and see how they're going.

Really positive statements about support were difficult to locate within our interview data. One teacher, however, commented on the very strong sense of support she felt from the school executive, stating:

They want the best outcome for the school as a place of work, but they also want the best outcome for the kids and they're very interested in a teacher's professional development because they want the best for you as well. That's how you feel, that's the message that's conveyed.

Other statements about support for early career teachers were rather negative:

The supervisor doesn't do a lot of work with me; I tag along with the other teachers' supervisor. It's not going to get back to the school is it?

Oh, I suppose there's support, but that support is meaningless in that they've left it pretty much up to my own discretion whether I use it or don't use it, or whether I use parts of it.

Another teacher, who ended up with a Year 12 class in her/his first year, said:

They just said 'if you can swim through this year, then you'll be able to make it through anything'. I guess the idea is if you can have something like that at the beginning of your first year and have a life, hopefully it's going to get better. . . . There was no orientation. It was just 'here's your first day and go to this day and' . . . I don't know what we did. It just went for a long time and it was 'blah, blah, blah' for the entire day and I didn't know where things were. . . . Everybody tries to help you as much as they can but everyone's busy. . . . I'd really like to have been given a mentor; someone who I could just sit down with, even if it was just to whinge for an hour and just someone to have that time to listen to the issues that I'm having and to offer some help on it.

While there is some evidence of attention to the pedagogy model and support for early career teachers among these statements, what was most surprising to us was the dearth of interview data from early career teachers in the longitudinal study schools flourishing in environments where pedagogy was a focus and where the pedagogy model was being used explicitly to support their development. Instead, the Cohort 2 data suggest that the model is being used to support teacher development in very limited ways – there is more dabbling with the model than wading neck-deep and, as has been reported in many other studies of teacher induction (e.g., Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu, & Peske, 2002; Smith & Ingersoll (2004), too many early career teachers are being left to sink or swim. There is more interview data to gather during the course of this longitudinal study. We can only hope that the experiences relayed to us by early career teachers shift, as the study progresses and the pedagogy initiative is more widely and more deeply implemented.

Conclusions

Our analyses highlight two major points: first, pedagogy is largely neglected during induction and second, the quality of teaching demonstrated by early career teachers is not significantly different from the quality of pedagogy demonstrated by their more experienced peers.

The neglect of pedagogy during induction is demonstrated both through the case studies presented here and through the survey and interview responses of the larger sample of early career teachers. Teachers in their first years of practice appear to get some support, but not the kind of support that would directly act on the quality of pedagogy. We anticipated such a result, given our analysis of the literature on induction, and we searched hard for counter examples. In the end, however, we have been surprised that pedagogy in general and the pedagogy model in particular has featured so little in the induction of these teachers, particularly in a context where the importance of pedagogy has been recognised at the system level and in which materials to support pedagogical development are readily available in schools.

Implications of these analyses for what happens during induction are not difficult to discern – a number of the early career teachers in these studies told us what is needed. They wanted an experienced mentor who would listen and offer advice and colleagues who were motivated about teaching and willing to help them. They saw value in being observed and getting specific feedback on their teaching even though, as Will acknowledged, they might not like it. And, in

places where it was addressed, they acknowledged the pedagogy model, with its detailed attention to good practice, as supporting their development. Induction experiences for early career teachers must do more than make them feel comfortable and welcome and ensure that they know, as Cody put it, “how everything works” at their schools. Early career teachers also need much more than being left to their own devices in the classroom and provided with help only when they “need” it. No matter how strong their preservice preparation, early career teachers are still learning to teach. They need to be supported not only in matters social, emotional, and administrative. They need support in matters pedagogical.

Perhaps surprisingly, the quality of pedagogy (as measured by the study’s instruments) among early career teachers, in both cohorts studied here, was no different to that produced by their more experienced peers. A positive reading of these results is that preservice preparation supports teachers quite well for pedagogical success in classrooms, from the commencement of their appointments. That is, they really do ‘hit the ground running’ and, despite school conditions or the lack of pedagogical mentoring and supervision, they perform reasonably well. A more negative reading is that being a teacher for longer does not seem to improve the quality of pedagogy. This interpretation would indicate not only a neglect of pedagogy in induction but a more general neglect of pedagogy in professional development of teachers, thus far. The state’s initiative is designed to place more emphasis on pedagogy, and provide schools and teachers with valuable support resources for improving pedagogy. In these early stages of the pedagogy reform, our data highlight the urgency of the endeavour.

