Analysing mentoring dialogues for developing a preservice teacher's classroom management practices

Tracey Sempowicz & Peter Hudson
Queensland University of Technology

Abstract

> A key concern for preservice teachers is classroom management, including student behaviour management, which also has been a factor associated with teachers leaving the profession within the first five years. This study investigates the mentoring practices used to guide the mentee's classroom management. Using multiple data sources (e.g., lesson plans, preservice teacher reflections, mentor reports, and video and audio-recorded interviews), this case study uses a five-factor mentoring framework to analyse mentor-mentee dialogues about classroom management practices. Data indicated 30 out of 34 mentoring practices provided input into the mentee's classroom management; however there was no overt evidence on mentoring aims, curriculum, timetabling or assessment that facilitated the mentee's development of behaviour management. Specifically, drawing on the system requirement documents, modelling the school's behaviour management program, articulating pedagogical knowledge about implementing behaviour management, and providing feedback presented the mentee with opportunities for effective implementation.

Keywords*:* Mentoring, preservice teacher, mentor, classroom management, behaviour management

Introduction

Effective mentoring is pivotal to the development of preservice teachers, including the development of classroom management practices; however the quality and quantity of mentoring varies significantly. Although Australian states have established standards for teaching, there are no formal standards for mentoring despite mentoring by experienced teachers in schools comprising as much as 20% of a preservice teacher's university four-year degree. Standards for mentoring need to be based on the literature and empirical evidence on effective mentoring practices. Theoretical models have been proposed but few studies conduct investigations of practice within these models. For example, a five-factor mentoring model has gathered evidence on effective mentoring practices through the literature and quantitative studies but requires qualitative understandings (Hudson, 2007). This study investigates the mentoring of classroom management using this mentoring model as a theoretical framework for collecting qualitative data from a mentor (cooperating classroom teacher) and mentee (primary preservice teacher).

Classroom management

Many early-career teachers (and preservice teachers) claim that managing the classroom and student behaviour causes concern (Crosswell, 2009; Lewis, Romi, Qui, & Katz, 2005; McNally, I'anson, Whewell, & Wilson, 2005; Putman, 2009). Indeed, managing student behaviour in today's society is a key issue for teachers (Australian Education Union, 2006); particularly as unsuccessful student management can produce teacher stress and early burn out (Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 1999), which may also cause teachers to leave the profession (Ewing, 2001). Surprisingly, preservice teachers are more likely to signal the effects of managing low level behaviours such as students being off task or refusing to follow instructions (Crosswell, 2009). It is suggested that creating a favourable learning environment with "positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation" appears at the centre of managing student behaviour (Burden, 2003, p. 3). In addition, Brophy and McCaslin (1992) emphasise that principals value teachers with good classroom management, and, in particular, their ability to control misbehaving students. Yet, other educators (Emmer & Hickman, 1990; Sprick, 2009) argue that teachers need to move beyond control over students to working with students on issues of concern.

Psychologically, managing student behaviour requires understanding students' emotional, social and moral development (Snowman, Dobozy, Scevak, Bryer, Bartlett, &

Biehler, 2009). Theorists have presented ways for teachers to become effective in managing students. For example, Kounin (1970), who based his work on Glasser, outlines how to manage groups of students and coined "withitness" as the notion of knowing what is going on in the classroom at all times. In Kounin's theory, managing students necessitates devising techniques for dealing with behaviour problems as they arise, however, preservice teachers need to equip themselves by "pre-planning specific elements of classroom management" (Crosswell, 2009, p. 41). Some of these elements include learning about proactive, preventative measures for creating a positive emotional classroom climate such as planning, implementation and organisation, establishing clear expectations and consequences (rules, routines and procedures), developing positive relationships with students, and manipulating the environment such as furniture arrangements to produce conditions conducive for learning (Konza, Grainger & Bradshaw, 2001; Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Furthermore, catering for students' needs through differentiated teaching and learning can engage students in education and minimise potential behaviour difficulties (Arthur-Kelly, Lyons, Butterfield, & Gordon, 2007; Burden, 2003; Tomlinson, 2000).

Early-career teachers can require assistance from experienced teachers to manage the learning environment (Sugai & Horner, 2002); consequently school-wide approaches are being used to provide positive behaviour support (Rogers, 2007). It is important to have teachers who are effective classroom managers guide the practices of those in their early-career stages. Mentor teachers who have developed effective behaviour management strategies can assist by modelling and articulating these practices to their mentees. Importantly, facilitating reflection on practice can support and guide a mentee's classroom management skills (Arthur-Kelly et al., 2007; Larrivee, 2009; Schön, 1987). The Australian National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching (MCEETYA, 2003) and the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2011) recognise critical reflection on teaching practices as a way that teachers grow professionally. Practicum experiences for preservice teachers provide opportunities to observe, practise, and reflect on their classroom management practices.

