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Abstract

ACCELERATING EXPERIENCE: USING LEARNING SCENARIOS BASED ON MASTER TEACHER EXPERIENCES AND SPECIFIC SCHOOL CONTEXTS TO HELP INDUCT NOVICE FACULTY INTO TEACHING AT AN INDEPENDENT BOARDING SCHOOL

Paul B. Cyr-Mutty

Betsy R. Rymes

Many independent boarding schools have customarily hired significant numbers of novice faculty who are not certified teachers and who do not have significant teaching experience. Additionally, the time available to help such novice faculty learn about the many aspects of their jobs is quite limited. Therefore, the methods used to help novice faculty learn, while they already enacting their roles as educators, are important. As a result, this study examined the effectiveness of using school context based learning scenarios as a tool for teaching novice faculty at independent boarding schools. Specifically, the study tried to determine if such scenarios helped novice faculty feel greater self-efficacy and helped them to more effectively gain the benefits of their own experiential learning, thus acquiring more quickly the important knowledge of their craft that senior teachers developed through their own experiential learning. I theorized that this would ultimately lead to their achieving better educational outcomes with their students in all facets of their jobs. First, the researcher interviewed six master teachers from three different junior boarding schools to gather information about the key experiential learning events of successful teachers and then analyzed this data to identify
common themes and types of experiences. These narrated, real experiences and the analyses of them were used as the basis for the construction of learning scenarios. These scenarios attempted to both highlight important concepts and approaches to working with adolescents that the master teachers felt they gleaned from the actual experiences and reflect the specific details of the independent boarding middle school where they were used. These scenarios were then read and discussed with the novice faculty at the school as part of their induction to life and work there over the course of a four-month period.

To assess the impact of the use of scenarios, the researcher audio recorded, video taped and analyzed two of the scenario learning sessions; had the new faculty respond, in written form, to two scenarios; conducted a focus group with the new faculty, and administered a pre and post scenario learning experience self-efficacy scale.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“You can be knowledgeable with other men’s knowledge, but you cannot be wise with other men’s wisdom.” Michel de Montaigne (*Essays*)

Every year at Eaglebrook School, where I teach and am Assistant Headmaster, we welcome several young teachers to our faculty who are enthusiastic, academically successful, experienced in athletics, and optimistically interested in working with middle school children. As two of my chief administrative responsibilities are the coordination of faculty hiring and the induction of new faculty into teaching and life at school, I am closely involved with aiding these young people in their growth and development as professionals as well as their emotional support as young adults in a new and often challenging endeavor. Because of this, I seek to balance a variety of, at times, conflicting concerns. One of these concerns is created by the fact that independent schools in general and Eaglebrook in particular have traditionally hired many teachers who are just graduating from college and are not certified as teachers. Ingersoll (2011) noted this situation, citing that less than half of private school teachers hold formal teacher certification. Eaglebrook and independent boarding schools in general have, instead, usually sought teachers with strong subject area backgrounds, experience and interest in athletics, and personal qualities and character that will allow them to act as strong role models and mentors for young people (Cookson, Cookson & Persell, 2008; Smith, 2013). The opportunity to act in these different roles is often what motivates novice teachers to choose to teach in an independent school, for as Kane (1989) maintains, over half of the
teachers who choose to teach in independent schools do so because of the diverse requirements of the job.

Because of this common absence of formal training in teaching, there is some reason to suspect, however, that these novice teachers may not be fully prepared for some of the professional demands of the job (Smith 2013). Therefore, the process by which novice teachers learn about the many aspects of their jobs and the school culture in which they will teach and live, most commonly called induction, is of great importance (Gow, 2005).

Unfortunately, because the experience of teaching at a boarding school is often demanding and difficult and novice teachers coming directly from college have little experience with the scope of the job, attrition rates can be high. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) website shows that the national annual faculty attrition rate (for both boarding and day schools) is 9.9% (Pugh, NAIS, 2002). As a result, each new academic year brings in a significant group of faculty to independent schools who will need to learn about, not just the particular school and its students, but also some of the basic practices of teaching. In addition, the scope of what a faculty member does at such a school is broad, what Kane (1989) calls “a multitude of responsibilities” (p.287). In their first year as teachers, these young professionals may not only become classroom teachers for the first time but also coaches for the first time and dormitory parents/advisors for the first time. Even if a novice teacher is credentialed in teaching before their first job, as Ingersoll (2013) notes, they still have a great deal to learn and “extensive training” (p.189) is usually required, something normally addressed through some form of induction.
The magnitude and significance of this difficulty is increased, again, at a junior boarding school, the type of school that is the focus of this study. Because, as the Junior Boarding School Association (JBSA) website notes, a middle school students “need trustworthy, caring adults in their life” (JBSA, “Our Approach,” 2015), the need for supervising middle school students in a boarding environment is significant. As I noted in my pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015), faculty at Eaglebrook School often spend three-to-six hours a day actively working with students in the dorm, in addition to the hours spent teaching and coaching. In all of these settings, young teachers can encounter novel teaching and advising situations on an almost hourly basis, for as Veenman (1984) states, in discussing the difficulties of the first year of teaching, teaching is a “complex reality” (p.144). It is worth noting that he makes this statement about teachers in public schools, ones who do not necessarily coach and advise as well. Also, because independent boarding schools are small schools, they must maximize their faculty resources, and everyone is quite busy throughout the day. Thus, these new teachers often do not have easy recourse to advice and guidance from more experienced colleagues, a fact that has been documented about public school teachers as well (Bobbitt, 1993; Ingersoll, 2013). Further, the guidance they do receive is frequently constrained by time, as both beginning teachers and their supervisors cannot stop working with the students in any setting in order to learn or teach about the job (Cyr-Mutty, 2015; Smith, 2013) Additionally, as most novice faculty at independent boarding schools are “triple threat” teachers (Cookson, Cookson & Persell, 2008), ones who teach, advise and coach, they must learn a multifaceted role, and any learning or teaching about the work must occur in the course of a busy day (Gow, 2005). This places a premium on developing ways to help teachers
learn about their jobs in a way that is time efficient and immediately applicable to their work.

Traditionally, this has made much of the learning and teaching of new faculty that does take place less formal. It has frequently taken the form of novice teachers receiving feedback and guidance from more seasoned colleagues (Smith, 2013) about an experience with teaching, coaching or advising after it has happened, an issue I documented in my pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015). It can, therefore, be difficult for supervisors to ascertain whether new teachers are receiving adequate guidance about teaching, advising, and coaching, or articulate what they are trying to teach novice faculty in a clearly delineated curriculum. Because of this informality, the learning can be largely experiential and vary considerably from novice teacher to novice teacher.