References

- Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Colbert, J., & Wolff, D. (1992). Surviving in urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 193-199.
- Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching Selves: Identity, Pedagogy and Teacher Education*. Albany: University of New York Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Teacher recruitment, induction and selection policy influences on the supply and quality of teachers. In Darling-Hammond, L. and Sykes, G. (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession. Handbook of policy and practice*. (pp.??). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Department of Education, Science and Training. (2002). *An Ethic of Care. Quality Teacher Program- Teachers for the 21st century*. Canberra: Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Eddy, E. (1969). *Becoming a Teacher*. Columbia University: Teachers College Press.
- Ewing, R. and Smith, D. (2002). Retaining beginning teachers in the profession. Paper presented to European Education Conference, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher Preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In Houston, W.R. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. (pp. 212-233). New York: Macmillan.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Gore, J.M. (1993). *The Struggle for Pedagogies*. New York: Routledge.
- Gore, J.M. (2001). Beyond our differences: a reassembling of what matters in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 124-135.
- Gray, D. L., & Smith, A. E. (2005). No teacher left behind. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42(1), 7.
- Haberman, M. (1991). The Pedagogy of Poverty versus Good Teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(4), 290-294.
- Hatton, N. and Harman, K. (1997). Internships within teacher education programs in NSW. University of Sydney: NSW Department of Education and Training. Unpublished paper.
- Ingersoll, R.M. (2001). A different approach to solving the teacher shortage problem (Teaching Quality Policy Brief No. 3). Seattle: University of Washington. Centre for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved October, 2001, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail>

- Johnson, S.M. (2001b). Retaining the Next Generation of Teachers: The Importance of School-Based Support. Harvard Education Newsletter. Retrieved September, 2001, <http://www.edweek.org/ewstory.cfm?slug=39>
- Johnson, S.M. (2004). *Finders and Keepers- Helping New Teachers Survive and Thrive in Our Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kardos, S.M., Johnson, S.M., Peske, G., Kauffman, D., and Liu, E. (2001). Counting on Colleagues: New Teachers Encounter Professional Cultures of their Schools. Harvard Education Newsletter. Retrieved December, 2001, from <http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/2001-ja/support.shtml>
- Lortie, D. (1975). *School Teacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manuel, J. (2003). 'Such are the ambitions of youth': exploring issues of retention and attrition of early career teachers in NSW. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 31(2), 139-151.
- Martinez, K. (1994). Teacher induction revisited. *Australian Journal of Education* 38(2), 189-196.
- Martinez, K. (1998). Preservice Teachers Adrift on a Sea of Knowledges. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 26(2), 97-105.
- Martinez, K. (2002). Mentor Mania: the new wave. Unpublished paper.
- McCormack, A., Gore, J.M., and Thomas, K. (2004). Learning to teach: Narratives from early career teachers. Paper presented at AARE Conference, Melbourne.
- Newmann, F. & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Page, M., Marlowe, B., and Molloy, P. (2000). The Power of a Poem to Teach Us. *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 28-32.
- Ramsey, G. (2000). *Quality Matters. Revitalising Teaching: Critical times, critical choices*. Report of the Review of Teacher Education. Sydney: NSW Department of Education and Training.
- Rogers, D. and Babinski, L. (2002). *From isolation to conversation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rowe, K.J. and Rowe, K.S. (2002). *What matters most: Evidence-based findings of the key factors affecting the educational experiences and outcomes for girls and boys throughout their primary and secondary schooling*. ACER, Melbourne. Retrieved July, 2005, from <http://www.acer.edu.au>.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57 (1), 1-22