Theoretical Framework

Since the early 1990s (e.g., Little, 1990), the mentoring literature for learning how to teach has increased significantly, with empirical evidence indicating ways to guide the mentee's practices. A five-factor model for mentoring has been identified in the literature, namely, personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modelling, and

feedback, and items associated with each factor have been statistically justified (see Hudson, Skamp, & Brooks, 2005). This model had associated attributes and practices, which provided a theoretical framework for gathering data around mentoring, and will be used specifically for understanding the mentoring towards effective classroom management in this current study. The following outlines each of the five factors and the associated attributes and practices (see Hudson, 2010), but also it will be presented in relation to classroom management as a basis for investigation in this study.

Personal Attributes: An effective mentor develops a professional relationship with the mentee and is supportive of the mentee's classroom management (Feiman-Nemser, 1998). The mentor's personal attributes includes being comfortable in talking about classroom management and listening attentively to the mentee, particularly managing student behaviour, as the mentor will have more detailed information about students that can assist in this management. The mentor's personal attributes are used to encourage the mentee's reflection on classroom management, and instil confidence and positive attitudes in the mentee towards effective practices.

System Requirements: Devising relevant and appropriate teaching plans to create a positive learning environment is at the forefront of classroom management (Snowman et al., 2009). In its simplest form, the mentor needs to articulate the aims (e.g., achievement standards, outcomes), policies, and curricula required by an education system. Yet, the complexities for implementing the system requirements can be noted in the pedagogical knowledge that mentors need to articulate for successful teaching.

Pedagogical Knowledge: Developing deep pedagogical knowledge provides a way for a mentee to manage the classroom (Huling-Austin, 1992). Effective mentors explain how to plan for teaching; they timetable or schedule lessons for the mentee. Preparation for teaching needs to be discussed, particularly with the location and use of resources. Experienced teachers develop a repertoire of teaching strategies for successful lesson delivery, and in their roles as mentors, they can present a perspective on how these teaching strategies work in their specific classrooms (see Killen, 2009). A mentor needs to check on the mentee's content knowledge (e.g., key concepts in the subject area) to ensure this knowledge is age appropriate and linked with the system requirements. Problem solving during a lesson is a skill for which the mentor can guide the mentee on effective practices. Managing student behaviour requires a range of techniques and preventative strategies (Snowman et al., 2009), where a mentor can provide insights into student behavioural traits and outline to the mentee strategies that work and those that do not work. Achieving high levels of student engagement also necessitates

astute questioning skills involving higher and lower-order questions with questions distributed equitably around the classroom. A mentor can guide the mentee's lesson implementation process by ensuring the system requirements are met and the lesson is structured to thread the key concept(s) in the introduction, body and conclusion of a lesson. Managing students' learning necessitates pedagogical knowledge about assessment (Athanasou & Lamprianou, 2002), where the mentor can articulate the connection between curriculum activities and embedding assessment techniques.

Modelling: Learning how to manage the class requires a mentor to model effective classroom management strategies, during which the mentor can demonstrate desirable teaching traits. Importantly, the teacher-student relationship is central to teaching and demonstrating a positive rapport with students can show the mentee how a positive relationship can facilitate learning (Snowman et al., 2009). The mentor needs to model classroom language (age-appropriateness and curriculum discourse), effective teaching (if not what to do, what not to do), effective teaching, classroom management, and well-designed hands-on lessons.

Feedback: Effective mentors articulate expectations and provide advice to the mentee, they review lesson plans, observe the mentee teach, provide oral and written feedback, and further feedback on the mentee's evaluation of teaching and the learning environment.

Data will be gathered around the aforementioned five factor attributes and practices in relation to classroom management. The research question was: What mentoring practices does a mentor use to guide the mentee's classroom management?

Context

This study is located at a campus of a large Australian university in a low socio-economic area. The campus strategic plan promotes community engagement (practicum and internship) for those commencing their teacher training. The campus was successful in a grant application titled *Teacher Education Done Differently* (TEDD), with an aim to enhance mentoring practices for preservice teachers. In consultation with partner schools (site co-ordinators, principals and teachers), a mentoring professional development program was developed to promote effective mentoring practices for mentors (supervising teachers).

Thirty-eight preservice teachers were enrolled in a Bachelor of Education (Primary) and associated field experience program at an Australian university. As part of the TEDD project, they had undertaken preliminary visits (6 x 1 day per week) to learn about the school's culture, infrastructure and the students in their classrooms. These additional school-

based experiences were designed to assist in building professional relationships and aid them in making links between theory and practice. These preservice teachers completed a four-week block practicum to develop their pedagogical abilities, including knowledge about behaviour management techniques for primary students.

Schools in the area surrounding the campus play a fundamental role in the TEDD project as many purposeful university-school interactions and activities involve the preservice teachers. The school selected for this qualitative study is one of these partner schools. The two main participants, a mentor and a preservice teacher undertaking a first practicum experience, were not paired specifically for this study, however the partnership was considered likely "to yield the best data" as a representative case (Yin, 2009, p. 91). For the purpose of this study, pseudonyms will be used: the mentee will be known as Anna and the mentor as Grace. Anna (19 years) was completing the second year of her university course and this study focused on her first field experience (i.e., practicum or professional experience) held in a Year 2 class. An elite athlete in national sporting competitions, Anna routinely trained for three hours per day, outside of school hours, while on her practicum and worked part-time as a swimming instructor. Grace, had 20 years teaching experience, mentored 8 preservice teachers throughout her career and taught in 7 different primary schools. She had taught across years 2 to 5 including multi-level classes.