While these limiting factors on the articulation of a curriculum for helping beginning teachers learn about teaching, coaching and advising while they are actually teaching, coaching, and advising are real enough, there is reason to feel that independent schools do produce effective teachers through the manner described above. For example, while only 40% of high school graduates graduate from a college within six years, nearly 50% of students from independent/private schools do (Council for Private Education, 2013). Also, colleges and universities seem to recognize that students emerging from independent schools are well prepared for the rigors of post-secondary education. Students who attended independent secondary schools often comprise 20% of “highly selective” college’s freshman classes, although they are only 10% of college applicants (Council for Private Education, 2013). While there are clearly a host of factors that can influence these rates, the statistics do not point to a particular crisis in the quality of
teaching in independent schools. Therefore, the question may be: How do such schools cultivate young teachers in a way that respects the current, traditional process, while enhancing it in a meaningful and functional way?

An important element in any teacher’s learning is experience (Meirink, Meijer, Verloop, & Bergen, 2009; Bobbitt, 1993), and it is of particular importance in independent schools where a smaller number of teacher’s have certification (Ingersoll, 2013). Based on their first experiences, even a freshly certified teacher begins to construct “craft knowledge,” which is a critical aspect of their ability as a teacher (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). It would seem, then, that examining ways to enhance that experiential learning would be logical. In looking for a time efficient way to do this, I recalled a professional development opportunity we offered to our faculty by a lawyer, David Wolowitz, J.D. of McLane Middleton, on establishing appropriate social-emotional boundaries between teachers and students. His presentation, which used short, multi-stage scenarios as a teaching device, was very well received; several teachers commented to me on how effective and engaging they thought the format was. This seemed linked conceptually to the premise expounded by many theorists of experiential education, most notably Bandura (1971), that it is possible to learn from experience vicariously, that is through experiences that are not in reality your own. I therefore focused this study on whether it was possible to enhance the novice faculty learning programs at an independent boarding middle school by identifying key learning experiences of master teachers to use as the basis for creating learning scenarios for the professional education of novice faculty in all aspects of independent boarding school teaching.
Significance and Rationale

Background and Context. The three schools in which I conducted this study all self-identified as “junior boarding schools” and are members of a ten-school group called the Junior Boarding School Association (JBSA). Junior boarding schools are a small subset of the larger category of boarding schools, as The Association of Boarding Schools (TABS), of which all the JBSA schools are also a part, lists “almost 300” members (TABS, 2015). These JBSA schools are fairly small, with an average boarding population of 93 students, and their boarding populations range in size from 69-to-193 students. The average class size at these schools is 12 students, and student-faculty ratios average around 4.5:1 (Collegebound.com). Several of these schools’ boarding programs exist in conjunction with, an often much larger, day school program. All of the ten member schools in the JBSA share the quality of not having a grade above grade nine, and their boarding programs also do not go below grade four, with grades six-through-nine being the most common configuration for their boarding programs. In the TABS search engine, there are 167 schools listed nationally as having boarding programs below the ninth grade that also offer boarding programs through the twelfth grade. There are only a few schools that offer a similar six-through-nine configuration that are not members of the JBSA, and several of these offer more specialized programs, such as military academies, choir schools, and schools intended for students with learning differences. Of the three JBSA schools in this study, two were single-sex boys’ schools and one was co-educational.

Although tuitions can be high at JBSA schools— the available data does show that tuition ranges from $49,500 to $57,900 (JBSA, 2015)— the cost of educating a student in such a setting can be significant. Therefore, the need to operate in a fiscally
prudent manner is very real. Given this tight cost structure, options for creating substantial and supportive novice faculty induction can be limited. Therefore these schools, as do many independent schools, often ask their novice faculty to learn a great deal about their roles by doing them. However, any difficulties with novice faculty learning notwithstanding, JBSA schools stress the high quality of their faculty and overall programs. The JBSA schools enumerate 26 qualities on their website that all members schools share. These include having, “committed, superb, energetic faculty who have chosen to work in a boarding, middle school setting” and, “exemplary 9th grade programs” (JBSA, 2015).

I conducted master teacher interviews at three of the ten JBSA schools. I used my own school, Eaglebrook, as one site for these interviews, as it was to be the location in which I planned to use scenarios. This choice was particularly germane because, as I will explain later, it is important to have context specific details to use in the scenarios in order for the learning to be more self-motivated and problem centered (Merriam, 2001). I also interviewed teachers at the Cardigan Mountain School, which is similar in size and structure to Eaglebrook (all boys, mostly boarding students) to help insure that the themes being developed were not entirely the concerns of one particular context. To provide for some triangulation, I also conducted interviews of master teachers at Rectory School. Almost half the students at Rectory are day students and it is also co-educational. Conducting interviews at these different, though similar, schools allowed me to investigate how much commonality there was between different school contexts and approaches to teaching.
Significance

As Cookson and Persell (2008) state, “there is virtually no systematic research on the specific topic of elite boarding schools” (p. 15), and, based on my review of the literature, this was true of junior boarding schools as well. Nonetheless, it is conventional wisdom that the work of teachers in independent, boarding schools is complex, time-consuming, heavily dependent on context, and customarily learned while engaged in the work (Gow, 2005; Smith, 2013). Therefore, it can take a significant amount of time for any novice faculty member to learn the many aspects of their job. As noted earlier, the majority of novice teachers at such schools are not certified teachers (Ingersoll, 2013; Smith, 2013), and therefore, they do not necessarily have a background in teaching theory and practice. Unfortunately, time to teach these novices is often limited, because the structure and philosophy of such schools is that most faculty are expected to teach, coach sports, help administer the routines in the dorms, advise students, and coordinate extra-curricular activities such as clubs (Cookson & Persell, 1985). At my school, a 15-hour working day is common, and much of that time involves direct interaction with students (Cyr-Mutty, 2015). Kane (1989) notes that at most independent schools (not just boarding schools) the average work week is 55 hours as compared to 48 hours for a public school teacher. She further states that independent schoolteachers usually have a “multitude of duties” (p.287), noting that 49% of independent schoolteachers also coach a sport. In my school the figure is closer to 60%.

Of necessity then, much of the learning for new and novice faculty comes from their doing their daily work while being loosely supervised, guided, and advised by more experienced colleagues. At my own school, we have five days of meetings with new
faculty before school opens to introduce them to school policies and routines and to provide them with some basic pedagogical background information and technique. There is also a weekly 45-minute New Faculty Meeting, which endeavors to continue this same process during the school year. However, much of their significant learning still seems to take place when they are actively working in classes, athletics, and the dorm (Cyr-Mutty, 2015; Smith, 2013). Additionally, as is true for many teachers in all types of schools, much of a faculty members’ work time is still spent working with students without other faculty present (Bobbitt, 1993), so they often lack the timely guidance and advice that would enhance that learning. Further, because so much of their teaching knowledge is gained through experience, often while working alone, it is hard to ascertain precisely what knowledge novice faculty gain through their learning experiences (Cyr-Mutty, 2015; Smith, 2013). The possibility that novice faculty might not construct the knowledge that allows them to effectively address important challenges that they may eventually face for a significant period of time is, therefore, a real one. Also, a novice teacher who encounters difficult situations that do not go well early in their careers might enter into a cycle where they lose confidence, and this lack of confidence can then lead to further difficulty (Morgan & O’Leary, 2004).