- Strong, M. and St. John, L. (2005). A study of teacher retention. The effects of mentoring on beginning teachers. New Teacher Center, Santa Cruz. Unpublished paper.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-148
- Wang, J. and Odell, S. (2002). Mentored Learning to Teach According to Standards-based Reform: A Critical Review. *Review of Educational Research* 72(3), 481-546.
- Williams, A. and Prestage, S. (2002). Still in at the deep end? Developing strategies for the induction of new teachers. UK: Association of Teachers and Lecturers.
- Williams, C. (2002a). Feet on the Ground and Running. Paper presented at Challenging Futures Conference. UNE, Armidale, February.
- Williams, C. (2002b). Telling Tales: Stories from New Teachers in NSW Country Schools. Paper presented at AARE Annual Conference. Brisbane.
- Williams, C. (2003). Where did they go? What did they do? A Pilot Study on the preparation, recruitment and retention of preservice and newly appointed teachers. Unpublished paper.
- Williams, C. and Wallace, A. (2003). Supporting new teachers in rural schools. Paper presented at SPERA Conference. Canberra, October.
- Zeichner, K.E. and Gore, J.M. (1990). Teacher Socialisation. In Houston, W.R. (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.
- Zeichner, K. and Tabachnick, R. (1981). Are the effects of University Teacher Education 'Washed Out' by School Experience?' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 32(3), 7-11.

Importance of the pedagogy model

The questionnaire examined participants' opinions on the importance of the model of pedagogy. A construct was created, made up of four items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .65$. Respondents were asked to rate their opinion of the pedagogy model and its dimensions. The lowest possible score is 4 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 24 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 14, so any score above a 14 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 24, the stronger the agreement with the concept of seeing the model as important.

The items included in this scale all led with the general prompt, 'What are your opinions about the model of pedagogy? Mark the choice which is closest to your opinion' and included the following stems:

- The [pedagogy] model is an important focus for the[state department].
- It is important for teaching to promote high levels of intellectual quality for all students.
- A strong, positive and supportive learning environment affects the quality of students' work.
- If students are to value what they learn, they need to be able to link their school work to their lives beyond the classroom.

Effect of the pedagogy model

The questionnaire examined participants' opinions on the extent of influence of the model of pedagogy. A construct was created, "Effect of the pedagogy model", made up of nine items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .91$. The lowest possible score is 9 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 54 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 31.5, so any score above 31.5 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 54, the stronger the agreement with the concept of seeing the model as influential.

The items included in this scale all led with the general prompt, 'To what extent have you engaged with the model of pedagogy? Mark the response which is closest to your opinion' and included the following stems:

- I often engage in conversations with colleagues at my school about the model.
- I have attempted to use the model as a self-reflective tool.
- The model has influenced the way that I plan my teaching.
- The model has influenced the way that I develop learning tasks for my classes.
- The model has had no impact on my students' learning (reversed).
- I have tried to keep up-to-date with the pedagogy model publications released by the [state department].
- The model has made no difference to the way that I teach my students (reversed).
- I have found the model to be a useful resource for my teaching.
- The model has influenced the way that I develop assessment tasks for my classes.

Support for engaging with the model

The questionnaire examined participants' opinions on the extent to which they felt they have been supported to engage with the model of pedagogy. A construct was created, "Support for engaging

Longitudinal study 2004 Scales Appendix One

with the model”made up of three items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .67$. The lowest possible score is 3 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 18 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 10.5, so any score above 10.5 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 18, the stronger the agreement with the concept of being supported to engage with the pedagogy model.

The items included in this scale all led with the general prompt, ‘To what extent do you agree with the following statements?’ and included the following stems:

- I have been supported by my colleagues to engage with the model.
- I have been supported by my school executive to engage with the model.
- I have been supported by the [state department] to engage with the model.

Professional learning satisfaction

The questionnaire examined the extent to which participants were satisfied with all of the professional learning experiences in which they had participated during Term 1 and Term 2, 2004. A construct was created, “Professional learning satisfaction”, made up of seven items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .83$. The lowest possible score is 7 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 42 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 24.5, so any score above 24.5 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 42, the stronger the agreement with the concept of being satisfied with professional learning experiences.