Data collection methods and analysis

An initial meeting was conducted in the week prior to the professional experience with the mentor and mentee to negotiate and discuss the case study protocol and to gain consent for this study (Yin, 2009). Their consent involved collecting data on the mentoring between Grace and Anna over the four-week practicum, and classroom management was a pedagogical practice analysed in the data after the practicum. This case study (Hittleman & Simon, 2006) used multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2009) to collate and analyse data on 30 of the 34 attributes and practices associated with the five factor mentoring model. Sources of evidence incorporated: 5 direct observations of video-recorded dialogues; 8 informal audio-recorded sessions; 7 audio-recorded teaching episodes; 6 formal mentee-written lesson plans and 15 written reflections; 3 "Feedback on Teaching" evaluations completed by the mentor; 4 formal written lesson observations by the researcher; a formal individual interview with the mentee and then the mentor; and the mentee's Interim and Final Field Studies reports.

Formal mentor-mentee dialogues (between 7 and 16 minutes duration) were video-recorded and annotated observations were made using the five-factor mentoring model as a

framework for collecting and analysing the data. Informal mentor-mentee dialogues (ranging from 4 to 12 minutes duration) were audio-recorded by the mentor in the classroom during morning tea and lunch breaks using an audio digital recorder. These dialogues generally occurred immediately prior to or following a lesson taught by the mentee for the purposes of forward planning or reflection on practices. A sample of the mentee's teaching episodes were also audio-recorded and included four short class activities (20-30 minutes) and one complete lesson (57 minutes).

The mentee was required to design formal lesson plans before teaching either a small group activity (three lessons, 20-30 minutes, repeated to six groups of four students) or a whole class lesson (three lessons, 45 minutes to 1 hour). The university provided the lesson plan structure which Anna used, and all but one of her plans were collected in this study. The mentee was required to provide written reflections after teaching lessons, and these were provided for all individual lessons taught including those that were repeated lessons. Anna wrote about aspects of the lessons that worked well and areas that needed further improvement.

The mentor observed Anna teach and provided written feedback using the "Feedback on Teaching" form provided by the university. The form gave the mentor a choice of providing feedback using ticks (checks) against competencies listed under three headings (planning and preparation, teaching and reflective practice) and it also provided for more detailed written feedback under five headings, namely: planning and preparation, lesson implementation, communication, classroom management, and general feedback. An additional four formal lesson observations were made by the researcher and feedback provided using the same "Feedback on Teaching" form.

Interim and final field studies reports focused on four of the ten professional standards (Queensland College of Teachers, 2006), which were deemed appropriate by the university for second-year preservice teachers. These were: Standard One – Design and implement engaging and flexible learning experiences for individuals and groups. Standard Two - Design and implement learning experiences that develop language, literacy and numeracy. Standard Seven - Create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments. Standard Ten - Commit to reflective practice and ongoing professional renewal.

Critical evidence was obtained from the final interview conducted with the mentee (19:30 minutes) then the mentor (18:27 minutes). Thirteen semi-structured questions were developed in accordance with the five factor framework. For example: "What mentoring feedback assisted your development as a teacher during this field studies period?" and "How

has your mentoring assisted the mentee's classroom management practices? In the mentor's case, the questions asked required little or no additional explanation. However the mentee, as a result of her limited teaching experience and understanding about the pedagogical discourse, required some rephrasing and elaboration of questions to assist her in articulating responses. The interview was audio-recorded to increase the reliability of the evidence by providing an accurate account of the responses (Yin, 2009).

Data sources used in this study were complementary (Yin, 2009). For example, video-recorded dialogues captured subtle nuances in body language while individual interviews encouraged open non-threatening discussions to occur. The quantity of data collected was substantial but confined to the duration of the practicum. All data sources were cross-checked and triangulated to gain a rich description of the mentor and mentee interaction during the field experience (e.g., see Hittleman & Simon, 2006). Using the five factor model as a framework for collecting the data enabled the key issues and concepts in this study to be identified, examined and categorised (e.g., see Pope, Ziebland, & Mays, 2000).

Results and discussion

Analysis of the data showed that classroom management was a specific area of teacher development that the mentor teacher chose to focus on with the preservice teacher. The following discussion reveals that the majority of attributes and practices outlined in the five factor model impacted in varying degrees on the mentor's ability to positively influence the mentee's understanding of effective classroom management practices.

Personal Attributes

In the interview, Anna (mentee) stated that her mentor demonstrated specific personal attributes and modelled positive attitudes for teaching (eg. being supportive in the classroom, "always on time", and reliable) to assist Anna's understanding of proactive classroom management practices and strategies. In an audio-recorded session Anna also claimed that her mentor listened to her ideas, allowed her to try new things and then helped her to reflect on the outcomes of each teaching episode. Grace (mentor) shared in her video-recorded dialogue that an effective mentor needs to be comfortable with talking (frequently) with the mentee, to give advice, explanations and "a range of strategies" to assist in classroom management.