**Rationale**

Because the experiential learning of novice faculty as described above can be powerful but variable in its effectiveness and hard to articulate, a major priority for independent junior boarding schools is to facilitate novice faculty learning about their jobs in a way that directly connects with their actual work-life, is time-efficient, and helps them to develop a flexible set of principles of practice that they can effectively utilize
independently in their responses to the actual challenges they face later in their practice. Such an approach should aid them in developing greater feelings of confidence or self-efficacy when encountering challenges, and this may then create a positive cycle of increasing self-efficacy that has been found to improve teacher success in their first year of teaching (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

Master teachers, particularly those who have worked their entire careers at junior boarding schools and are not certified teachers, have generally learned about many important aspects of their roles through on-the-job experience. They participated in an experiential learning process that, while generally not explicitly articulated by the schools themselves, was a significant force in their development as teachers, something that is also visible in public school teachers (Green & Ballard, 2011). It seemed, then, that it might be possible to more clearly delineate this experiential learning by having these master teachers reflect on their experiences and growth and narrate their key moments of learning. From these narrations of their learning about their roles as educators in a boarding school setting, key experiences for novice faculty learning could be identified and scenarios constructed to simulate these seminal learning experiences.

Further there seemed good reason to believe that carefully examining and discussing such constructed scenarios with a group of novice faculty, both before they began their work at school and also while they were actually working, offered a potential way to accelerate their learning in key areas. Scenarios and simulations have increasingly been used in human resource training in many businesses and professions, particularly in disciplines that are often viewed as complex (Fano, 1991; Moon, 2009) such as medicine and emergency services (Moats, Chermack & Dooley, 2008). Such scenarios appear to
have potential to foster novice faculty co-constructing knowledge with colleagues in a socially engaged way that would inform their future responses to similarly complex, context dependent situations. The novice faculty would be, in effect, gaining experience vicariously (Bandura, 1977) and thereby accelerating their learning. Such accelerated experiences also show promise as a way to create a felicitous cycle of increased feelings of self-efficacy for novice faculty that would lead them to approach their own future experiential learning opportunities with greater confidence, which could improve their success in them.
Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework

Novice teachers in independent junior boarding schools generally begin their careers with little specific background in teaching, coaching or advising (Smith, 2015; Kane, 1987). They also begin with varying levels of self-confidence or self-efficacy in regards to their ability to meet the challenges they will face, and self-efficacy is, in part, based on the “lessons” the individual has learned through their prior experiences (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Novice teachers then tend to teach as “they had been taught” (Smith, 2013), and Kane (1989) notes further that 39% of the teachers in the independent schools she surveyed chose to teach in independent schools because of the teachers they had had in independent schools themselves. However, depending on their backgrounds, they often have little experience with many of the stressors (Veenman, 1984) that they will face, and they learn how to manage these stressors by experiencing them and intermittently receiving some guidance from more experienced colleagues after the experience. For the most part, they learn the “craft knowledge” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) of the profession through their experiences, and this experiential learning is very durable. However, this type of experiential learning can also be quite variable (Darling Hammond, 2000), and identifying exactly which experience a given teacher has had or what they might have learned from it is hard to assess.

In a review of the increasing use of experiential learning techniques for training pre-service teachers, Buchmann and Schwille (1983) note that this type of learning has weaknesses. They argue that relying too heavily on a new teacher learning predominantly from their actual experiences means that the learner can miss important perspectives. Kolb (2014) notes further that, while unmediated experiential learning may have
usefulness, it can excessively weight certain dramatic experiences. He states further, citing Kahneman and Tversky’s “availability heuristic” (Kahneman, 2013, intro xix), that the individual draws heavily on the learning from these dramatic experiences because that learning is the most easily and immediately recalled. As noted earlier, successful experiential learning of this type can lead to increasing feelings of self-efficacy that will likely foster future success; however, less successful experiences may do the opposite (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Thus, it seemed that developing a way to create a time-efficient novice teacher learning device that could help them successfully manage their ongoing experiential learning would be useful. Such a technique for enhancing novice faculty learning might allow the learner to garner more numerous perspectives with which to augment their real experiences with vicarious experiences (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007), ones that they could incorporate into the larger framework of the craft knowledge and increasing self-efficacy that their learning from actual experiences created.

To this end, there is increasing documentation (e.g. Fano, 1996; Moon, 2009), that scenarios that simulate significant challenges, in a variety of forms, are useful in helping practitioners to learn how to respond to complex situations in business, emergency services, and other professions. The process of examining, discussing, and creating potential solutions to challenges presented in scenarios could allow new faculty, when they meet problems similar to those in the scenario in the future, to meet those challenges with greater feelings of self-efficacy (Tschannen Moran & Hoy 2007), more rational thought (Kahneman, 2013), and a greater reservoir of remembered, successful experiences. This could also likely set in motion a learning cycle (Kolb, 2014) that will
continue to enhance teacher learning over time by allowing novice faculty to base their future decisions on a more reflective thought process.

Therefore, it appeared that scenario learning represented a potentially excellent tool for promoting the knowledge development of novice faculty within the context of their complex roles as teachers in independent junior boarding schools. In light of the forgoing, this study sought to examine if such scenarios, written by or based on the key experiential learning experiences of master teachers, are useful tools for accelerating and improving their experiential learning and thereby increasing the novice faculty’s feelings of self-efficacy.

**Novice Faculty’s Learning**

**Novice teachers.** When any novice teacher begins teaching, coaching and advising at an independent boarding school, they face a number of challenges. Foremost among these may be that they have much to learn. The first year of teaching has been the subject of many studies and discussions (e.g. Ingersoll, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Veenmen, 1984), and the profession of teaching has been often described as complex (Zeichner, 1999). That the entry into the profession of teaching is difficult is argued by many authors (e.g., Ingersoll, 2004; Morgan & O'Leary, 2004) and because of the expanded scope of what boarding independent school teachers are asked to do, the effectiveness of induction programs takes on particular importance. These relatively inexperienced or untrained novice teachers are already teaching, and if they lack important knowledge, whether or not such knowledge would have been provided in a college-based certification program, the need to provide them with this knowledge to improve all aspects their teaching is significant. For example, if a parent feels that a
teacher is performing poorly with their child, whether in classes, sports, or the dorm, it seems likely that they will be dissatisfied with the explanation that the novice teacher is still learning. Clearly, this puts a great deal of stress on the beginning teacher as the novice is trying to simultaneously manage and balance the expectations of parents, supervisors, and children, as well as their own (Cyr-Mutty, 2015). This evident stress is one reason that much of the research on the usefulness of teacher induction processes is cast in terms of its effect on teacher retention (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1999; Cannady, et al, 2012) and it is often argued that the better a teacher’s induction experience, the less likely it is that a teacher will leave the school or the profession.