The items included in this scale all led with the general prompt, ‘How well do the following statements describe your professional learning experiences this year?’ and included the following stems:

- The professional learning in which I have participated this year has improved my teaching practice.
- The amount of professional learning in which I have participated since the beginning of this year has been sufficient.
- Professional learning is valued by teachers at my school
- The professional learning in which I have participated this year has encouraged me to be a self-reflective teacher.
- The professional learning in which I have participated this year has influenced the way I plan learning activities for my students.
- The professional learning in which I have participated this year has influenced the way I plan assessment tasks for my students.
- The quality of the professional learning experiences in which I have participated since the beginning of this year has been satisfactory.

Longitudinal study 2004 Scales Appendix One

Coherence with the pedagogy model

The questionnaire examined the extent to which participants identified consistency among the pedagogy model, professional learning and the culture of their schools. A construct was created, “Coherence with the pedagogy model”, made up of six items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .85$. The lowest possible score is 6 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 36 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 21, so any score above 21 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 36, the stronger the agreement with the concept that there was consistency among the pedagogy model, professional learning and the culture of the participants’ schools.

The items included in this scale included the following stems:

- The professional learning activities focused on the model in which I have participated this year have been consistent with my understanding of the model.
- The professional learning activities focused on the model in which I have participated this year have been consistent with the pedagogy support materials.
- The professional learning activities focused on the model in which I have participated this year have been consistent with each other (in terms of my understanding of the model).
- The professional learning activities focused on the model in which I have participated this year have modelled the pedagogy model in their practice (or delivery).
- The other (non-pedagogy model) professional learning activities in which I have participated this year have been consistent with the principles of the model.
- The culture of the school (or the way that work is organised in the school) in which I work is consistent with the model.

Professional learning coherency

The questionnaire examined the extent to which participants identified consistency between professional learning and the culture of their schools. A construct was created, “Professional learning coherency”, made up of seven items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .78$. The lowest possible score is 7 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 42 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 24.5, so any score above 24.5 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 42, the stronger the agreement with the concept that there was consistency between professional learning and the culture of the participants’ schools.

The items included in this scale included the following stems:

- Professional learning is supported by other initiatives to improve the school.
- Professional learning programs at my school do not complement my teaching. (reverse coded)
- Curriculum, instruction, and learning materials are co-ordinated across Year levels.
- Professional learning is sustained and consistently focused at my school.
- Most in-service professional learning helps to advance a co-ordinated school mission
- There is very little co-ordination of curriculum, instruction, and learning materials across KLAS at my school. (reverse coded)
- I make a conscious effort to co-ordinate curriculum content with other teachers.

Longitudinal study 2004 Scales Appendix One

Teacher responsibility

The questionnaire examined the extent to which participants agreed that they are responsible for student learning. A construct was created, “teacher responsibility”, made up of seven items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .67$. The lowest possible score is 7 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 42 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 24.5, so any score above 24.5 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 42, the stronger the agreement with the concept that teachers are responsible for student learning.

The items included in this scale included the following stems:

- I feel that I have been successful in providing the kind of education that I would like to provide for students.
- Many of the students I teach are not capable of learning the material I am supposed to teach them. (reverse coded)
- The attitudes and habits my students bring to my class greatly reduce their chances for academic success. (reverse coded)
- My success or failure in teaching students is due primarily to factors beyond my control rather than to my own efforts and ability. (reverse coded)
- Sometimes it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher. (reverse coded)
- I am certain that I am making a difference in the lives of my students.
- The level of student behaviour and/or drug or alcohol use in this school interferes with my teaching. (reverse coded).

Teachers’ belief in student capacity

The questionnaire examined the extent to which teachers’ believed in student capacity to learn as a sub-set of the Teacher responsibility scale. A construct was created, “Teachers’ belief in student capacity”, made up of two items. The reliability score attained for this scale was $\alpha = .65$. Scores for the included items with reverse coded for this scale to reflect the directionality of its meaning. The lowest possible score is 2 (Strong Disagreement) and the highest possible score is 12 (Strong Agreement). The mid-point of this scale is 7, so any score above 7 indicates agreement. The closer a score is to 12, the stronger the agreement with the concept that teachers believe in student capacity.

The items included in this scale included the following stems:

- Many of the students I teach are not capable of learning the material I am supposed to teach them. (reverse coded)
- The attitudes and habits my students bring to my class greatly reduce their chances for academic success. (reverse coded)