In response to the importance placed on talking and listening by both the mentor and mentee, "talk time" was analysed to determine who was more active in the dialogue. Video-recorded dialogue sessions revealed that the mentor spoke more than the mentee. In the majority of the video episodes, the mentor's talking time ranged from 4 to 14:11 minutes while the mentee's talking time ranged from 1:10 to 4:20 minutes (Table 1). Interestingly, the mentor spoke more about classroom management techniques than the mentee in all video dialogue sessions, with the exception of one. Further analysis showed that the talk about classroom management for both the mentor and mentee ranged between 3.1% and 28.1% of the total talk time across the five sessions (Table 1). The frequency and balance between mentor and mentee's cogenerative dialogues (e.g., see Roth, Tobin, & Zimmermann, 2002) suggested that while Grace articulated more knowledge about teaching practices than Anna, she was willing to listen and provide opportunities for the mentee to speak freely.

Table 1: *Video-recorded data of mentor and mentee talk time*

Day of practicum (20 days)	Dialogue session	Session length*	Total talk time (mins and secs)		Classroom management talk (subset of total time)	
			Mentor	Mentee	Mentor	Mentee
2	1	15:33	14:11	1:10	0:29	0:00
5	2	7:22	4:00	3:21	0:24	1:00
10	3	11:15	5:22	3:51	0:50	0:46
12	4	13:29	7:32	4:20	2:58	0:49
17	5	11:55	8:28	2:40	1:04	0:22

* Talk time in minutes and seconds

In comparison with the video-recorded data, the audio-recorded dialogues revealed less talk and a higher degree of attentive listening by the mentor (in 7 out of 8 dialogues) indicating that Grace provided Anna opportunities to share and discuss her lesson plans and reflections (Table 2). In most instances the mentor's talk time (questions, suggestions, confirmation and praise) ranged from 55 seconds to 5:38 minutes while the mentee's talk time ranged from 1:46 to 8:26 minutes. In only one audio session (session 6) did the mentor's talk (5:38 mins) exceed the mentee's (2:56 mins), when Grace offered many suggestions for teaching a full lesson on a new topic. Suggested classroom management

strategies included settling and refocusing strategies, transitions between activities, and managing noise levels (e.g., see Arthur-Kelly et al., 2003; Snowman et al., 2009). One such example was when Grace stated, "It's always important after the breaks to have a settling down activity … that's why I have the modelled reading". During this session, the mentee responded with short "ok" responses to all the mentor's classroom management suggestions, however, her body language (eg. tone of voice) and quick return to talk about content and pedagogy, demonstrated that she was keen to receive clarification on these elements in her lesson plan prior to teaching. Likewise, in the final session (8), the discussion focused on the content of a new lesson and appropriate pedagogy rather than classroom management strategies. Data indicated that when lessons were lengthy and content was new, the dialogue focused to a greater extent on content and pedagogy. When lessons were shorter and more activity-based (e.g., science experiments - session 4 and 5) or at specific times in the day (e.g., after breaks), greater attention was given to classroom management strategies.

Table 2: *Audio-recorded data of mentor and mentee talk time*

Day of practicum (20 days)	Dialogue session	Session length*	Total talk time (mins and secs)		Classroom management talk (subset of total time)	
			Mentor	Mentee	Mentor	Mentee
2	1	3:51	1:17	2:15	0:15	1:02
	2	6:07	1:30	3:35	0:21	0:46
4	3	4:55	0.55	3:33	0:17	0:49
5	4	7:36	1:45	4:36	0:27	2:13
7	5	10:59	3:12	8:26	0:33	2:03
	6	8:54	5:38	2:56	1:00	0:05
12	7	5:56	1:25	1:46	0:04	1:18
17	8	4:51	1:16	3:21	0:00	0:00

* Talk time in minutes and seconds

Other subtle differences between the video and audio-recorded data collection process were observed and recorded by the first-named researcher (Sempowicz). Early video-recorded sessions where the researcher and video-recording equipment were present, may have impacted on the mentor "controlling" the dialogue, while having the opposite effect on the

mentee (see Table 1, session 1). The gap between mentor and mentee talk reduced in subsequent sessions and it was obvious that both participants became accustomed to the data collection process. Audio-recorded dialogues occurred without the researcher present (with the exception of the interview). These dialogues revealed a less formal, more conversational style of discussion, and may have contributed to the mentee's ability to speak freely and confidently.

System Requirements

The mentor explained that she did not focus on many "big picture" system requirements but felt it was important to focus on classroom management as a priority for Anna's first field experience. One system requirement involved Anna in the delivery of the school-wide positive behaviour support program titled **"Program Achieve"**. Through this program, Grace gave Anna first-hand experience in implementing the school's student behaviour policy. The mentee selected, planned, and implemented two scheduled lessons for the whole class. The mentor believed her students had developed positive behaviour as a result of Program Achieve and suggested that Anna's participation in the program might allow her to identify positive student outcomes. Anna stated, "The behaviour management program helped me. I've been able to bring that into my teaching". Observations and interviews confirmed that the mentee's understanding of the school-wide approach to behaviour management enabled her to confidently implement learned strategies into her other lessons.