Current statistics regarding poor retention rates for new teachers are often cited with alarm, and the first year of teaching is frequently characterized as a “sink or swim” affair (Smith, 2013). The results of this stressful introduction can be attrition rates as high as 50% after five years (Ingersoll, 2004). These statements and ideas seem to indicate that the induction process for many beginning teachers, whether in public or independent schools, is suspect and warrants further analysis. Further, because teaching is an often demanding and difficult occupation with a high attrition rate, independent boarding schools are faced with a similar and significant induction challenge year after year (Gow, 2005) and this seems to further increase the need for developing more effective induction and novice faculty learning programs.

A teacher’s success in their first year is clearly not just an issue for the new teacher; it is also of importance to students (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Several studies cite that teacher quality is an instrumental influence on student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Rockoff, 2004). It also matters to parents. Yaacob, Osman,
and Bachok (2014), in a study of why parents in Malaysia chose independent schools, note that the quality of the teachers ranked fourth. Further, in my own experience, it is not uncommon for a parent to express concern over the fact that their child has a novice as a teacher, coach or adviser, and this potential conflict with a parent can serve to exacerbate any difficulties a novice teacher might be having by placing them under additional stress (Cyr-Mutty, 2015). And such stress, as Veenman (1984) notes, is one of the major problems for novice faculty in their first years of teaching. Novice faculty learning clearly has a great impact on many and it therefore seemed important to examine how it could be improved.

**Self-efficacy.** A significant influence on new teacher success in this stressful first year, which has a substantial foundation in the literature, is a teacher’s feelings of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy, commonly defined as the extent to which a teacher feels that they can positively affect student performance (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy 1998), is something that Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy and Hoy (1998) argue is a strong predictor of student performance. Further, since student performance is not the only area with which teachers at independent boarding schools need to concern themselves, it is also important to view other possible effects. Brouwers and Tomac (1999), in a study of the effects of perceived self-efficacy and novice teacher burnout, show that self-efficacy has a significant impact on this as well. Further, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2009) note, in a quantitative study that tested the accuracy of a Norwegian self-efficacy scale, that there is a strong relationship between teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy and teacher burn-out. Similarly, Morgan and O’Leary (2004), in a quantitative study that examined different factors that influenced novice teachers’ success, maintain
that self-efficacy was a relatively “important” (p. 79) determinant in teacher job satisfaction. These studies indicate that teachers with greater feelings of self-efficacy burn out less often and feel greater satisfaction in their work. Thus, it seems likely that they will stay in the profession longer which will allow them more time to learn.

It is important to note that feelings of self-efficacy are significantly affected, even determined, by experiences. Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy (2007), in a study that examined the relative affects of mastery experiences and verbal persuasion on novice and experienced teachers, note that mastery experiences are the most important sources of feelings of self-efficacy and, for teachers, these mastery experiences come from successful moments in actual teaching. This seemed to point to a link between experiential learning and self-efficacy, for, in terms of self-efficacy, experience may indeed be the best and primary teacher. However, since experience takes time to acquire and not every actual experience is going to be a “mastery experience,” there appeared a need to accelerate this process in a way that fostered a new or novice teacher encountering a greater number of positive experiences.

**Experiential learning.** It seems apparent, then, that novice teachers at junior boarding schools bring their already formed feelings of self-efficacy to bear on each new experience they face, and the self-efficacy they feel going into that real experience has a significant impact on how well they manage it. As noted above, this type of learning from experience has always been a critical element in novice faculty learning at independent boarding schools. However, because each new experience is also a learning experience, the importance of how they approach these new experiences is critical. This is true
because experiential learning is often conceptualized as a self-perpetuating cycle (Kolb & Kolb, 2005).

Much of the theory and research on experiential learning argues that learning from experience is a particularly powerful way to learn (Bandura, 1971; Kolb & Kolb, 2005), so there seemed good reason to try to more effectively and deliberately incorporate aspects of this type of learning into independent school induction programs.

Bandura (1971), in his seminal work on social cognitive learning, argues that learning is best understood as an ongoing interaction between a learner and the environment in which he or she learns. However, he also importantly argues that most learning that occurs through experience can also be learned through “vicarious” (p.2) experiences and that learning can also take place through “symbolic representations of behaviors” (p.4). This seems to suggest that there might be a way to facilitate experiential learning in a way that did not rely solely on new faculty having experiences in their actual practice.

Further, Kolb and Kolb (2005), in an overview of the foundations of experiential learning to provide a basis for their theory of learning spaces in higher education, ground their ideas in the work of Dewey and Piaget and articulate six propositions on which experiential learning is based. Of particular relevance to this is discussion is the proposition that learning is best conceived as a process of interaction between the learner with their environment and that learning is a process of creating knowledge through the resolution of conflicts between different approaches to that environment. This argues, then, that learning best occurs when a learner experiences challenges (conflicts) that they then resolve and thereby create their own knowledge. Kolb and Kolb also construe experiential learning as a four stage cycle: first one observes a concrete experience (CE)
within the environment which the learner reflects on and integrates into his or her previously held ideas, creating an abstract conceptualization (AC). Then, the learner uses this new understanding or conceptualization as a way to view other events in the reflective observation (RO) phase. Finally this moves to the active experimentation (AE) phase where the learner seeks to apply the new knowledge to other experiences, and the cycle starts again. Learners will perpetually cycle through this pattern as they construct increasingly sophisticated and developed understandings. Throughout this process, the learner becomes increasingly aware of their learning style (Baker 1989), and improves on his or her ability to effectively manage new experiences. Thus, each new cycle of experiential learning creates the knowledge base and feelings of self-efficacy that the teacher/learner will bring to their next experiences or learning moments.

However, there seems little way to control the types of learning experiences a novice has at a school in order that they be positive ones, particularly as new faculty spend much of their time working alone. Thus a new faculty member’s limited range of experiences, the experiences that create the tools that are most readily available to them in their toolbox of skills for handling new experiences, could be strongly influenced by negative, unconstructive experiences that are more easily remembered (Buchmann & Schwille, 1989). Thus, the scenario learning approach seemed to offer the possibility to control some of the experiential learning moments of new faculty, vicarious though these moments may be, so as to try to tip the scale of experiential learning towards more positive, mastery-type experiences.
Novice Faculty’s Learning with Scenarios

This basic pattern of experiential learning for new and novice faculty has been the standard in many independent schools. For a variety of reasons, such as that many independent schools are resistant to even the notion of full-fledged induction programs, with their associations with public school approaches (Gow 2005), it appears likely continue to remain so. In this current, common process for inducting new faculty into work at a boarding middle school, chiefly through their experiences, self-efficacy appears as a very important, maybe critical, factor in novice faculty feeling successful, doing well in their work and consequently, their helping to improve student performance. Because they are often facing situations for which they have no relevant experiences, novices must call on that sense of self-efficacy regularly to help them manage each novel, challenging experience. These feelings of self-efficacy are developed by an individual successfully meeting challenges (experiences) about which they are able to reflect, construct understanding, observe in other experiences, and then apply to a future challenge. However, it also seems true that a faculty member in an independent boarding school would likely face more unmediated experience with students in their first year of teaching than they would in any kind of non-experiential, learning process prior to teaching, especially if they were not trained to be a teacher.