The mentor scaffolded the mentee's classroom experience to instil confidence and to develop her classroom management practices through teaching one lesson repeatedly. She did this by providing her mentee with the opportunity to plan and conduct short lessons (20-30 minutes) which she repeated six times with groups of four children. Written reflections and subsequent lesson plans revealed that between repetitions Anna reviewed and modified her classroom management strategies. This process provided multiple opportunities to analyse the structure of lessons and seek ways to enhance her student behaviour strategies. Researcher observation determined that by week three of her practicum she taught her first whole class lesson (57 minutes) confidently. This was also evidenced by Grace's statement on the final field studies report:

> Anna's confidence grew over the 4 weeks which led to some very engaging well
> planned lessons for the children in small groups and whole class. She was

enthusiastically engaged with the individuals in the class, catering for their individual needs.

Grace highlighted Anna's planning, enthusiasm, and differentiation of the curriculum as successful classroom management practices. Presenting well-structured lessons can minimise behavioural problems (Snowman et al., 2009), while demonstrating enthusiasm for teaching and learning can motivate students on their tasks (Woolfolk & Margetts, 2010). In addition, students can become more focused when content targets their individual needs (Burton, Weston & Kowalski, 2009). Lesson observations affirmed the inclusion of behaviour management strategies into her other lessons, as she consistently reinforced concepts such as manners, persistence, positive thinking, best effort and the need to complete less pleasant or "yucky work" (e.g., cleaning bedrooms, taking the bin out). Incorporating the school's reward systems, such as "gotchas", she endeavoured to "catch kids being good", a practice she believed generally worked well with the year 2 class. While the mentee's experience with Program Achieve was a positive one, Grace explained that preservice teachers need to have more involvement in classrooms to understand long-term outcomes resulting from these programs. She stated,

> I think if she had a good solid class at the start of the year, the middle of the year and the end of the year ... she would be able to see the effort and the persistence that the children were putting in, as this is not just a point-in-time behaviour program but something that spans the entire year.

Pedagogical Knowledge

The mentor guided the mentee in making direct links between pedagogical knowledge and positive classroom management. Observations, video-recorded dialogue and lesson plans revealed that Anna heeded the mentor's advice to develop students' language skills as targeting a students' zones of proximal development can engage them in tasks (Vygotsky, 1986). Anna used repetition and guided practise of new or "big words" and related these new concepts to prior knowledge, thus using age-appropriate content and language to facilitate student engagement. Grace emphasised the need for students to use new terminology to reflect on their own learning and attributed improved student engagement to Anna's use of language repetition in science and mathematics lessons.

The mentor encouraged Anna to relate new learning to students' real-life experiences to enhance student engagement (eg., see Horng, Hong, ChanLin, Chang, & Chu, 2005). This

was observed in a mathematics measurement lesson where students had to sort household objects into groups according to the most probable measurement capacity (litres or millilitres). The mentee asked: "Have you heard of measurement and liquids before? Has mum said when you go to the shops that you need to get two litres of milk?" Students were engaged through her technique of questioning and responded appropriately.

Observations conducted in the second half of the field experience revealed that the mentee was demonstrating psychologically acceptable strategies for ensuring effective management of students (e.g., see Woolfolk & Margetts, 2010). These had been either discussed in dialogue sessions or modelled by her mentor, and included giving clear instructions for activities, for example, "if someone drops a paintbrush on the floor we stop, raise a hand and wait for assistance". Throughout the lesson she also reinforced the objectives of the lesson or activity and used positive reinforcement strategies in line with Program Achieve, such as praise, stickers, and encouragement. Anna scaffolded students' work using demonstrations and guided practice, and utilised "learning buddies" to further develop a sense of responsibility for their own work and to generate ideas.

In the interview, Grace discussed her conscious decision to provide Anna with classroom management strategies as opposed to focussing on systemic requirements. She conceded that while she tended to treat mentees as second or third practicum students (based on her prior mentoring experience), she realised the need to "step back a little bit" and concentrate on providing her mentee with practical strategies needed for her first teaching experience. An example of how Anna accepted and implemented her mentor's practical advice was in her "Hard Working Pigs" lesson (Program Achieve). Evidence provided by video and audio-recorded dialogue, researcher observation and the mentee's written reflection indicated that guidance given by the mentor about her lesson plan prior to the lesson (e.g., to use the "sound gauge" for identifying acceptable noise levels) increased her confidence to manage student behaviour towards more effective teaching.

During the lesson Anna used a range of attending strategies (Woolfold &Margetts, 2010), such as direct questioning, waiting and scanning, restating expectations, relocating students, praise for listening, and standing up for "wiggle time". She emphasised key concepts discussed with the mentor (reinforcing terminology, extending students' thinking about "persistence", acknowledging "good manners"). She also provided clear instructions for transitioning between activities and motivated students with the promise of a "gotcha" reward for efficient and productive work. Anna gave clear instructions for activities and monitored discussion time with "learning buddies". Significant to student behavioural

responses was the consistency in matching teacher statements to "promised" rewards (Woolfolk & Margetts, 2010). For instance, the mentee acknowledged and praised students who were working well and provided the promised "gotcha" reward, thereby supporting her statements with actions and giving her credibility with the students.

Following the lesson Anna wrote in her reflection: "using the sound gauge which was discussed at the start of the year, settled the children". Hence, when she asked the students to use "level 3 noise" (i.e., "working and whispering voices"), they knew what was expected and responded appropriately. In the interview, Anna explained that she appreciated the suggestions made by her mentor prior to this particular lesson, stating that it "made me feel more comfortable running the lesson and having an idea that I was on the right track".

Video and audio-recorded dialogues conducted prior to each lesson revealed that Grace guided Anna through a problem-solving approach to classroom management, asking pertinent questions, giving her "think time", and providing opportunities for her to implement solutions. In the interview, Grace described herself as "organised", having good "pre-emptive thoughts" about what generally works or does not work in the classroom. Hence, throughout the dialogues, she encouraged the mentee to anticipate problems, by asking open-ended questions and allowing her time to think through possible solutions with "pre-emptive thoughts".

Modelling

In addition to discussions about classroom management practices, Grace modelled classroom management strategies through her own teaching. In the interview, Anna identified these modelling exemplars as: transitions between structured activities such as student movement from carpet to desk activities); strategies for settling students (e.g., reading after lunch breaks); discussion of steps for participating in "messy work" in subjects like art and craft; restating behavioural expectations throughout lessons such as using "working voices"; refocusing strategies that use non-verbal body language (i.e., proximity, eye contact, teacher movement around the classroom); questioning to check for student understanding; and re-stating rules with an emphasis on safety and time management. In addition, Anna identified that one of the most significant skills modelled by her mentor was how to develop well-structured lessons and incorporating daily routines to facilitate effective classroom management (e.g., a progression and method for teaching spelling across the week). Lesson observations, the interviews and statements made by the mentor in the final report provided

evidence that by the end of the field experience, the mentee enacted many management strategies modelled by the mentor. In the final report the mentor stated, "[Anna] became a very good classroom manager by the fourth week – in regards to behaviour management in particular. She showed in a variety of ways that she is committed to provide a safe supportive environment for the children".

Remedial and gifted students require strategies to differentiate their learning, which helps them to gain focus (Gagné, 1995; Subban, 2006). In the interview, Anna explained that Grace modelled teaching strategies for differentiating learning that helped to engage all students and minimise disruptions. In Anna's case, these strategies included: using pictures plus text on worksheets, note taking for slower writers to get them started, providing individual assistance when required, and presenting relevant extension work for early-finishers. Observations of Anna using these proactive strategies showed that students who may have demonstrated negative behaviour were highly engaged.

Grace modelled positive teacher-student relationships to enhance her own classroom practices. In the interview, Anna described Grace as "very caring". Interestingly, Grace described Anna as **"**kind and caring". While this could be a shared trait for success (e.g., Godshalk & Sosik, 2000), it could be concluded that the mentee was influenced positively by the mentor modelling a positive rapport with her students. From the first week of lesson observations, it was evident that Anna endeavoured to develop her own positive rapport with students. She learnt students' names quickly, used them frequently, and gave positive reinforcement for individual effort. The mentor stated in the interview, "as [Anna] got to know the children individually, she was able to manage children with higher needs very, very well". Anna acted appropriately to make sure students who were off-task were refocused effectively (see Kounin, 1970). Observations showed that she learnt how to scan the classroom to address issues efficiently, avoiding escalation of undesirable behaviours.

Grace claimed that Anna formed a "lovely relationship" with the class, and that some of the boys who needed extra help really liked and appreciated being able to sit in a group with her to receive the required individual assistance. Grace added that Anna was very patient and that her quiet, calm voice added to her management of the classroom and her relationship with the students. Indeed, Anna was working with the students rather than exerting control over them (Sprick, 2009). At the final interview Anna stated, "I've got to know my students... what they like and dislike... if I say 'come on, please do it for me' they seem to do it".

Feedback

Throughout the dialogue sessions, Grace demonstrated the importance of providing feedback to the mentee, and establishing a method for the mentee's self-reflection and continuous improvement. Grace outlined her expectations (devising lesson plans, reviewing lessons and providing reflections) to the mentee during the first week of the practicum and a process was negotiated. There was immediate evidence in the structure of both the recorded dialogue sessions and the mentee's written reflections. The mentor and mentee would meet prior to a lesson to review the mentee's lesson plan and discuss further ideas and strategies for teaching, including classroom management strategies. The mentor observed the lesson being taught and provided a few quick verbal comments as immediate feedback following the lesson. Grace also prepared formal written *Feedback on Teaching* observations following selected lessons. Anna was then allowed "take up time" to think and prepare for further discussion the next day. The following day Grace asked questions for Anna to consider, for example:

> Mentor: There will be general things that I'd like to see you improve on overall ... classroom management kinds of things. So are there some of those things that you know that you could work on?

> Mentee: Just a way to get the children to be quiet without having to speak that little bit louder, like put your hands on your heads. If they see me doing it they know that means stop, look, listen, be quiet.