Significantly and as noted earlier, traditional practices for induction in boarding schools where novice faculty learn through experience, are also prone to a high rate of failure. Again, self-efficacy may play an important role. While a positive cycle leading to increased self-efficacy and effectiveness may develop through this traditional approach, a
negative cycle could easily develop as well. If a novice faculty member consistently encounters challenging experiences for which they do not feel prepared, this would likely result in decreased self-efficacy, then the chances of a poor outcome from future experiences and the consequent reduction of their overall sense of self-efficacy increases. For this reason, Tschannen, Woolfolk-Hoy and Hoy (1998) note that teachers with lower feelings of self-efficacy tend to leave the profession at higher rates. It seems then that if experience is to continue to be the primary teacher in independent boarding schools, a system for expediting and augmenting that type of learning in way that fosters the creation of a positive cycle of increasing self-efficacy would clearly be beneficial.

Introducing timely, context-centered, vicarious experiences through scenarios appears to offer a way to allow teachers to experience relevant but mediated challenges in a structured, scaffolded way that is safe and supportive. It might also allow them to develop skills for knowledge creation in all their other experiential learning by helping them to more habitually adopt a learning cycle where, after each new challenging experience, they reflect, analyze, and plan for the future events. The use of scenarios that are developed from the real experiences of more experienced, successful colleagues might create such a “vicarious” learning cycle for new teachers that follows this experiential learning progression, a cycle that would exist within the larger “real” experiential learning cycle they are in as teachers. This vicarious learning cycle, embedded within the larger, “real” cycle, was theorized to be an aid to the reflective learning aspect of the larger cycle.

**Scenarios.** Scenarios and simulations, the term most frequently used for largely computer-based scenarios used for training, have been shown to be useful in teaching
specific skills (e.g. Lange 1971; Fano 1996; Moon, 2009). Studies have also revealed that simulations are useful for teaching problem solving to younger students (Moon, 2009). Further, De Jong (1991) notes that computer simulations foster exploratory or experiential learning. Similarly, Thalheimer (2009) argues that scenarios are helpful in remembering, and as participating in the analysis of a scenario provides practice in memory retrieval, this could increase a learner’s general ability with memory retrieval. He also notes that language alignment (similarity) allows for better remembering. This argues that the learner remembers more when the context in a scenario and the anticipated “real” challenge are similar. This suggests that, to increase the effectiveness of scenarios, they should be crafted so as to be as site or context specific as possible. It was also significant that Nelson (2007), in a discussion of the use of educational, multi-user virtual environments (MUVEs), notes that a chief limitation of MUVEs is that the use of “guidance” or discussion from outside the environment of the simulation significantly enhances the level of learning from the simulation. This suggests that simulations and scenarios are, therefore, not as effective by themselves, and the guidance and interaction achieved through discussion might significantly aid the vicarious learning provided by a scenario.

The scenario learning approach, although construed somewhat differently than I do here, has also become an increasingly common technique for training emergency personnel. In the literature on using scenarios for this purpose, several authors argue that scenarios are an excellent tool for learning about “complex” and significantly context dependent problems (Moon 2009; Spector, Christensen, Sioutine & McCormack 2001). Given the variety of factors that a teacher must consider in a classroom, let alone what
they might also face in a dormitory or on a sports field, construing teaching as a similarly complex activity seems logical and such has been stated by several authors (Shulman, 1987; Hargreaves & Jacka, 1995). Hargreaves and Jacka also state that teaching is “notoriously hard to learn” (p. 41). To carry the analogy with emergency services work a bit further, the cliché notes that firemen and other first responders have extended periods of boredom that are interspersed widely with moments of terror. In a similar way, although novice teachers may learn a great deal at first, much of their practice may become routine; however, occasionally they are challenged by significant, critical experiences that cause significant stress, maybe even terror. I noted that talking with parents who are upset was an example of this in my own pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015). These critical experiences were also often characterized as discipline situations, and Veenman (1984), in his examination of the major stressors on novice teachers, notes that student discipline is one of the most significant stressors for novice faculty in the first year of teaching. When a teacher works with students on a nearly round-the-clock basis, as in a boarding school, these sorts of discipline issues can and do happen on a frequent basis.

It also seems relevant to draw a distinction between scenario-based learning and the more commonly practiced case study method, although they appear as close analogs. Shulman (1992) notes that the case method has long been used in preparation for activities such as medicine, law, and even chess. It involves the use of written cases, based on real events, that are then assessed in terms of how the steps taken within the case contributed to its outcome. However, Shulman notes that the case method is “inherently simplifying” (p. 12). In effect, some of the complexity of the situation is
removed, as the end result seems fixed. Scenarios, on the other hand, seemed to respect the uncertainty in such situations and allow for more rich dialogue about different approaches. Levin (1995), in her mixed methods study of the usefulness of the case method as a tool for teaching teachers, specifically focuses on this feature of discussing the issue presented by a case in her study. She states in her conclusion that “we know that the discussion of the case is an important factor in promoting the development of teachers’ thinking about cases” (p.76). Discussion, therefore, appears a critical element in the use of scenarios to enhance teacher learning.

Clearly, arriving at a base definition of “scenario” is important to this study, but it was often defined variously in the literature (Pesonen, Ekvall, Fleischer, Huppes, Jahn, Klos & Wenzel, 2000). In an early paper by Wack (1985), one that discusses the use of Scenario-Based Planning (SBP) by companies, there is no clear definition of a scenario. In SBP, the scenario replaces a fixed, targeted outcome with a series of potential futures, and the executives then plan for a variety of possibilities based on the scenarios. This allowed for flexible and individual responses that, Wack argues, are ultimately more successful. In their article on SBP, Pesonen et al (2000) presented a number of possible definitions for scenario that were developed with SBP in mind, but do not seem particularly applicable to the use of scenarios conceptualized here. In an educational administration application of SBP, James Lytle (1996) notes his use of simulations to help school district stakeholders in Philadelphia practice making budget cuts together, which allowed them to eventually make real budget cuts “without a single grievance filed” (Lytle, 1996). A destructive conflict was avoided by practicing the conflict in a simulation, although again the terms “simulation” or “scenario’ were not defined.
A more recent article that focuses on the use of scenario-based training (SBT) with emergency and crisis management personnel (Moats, Chermack, & Dooley, 2008) posits a partially applicable definition for a scenario as an imagined future situation that “provides the opportunity to experience interaction with a potential reality to develop and test potential solutions to the problems presented” (p. 401). The authors argue that scenarios can take leaders “beyond what is currently imagined” (p. 447), because of the introduction of uncertainty into the planning process. Thus, using this definition, scenario learning appears to offer the challenge of uncertainty that could promote the development of a range of actions in regards to the imagined scenario. This could then lead the learner to imagine a range of outcomes, choosing the one that seems most efficacious for the particular set of factors within the context of the scenario. This appeared particularly important in terms of this study of novice teachers, because every interaction between a given teacher and student is a unique relationship, that is based on myriad contextual variables. Therefore, to maintain that a set of prescribed standard steps would lead to a predictable outcome in all cases would seem naïve and an open-ended scenario would better simulate the reality of experience.