Subsequently, Anna wrote her reflections incorporating both her own thoughts and Grace's feedback. It was evident from the video and audio-recorded dialogues that the mentor established a structure for reflection and feedback, which included: asking open-ended questions to prompt Anna to think about relevant issues; listening to the mentee's responses, and providing suggestions and encouragement for future action. After examining the mentee's written self-reflections it was evident that Anna also adopted a structure for reflecting using three key categories: "What worked well? What didn't work well? What would I change for future lessons?" During the interview, Grace identified one of Anna's strengths as her "willingness to listen, to implement then to reflect" and to make the desired changes in future lessons. Grace added "she has a very, very good reflective ability", which was particularly apparent in the lessons that Anna repeated. Grace described how well Anna adopted her advice, actioning this advice in her very next lesson (for example: movement

about the class, proximity, checking for understanding). She stated humorously, "I can hear myself", which further emphasised that Grace's modelling of practices was linked to her feedback. The comments from both Grace and Anna indicated there was mutual respect in this mentor-mentee relationship that supported the learning needs of the mentee and the students in the class, and this mutual respect facilitated the mentoring process (e.g., see Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008).

Conclusion

This qualitative study explored mentoring practices aligned with the five-factor model, an empirical mentoring model that served as a framework for identifying, examining and categorising data about the mentor's practices within a specific field of investigation. In particular, the study focused on the development of a mentee's classroom management practices within the various attributes and practices assigned to the mentoring model.

The findings showed that the mentor was supportive of the mentee by providing quality time to talk and listen to the mentee on developing classroom management practices. This support along with instilling confidence in teaching indicated the mentor was prepared to cater for the mentee's development of classroom management practices in positive and constructive ways. Although the mentor was not selected specifically for this mentee, it appeared as a positive pairing arrangement as both the mentor and mentee were comfortable with the mentoring provided (see also Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009). The system requirements (e.g., Program Achieve) presented a contextualisation for the mentee to focus on her behaviour management strategies, especially in the way the mentor guided the mentee's development in this area.

Pedagogical knowledge was articulated at various points during the mentee's field experiences, mainly during planning, preparation, and implementation stages. The mentor willingly shared the dialogue but also provided advice on how to be more effective in classroom management. These strategies were not limited to rewards and consequences only, instead the strategies extended to developing a positive teacher-student rapport and differentiating programs to cater for individuals. This differentiation incorporated appropriate questioning to ascertain students' prior knowledge, and working with individuals and small groups as well as using "learning buddies" to facilitate student success and engagement (see also Hall, 2002; Tomlinson, 2000) .

Effective mentoring means modelling practices to allow a mentee observational experiences that assist in pedagogical development. This study showed that the mentor

modelled the advocated "Program Achieve" strategies in lessons so the mentee could observe how these strategies worked in practice. Consequently, many of the strategies advocated in this system requirement document and those modelled by the mentor transferred to the mentee's classroom management practices. This also included using age-appropriate language and making concepts understandable so that students were engaged in lessons and not off task. The mentor's modelling of the lesson structure showed the mentee how to move students from one activity to the next, and reward behaviour accordingly.

Feedback was a cornerstone of this mentoring partnership. The mentor did not dominate conversations but instead articulated pedagogical knowledge where required and asked questions for the mentee to demonstrate reflective thinking. Lesson plans were reviewed before lessons commenced but also discussed when the lesson concluded. This feedback was provided in various forms, including oral and written feedback (formal and informal). The mentee's reflection on practice indicated growing knowledge about effective classroom management practices, which became apparent through lesson observations and formal reports on the mentee's teaching.

Little or no data were collected specifically on the development of aims and curriculum, formal assessment, or timetabling in this first practicum period. Aims, curriculum, and timetabling (scheduling) were inferred only when the mentee planned lessons. As a first practicum experience, the mentor did not guide the mentee around assessment practices. Within the associated university, assessment becomes more of a focus as preservice teachers progress through their field experiences.

Gathering data from rich qualitative case studies can provide insight into mentors' practices. Utilising the five-factor model as a framework for collecting data around mentoring can make discussion and professional development about effective attributes and practices more explicit. Further research can include using the five-factor model for exploring other specific pedagogical knowledge practices such as planning, preparation, teaching strategies, questioning skills, assessment and so forth. Research is also needed to understand how an effective mentor can facilitate the mentee's development of teacher-student relationships or what practices are used to instil confidence and positive attitudes for teaching. Quality mentoring can enhance a mentee's pedagogical development and gathering empirical evidence on how mentors specifically use their knowledge and skills can aid the development of more effective mentoring programs.

References

Arthur-Kelly, M., Lyons, G., Butterfield, N., & Gordon, C. (2007). *Classroom management: Creating positive learning environments.* South Melbourne, Vic: Cengage Learning Australia.

Athanasou, J. A., & Lamprianou, I. (2002). *A teacher's guide to assessment.* Tuggerah, NSW: Social Science Press.

Australian Education Union. (2006). *AEU national beginning teacher survey results 2006* [Electronic Version]. Retrieved 6 January, 2010, from http://www.aeufederal.org.au/Publications/Btsurvey06.html

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2011). *National professional standards for teachers.* Retrieved 6 March, 2011, from http://www.aitsl.edu.au/national-professional-standard-for-principals-landing.html

Brophy, J. & McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. *The Elementary School Journal, 93*(1), 3–66.

Burden, P. R. (2003). *Classroom management: Creating a successful learning community.* (2nd ed.). New York, United States of America: John Wiley & Sons.

Burton, L., Weston, D., & Kowalski, R. (2009). *Psychology*. (2nd Ed.). Milton, QLD: Wiley & Sons.

Crosswell, L. (2009). Classroom management: Developing your own approach to managing the classroom. In J. Millwater & D. Beutel (Eds.), *Stepping out into the real world of education* (pp. 41-68). New South Wales, Australia: Pearson.

Emmer, E., & Hickman, J. (1990, April). *Teacher decision making as a function of efficacy, attribution and reasoned action.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Ewing, R. (2001). Keeping beginning teachers in the profession. *Independent Education, 31*(3), 30-32.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1998). Teachers as teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 21*(1), 63-74.

Gagné, F. (1995). The differentiated nature of giftedness and talent: A model and its impact on the technical vocabulary of gifted and talented education. *Roeper Review*, *18*(2), 103-111.

Godshalk, V. M., & Sosik, J. J. (2000). Does mentor-protégé agreement on mentor leadership behavior influence the quality of mentoring relationships? *Group & Organization Management*, *25*(3), 291-317.

Hall, T. (2002). *Differentiated instruction: Effective classroom practices report.* Retrieved 26 October, 2010, from http://www.cast.org/publications/ncac/ncac_diffinstructudl.html

Hall, K. M., Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., & Bullough, Jr, R. V. (2008). More than a place to teach: Exploring the perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of mentor teachers, *Mentoring & Tutoring*: *Partnership in Learning, 16*(3), 328–345.

Hittleman, D. R., & Simon, A. J. (2006). *Interpreting educational research: An introduction for consumers of research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 207-216.

Horng, J.-S., Hong, J.-C., ChanLin, L.-J., Chang, S.-H. and Chu, H.-C. (2005), Creative teachers and creative teaching strategies. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 29*, 352–358.

Hudson, P. (2010). Mentors report on their own mentoring practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(7), 30-42.

Hudson, P. (2007). Examining mentors' practices for enhancing preservice teachers' pedagogical development in mathematics and science. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 15*(2), 201–217.

Hudson, P., Skamp, K., & Brooks, L. (2005). Development of an instrument: Mentoring for effective primary science teaching. *Science Education, 89*(4), 657-674.

Huling-Austin, L. (1992). Research on learning to teach: Implications for teacher induction and mentoring programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(3), 173-80.

Killen, R. (2009). *Effective teaching strategies: Lessons from research and practice*. (5th ed). South Melbourne: Cengage Learning.

Konza, D., Grainger, J., & Bradshaw, K. (2001). *Classroom management: A survival guide.* Katoomba, Vic: Social Science Press.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms.* NY, NY: Holt, Reinhardt and Winston.

Larrivee, B. (2009). *Authentic classroom management: Creating a learning community and building reflective practice* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y. J. (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline and student misbehaviour in Australia, China, and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 729–741.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organisation of teaching. *Review of Educational Research, 16,* 297-351.

Martin, A., Linfoot, K., & Stephenson, J. (1999). How teachers respond to concerns about misbehaviour in their classroom. *Psychology in the Schools, 36*, 347-358.

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6-13.

McNally, J., I'anson, J., Whewell, C., & Wilson, G. (2005). "They think that swearing is okay": First lessons in behaviour management. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 31*(3), 169–185.

Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). (2003). *A national framework for professional standards for teaching: Teacher quality and educational leadership taskforce.* Canberra, Australia: Author. Retrieved 6 May, 2010, from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/national_framework_file.pdf

Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). *Qualitative research in health care: Analysing qualitative data.* (2nd ed.). *British Medical Journal, 320*, 114-116.

Putman, S. M. (2009). Grappling with classroom management: The orientations of preservice teachers and impact of student teaching. *The Teacher Educator, 44*(4), 232-247.

Queensland College of Teachers. (2006). *Professional standards for Queensland teachers.* Retrieved on 2 August, 2010, from http://www.qct.edu.au/standards/index.html

Rogers, B. (2007). *Behaviour management: A whole-school approach.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Roth, W. M., Tobin, K., & Zimmermann, A. (2002). Coteaching/cogenerative dialoguing: Learning environments research as classroom praxis. *Learning Environments Research, 5*(1), 1-28.

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

Snowman, J., Dobozy, E., Scevak, J., Bryer, F., Bartlett, B., & Biehler, R. (2009). *Psychology: Applied to teaching*. Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons.

Sprick, R. S. (2009). *Discipline in the secondary classroom: A positive approach to behavior management.* United Kingdom, Guernsey: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated instruction: A research basis. *International Education Journal*, *7*(7), 935-947.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behaviour supports. *Child & Family Behaviour Therapy, 24*(1), 23-50.

Tomlinson, C. (2000). Differentiation of instruction in the elementary grades. *Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.* Retrieved 20 June, 2010, from Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) database. (ERIC Document No EDO-PS-00-7)

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. London, UK: The MIT Press.

Woolfolk, A., & Margetts, K. (2010). *Education psychology*. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods.* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.