For the purposes of this study of using scenarios for promoting teacher learning, I posited the following definition for a scenario, basing it on that of Moats, Chermack and Dooley (2008): a teacher-learning scenario is a written description of a hypothetical problem, with no explained outcome, that a teacher could likely encounter in the future and is intended to be discussed with other novice faculty and experienced teachers. The purpose of these scenarios is to provide the opportunity for a teacher/learner to
experience interactions with potential realities in order to develop and experiment with possible solutions to the problems presented.

**Social-constructivist learning.** Because both experiential and scenario based learning, particularly as developed above, is a social process in which learners are interacting with other learners and more knowledgeable colleagues to construct understandings out of their experiences, it seemed important to consider certain aspects of social constructivist learning theory. In particular, Vygotsky’s (1938/1978) ideas about the *zone of proximal development* seemed relevant. Vygotsky theorizes that learning is a social process and that, in order for optimum learning to be achieved, new experiences must be within the learner’s *zone of proximal development (ZPD)*. Further, he argues that experiences within the *ZPD* will maximize growth. The *ZPD* is the space between what a learner can do on his or her own and what he or she can do with guidance and support. The *ZPD*, then, is the area into which new learning needs to be targeted and scaffolded. It appeared logical then that the learner’s learning of particularly challenging, complex material or processing similarly complex and challenging experiences could be supported by the insights of others, while still allowing and fostering the individual learner’s creating their own understandings. Thus, to target the goal of fostering the development of greater self-efficacy, vicarious experiential learning lessons need to be within the learner’s *ZPD*. I theorized that this could be accomplished by fashioning scenarios that were difficult enough for novice faculty to be significantly challenged in developing a response independently for but not so daunting that they could not develop a successful response with guidance from fellow novice faculty and more experienced colleagues. This *ZPD* would change continually as the novice faculty gained experience and
increased self-efficacy, which meant that the difficulty or challenge of the scenarios should also follow a progression from easier to more difficult.

The literature also suggested that there was an important connection here to theories of “situated” learning, an offshoot of social-constructivist and experiential theories of learning. In an overview of what they refer to as the “situative perspective” Putnam and Borko (2000) examine the influence of situated learning, which is learning that is closely tied to “the physical and social context in which an activity takes place” (p.4). They argue that, in the same way that “authentic” learning activities have been found to be more effective when working with students in the classroom, because they foster critical thinking and problem solving skills, so too would such situated learning activities promote the these qualities in teachers. The “situative perspective” also argues that cognition is more accurately thought of as “distributed” (p.4), meaning that all knowledge about a given situation exist amongst a group rather than within just one individual. Both of these ideas seemed to point to the notion that the best learning activities for new teachers would be ones that are closely linked to context and involved interaction with others. This interaction could, in effect, lead to the formation of a discourse community (Lieberman & McLaughlin 1992), among whom the knowledge and learning would be distributed. This also seemed to argue for placing learning activities for new teachers into a similar context as the ones that would be faced and in temporal proximity to when the knowledge might be needed. The current, unplanned, temporal nature of the learning experiences of new faculty also appeared an aspect of the situation that could be problematic in this regard, as the learning and the actual use of that learning could be separated by considerable amounts of time in the current model. I argue
that this could be addressed by use of scenarios that emphasize more situated learning. Rather than having widely dispersed important learning events, these new faculty could have more regular, vicarious experiences that would allow them to encounter more frequent learning moments. These experiences could be targeted on events that were more likely to occur in the near future but which the new faculty might not otherwise encounter for a much greater period of time.

It seems worthwhile noting that, in a mixed methods study that examines how experiential learning affects retention of information involving of 31 students in an Irish university—and therefore people close in age to many new faculty in these contexts—Van Eynde and Spencer (1988) note that there was no significant difference between lecture and experiential learning in their effect on relatively short-term retention in preparation for a test. However, experiential learning was “significantly better” (p. 57) for long-term retention as measured by a term-ending exam. For the purposes of my own study this seems to point to three important ideas:

1. Experiential learning is a strong way to teach that leads to more effective memory.

2. Using group discussion of observed information facilitates this.

3. This learning is most effective when situated in the context in which it will be utilized.

**Adult learning.** In order to foster the learning and increase the feelings of self-efficacy of new teachers with any learning experience, it seems clear that one must attend to adult learning theory. Since the goal of this project is to find a learning process that is effective for adults, then some level of adherence to the principles of andragogy was
important. Several authors (e.g., Desimone, 2001; Merriam, 2001) confirm this observation. Merriam (2001), in a survey of the basic principles of andragogy, states that adult learning is best facilitated by learning experiences that are: self-directed, based on accumulating experience, related to changing social roles, problem centered, and motivated by internal rather than external forces. Scenario learning seems to fit these criteria well.

I conceptualized that, through a learner’s interaction with a scenario, they could articulate their ideas about the best course of action for a given hypothetical experience, and then discuss this response with colleagues, with the goal of generating alternative approaches that the group can assess in terms of possible outcome or effectiveness. In this there seemed significant self-direction for new faculty. Also, since the learner was being specifically asked to articulate how they would respond, they were being asked to draw on their own previous experiences. There also seemed a relevant connection between scenario learning and developing social roles here, as well. It has often been observed that there are clear differences between a new teacher, trained or not, and an experienced, veteran, or master teacher. It therefore seemed reasonable to posit that, for most young teachers, an association with the latter group would be more desirable. This seemed to imply, therefore, a useful connection between new faculty member’s desire to be successful in a scenario learning experience and that learner’s desire for a changed social function.

That scenario learning was “problem centered” is self-evident, since the scenarios were conceptualized as a hypothetical challenge. Further and importantly, as the learning scenarios were conceptualized as ones that were specific to the context in which the
teacher was working, there was a high degree of personal relevance. This relevance would also be achieved and enhanced by the scenarios embodying problems that the teachers would more than likely have in their own work lives. Because of this fact, it seemed probable that a learner would have increased internal motivation. In sum then, the process of scenario learning seemed an excellent fit with the adult learning construct.

**Using the rational mind.** As part of the goal of using a scenario learning approach was to alter how novice faculty approached future experiences, it seemed that Kahneman (2013) offered a useful theoretical lens for discussing the how scenario learning might prove beneficial for novice teachers. In his argument in regards to economic decision-making, Kahneman undermines the longstanding predominance of the “expected utility theory” (p. 270), also known as the “rational-agent model,” of economics. In his book *Thinking Fast and Slow*, Kahneman posits, using terminology from Stanovich and West (2008), the presence of two types of minds, “System 1” and “System 2” (pp. 20-21). One part of the mind, “System 1,” thinks quickly and intuitively, using heuristic shortcuts. This mind, he theorizes, is deeply grounded in responses and experiences that are developed early in life in concert with instinct. This seemed to parallel the type of learned response that might be the result of unguided or un-scaffolded experiential learning. The learner, particularly the younger learner, responds to most situations with their “fast” mind, “System 1” based on their accumulated experience and instinct. However, such responses may be the wrong ones, as Kahneman (2013) seeks to illustrate by showing how people often make decisions and act intuitively in ways that are actually counter to their best interests. The other “slow” mind, “System 2,” is reflective,
deliberative, and rational; this mind considers a variety of options and is more likely to construct a reasoned response.

I posited, then, that a vicarious scenario learning experience might allow new teachers to practice utilizing more the more rational, “System 2” mind. Rather than facing the imperative of having to construct a tangible response to a real challenge immediately, which would more likely be a response generated by the intuitive, experiential, “System 1” mind, by developing and articulating responses to challenges in a reflective, social setting, new faculty would be practicing a more reflective thought process that was mediated by the more rational, “System 2” mind. I argued that this might help the learner develop a thought process that allowed them to respond, even to immediate, challenging experiences, with greater thoughtfulness and rationality. This could lead to better outcomes for both the teacher and his or her students.

Epstein (2003) also establishes a connection between Kahneman’s ideas and the preceding discussion. In his development of what he calls “Cognitive Emotional Self-Theory,” he specifically refers to Kahneman’s System 1 as the “experiential” mind (p. 159). He further notes that experiences generate unarticulated theories, which are ultimately very hard to undermine. He argues that the experiential mind is used more often when in real situations than the rational mind and is more active when dealing with abstractions. He also importantly remarks that the balance between the two minds changes as an individual ages and that, in general, the rational mind gains more control, as a person grows older. I extrapolated these points to my study of the use of scenarios, because novice faculty in independent schools often naturally teach based on how they were taught (Smith, 2013). When doing so, it seems likely that they are responding more
reactively, based on the deeply embedded paradigm of “System 1.” Further, this seemed to indicate that, as the individual teacher ages and gains experience, the mind becomes better able to activate the rational system. This, it seemed, implied that if one could reinforce this rational process, by practicing more reasoned, deliberative assessments in vicarious experiences that have a significant aspect of reality to them, it would help new faculty to draw on the more rational mind. I propose that, as a result of practicing responses in a “vicarious” setting, the new teacher would be able to handle novel, real challenges in a more rational and likely more effective way. This would, in turn, lead to a more successful outcome for the student. And, because of that student success, the new teacher would likely feel greater success him/herself and this should then positively affect the feelings of self-efficacy with which she or he will meet challenges in the future.

**Conclusion**

Based on the literature I reviewed, it is clear that scenario learning for new teachers is consistent and complementary with theories and research related to the induction of novice faculty (Ingersoll, 2001), self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy 1998), experiential learning (Kolb & Kolb, 2005), social constructivist learning (Vygotsky, 1938/1978), situated learning (Putnam & Borko, 2000), adult learning (Merriam, 2001), and the concept of the “experiential” and “rational” minds (Kahneman, 2013). Further, there seemed increasing documentation that scenarios, in a variety of forms, can be useful in helping practitioners learn how to respond to complex situations in business, emergency services, and other professions. The process of examining, discussing, and creating potential solutions to challenges presented in scenarios seemed to allow a way for new teachers, when they met problems similar to
those in the scenarios in the future, to meet those challenges with greater feelings of self-efficacy, more rational thought, and a greater reservoir of remembered experiences or experiential learning. This could also likely set in motion a learning cycle that would continue to enhance teacher learning over time by allowing new faculty to base their future decisions more on a reflective thought process.

As Dwight Eisenhower remarked, when reflecting on the D-Day Invasion, “The plans are nothing but the planning is everything” (Brooks, 2015, p. 63). By helping novice teachers learn and practice how to plan for future real events by using simulated or vicarious ones, teacher-educators might increase the chances that new faculty will achieve a more positive outcome in these fluid, uncertain, contextually influenced and real events. I theorize here that this planning for potential future events will lead to better outcomes for both the teacher and student just by having taken the opportunity to think a situation through.

Therefore, it appears that the scenario learning process represents a potentially effective tool for promoting the knowledge development of new faculty within the context of their complex roles as teachers in independent junior boarding schools. In light of the forgoing, this study sought to examine if such learning scenarios, written by or based on the key experiential learning experiences of master teachers, were useful tools for increasing the feelings of self-efficacy of novice faculty thereby accelerating and improving their experiential learning. The following figures offer a visual representation of my conceptualization of the learning cycle and self-efficacy development of new faculty. In the first figure, I represent my understanding of how this cycle currently progresses in the “traditional” approach to new faculty learning. The second figure
illustrates my conceptualization of how this progression might be different when using scenario-learning.
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Figure 1: Novice faculty learning progression and self-efficacy development without scenarios.
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Figure 2: Novice faculty learning progression and self-efficacy development using scenario learning in their induction.
Chapter 3: Methodology and Research Design

To investigate the usefulness of enhancing the professional learning of new and novice faculty by using scenarios, which were based on the experiences of master teachers, this study had three separate but closely connected phases. In the first phase I interviewed master teachers to learn about experiences relevant to helping new faculty learn about all facets of their work. In the second phase, I developed these actual experiences into learning scenarios to be used in a specific context. In the final stage, the study sought to discern if such scenarios could be effectively and intentionally used to help accelerate the learning of novice teachers who do not have formal training as teachers. In particular, it tried to ascertain if participating in learning sessions using such scenarios helped foster the novice teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy, enabling them to approach future experiential learning moments with greater confidence. It attempted to do so using the following research question and sub-questions:

Research Question

In what ways do written, school context-based learning scenarios, based on the actual learning experiences of master teachers, provide effective tools for increasing a new faculty member’s ability to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school?

Sub questions.

1. What do master teachers in boarding middle schools identify as the most important learning experiences in their development as teachers, advisers and coaches?
2. What procedural steps are needed to develop the experiences of master teachers into individual, school context-based scenarios that are designed to promote reflection and the construction of possible responses within a cooperative learning context?

3. Does participating in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help new and novice faculty to increase their feelings of self-efficacy?

4. In what ways does participation in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help new and novice faculty develop general approaches or guiding principles that they then feel they can use to more effectively address challenging situations in the future?

5. To what extent and in what ways do new and novice faculty responses to scenarios become more sophisticated and complete after they have participated in scenario learning sessions?

Since this study sought to learn how master teachers viewed their own experiential learning and how novice teachers felt about participating in the scenario learning process, a predominantly qualitative approach, which allows for “locating the meanings people place on events” (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 1994, p.11), seemed the most appropriate. However, to augment this data, I also used a few, smaller quantitative measures, namely a self-efficacy scale, a score for written scenario responses using a basic rubric, and a short survey that supplemented data collected in a focus group. These last elements notwithstanding, a predominantly qualitative research design allowed me to examine chronologies and discern “which events led to which consequences and derive fruitful explanations” (p.4) about the phenomenon. Therefore, qualitative tools were ideal for ascertaining both the key experiential learning moments of master teachers and
whether and in what ways new faculty felt that the scenarios were beneficial. Also, as part of my goal was to learn how master teachers’ conceptualize their key learning experiences, a largely qualitative study seemed more likely to reveal their understandings of these important learning experiences (Anderson, Herr & Nihlen, 2007).

Secondarily, while much of the research on helping new faculty learn and grow in their first year of teaching is framed in terms of the effects on teacher retention (e.g. Ingersoll, 2001; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Strong, 2009), this metric was not particularly useful here. Given the small sample of novice faculty at these schools— the average faculty size for a JBSA School is approximately 75 and the average attrition rate for all faculty at independent schools is 9.9% (Pugh, NAIS, 2002) — seeing a meaningful effect using these quantitative measures over such a short time period seemed unlikely.

In the initial part of the study, I conducted semi-structured interviews with six master teachers at three of the ten JBSA schools. In these interviews, the master teachers were asked to articulate, in some detail, the experiences that they felt were most influential on their learning and practice as teachers, and this detail allowed for the enhancement and development of key details in the scenarios. These interviews were also very important to the development of my understanding of general concepts or knowledges that the master teachers’ felt they learned from each experience. Since semi-structured interviews are useful for guiding an interview (Ravitch & Carl, 2016), they allowed me to focus the master teachers’ responses on the different aspects of the teaching job at these schools, particularly the main areas of the “triple threat” (Cookson & Persell, 1985): teaching, coaching and advising. I recorded the interviews and had them transcribed. The transcriptions were then coded and analyzed, using a descriptive
(Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013) and iterative, open-coding technique (Maxwell, 2013). The themes developed in the interview were organized in a matrix to facilitate their use as the basis for the construction of multi-step learning scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of teaching role (“threat”)</th>
<th>Scenarios developed (scenario #)</th>
<th>Scenarios used (scenario #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teaching</td>
<td>1, 3, 11, 13, 18, 21, 22</td>
<td>1, 3, 11, 13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics coaching</td>
<td>4, 9, 17</td>
<td>4, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising/working in a dorm</td>
<td>2, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20</td>
<td>2, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Scenarios developed and used with new faculty

In the second phase of the study, I developed 22 scenarios that sought to embody the main themes that emerged from the master teacher interviews. I developed at least two-to-five scenarios for each aspect of the “triple threat” and used at least two scenarios from each area with the new faculty. Each scenario was constructed so as to try to accentuate the key learning concepts, the Mindsets and Knowledges (see p.80), that the master teachers identified. The draft scenarios were shared with the master teachers I interviewed for their input, and I particularly solicited information on whether the scenarios captured the important lessons and details of the events from which they emerged. This allowed for the scenarios to be “coauthored,” (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013, p. 38) to some degree and helped to insure that the themes developed in the scenarios were not too skewed by my ideas and understandings.

In the third phase of the study, I used the scenarios in learning sessions with the new faculty at Eaglebrook School, both at the start of the school year and in weekly new faculty meetings after it had begun. These scenario-learning sessions included considerable discussion at each stage or step of the individual scenarios, and this was designed to help foster learning from that particular scenario experience (Nelson, 2007).
As the study developed, I tried to establish basic types or categories of questions to ask at the different stages of the scenarios. I video recorded two of these sessions and had them transcribed. From these transcriptions I acquired data that I used to examine how the novice faculty discussed the scenarios and whether in doing so they were identifying similar mindsets and knowledges that the master teachers had learned in the original experiences.

Finally, since focus groups are useful for helping one understand the dynamics of social situations (Ravitch & Carl, 2016), I conducted a focus group with the novice faculty to help me better understand whether these novice teachers felt that discussing the scenarios helped them in their practice as teachers and whether they approached the real-world challenges they experienced with greater feelings of self-efficacy. Additionally, because the time period in which I was conducting the focus group was a busy and stressful one for new faculty, in order to reduce the amount of their rather limited time that I used, I also used a short follow-up survey. This survey was not intended to generate statistically valid quantitative data but rather to simply allow the new faculty to augment or expand their thoughts at a time more convenient to them.

Since self-efficacy was construed as a central concept in this study, in this third stage of the study I also administered a simple, standard, self-efficacy survey to gain some insight into the novice faculty’s feelings of self-efficacy. Because I used a small sample, over a short time frame, I did not seek a statistically valid measure. Instead, I used it to gain some perspective on novice faculty’s feelings of self-efficacy, which allowed me to triangulate the other results and provide some “analytic texture” (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013, p. 43) to the study. This scale helped provide one small
“link” or small piece of “confirmatory” evidence (Miles etc. p. 42) for the findings and conclusions that I drew from my qualitative analysis. I administered the survey to the New Faculty (NF) when they first started their induction program in August before the school year began and then again in November after they had completed their first term teaching at school. For this purpose, I used the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (Chen, Gully & Eden, 2001).

Additionally, because I was hoping to discern if the new faculty changed their approach to scenarios and, therefore, possibly changed their approach to their actual practice, I used two administrations of a written response (see p. 55) to help develop a “before and after” picture of their approaches to the issues presented in the scenarios and whether any changes in the whole groups’ response to scenarios had occurred. I used an anonymous survey that asked for responses to the three different stages of a scenario. This response was scored using a simple rubric, and rubrics are a well-established technique for evaluating writing (Moskal, 2000) although they are not without relevant limitations. Again, the goal with this ostensibly quantitative element was to triangulate, not generate statistically valid quantitative data.

To help account for my well-developed opinions on this subject as well as my supervisory role in coordinating new faculty hiring and induction, I used several techniques to gather data to help assure validity. Thus, I conducted an initial and ongoing document review of selected materials from each of the three schools where I conducted interviews to obtain relevant statistical data, and I also examined other documents that seem significant in the master teachers’ narrations of their experiences, such as faculty handbooks and new faculty induction materials. Also, by conducting interviews with
master teachers and allowing these teachers to review the transcripts for accuracy and also get their input as to whether the interviews fully captured what they felt the key learning experiences were, I tried to decrease the possibility that the scenarios would reflect only the my views.

Data analysis involved writing contact summaries and short memos after each master teacher interview, editing interview transcriptions for accuracy, coding interview and focus group transcriptions, constructing a theme-based matrix utilizing the codes that I developed, constructing learning scenarios that sought to embody the themes developed from the interviews, using the results of the NGSE survey to triangulate the impressions I generated from my coding, and sharing the transcriptions and initial findings with the master teachers and later the novice faculty. All of these then informed the development and composition of my final findings. All of the above methods are described in more detail below.

Site and Participant Selection

Research sites. I used my own school, Eaglebrook, as the site for the new faculty aspect of the study and as one site for interviews, because, as explained above, it was important to have context specific details to use in the scenarios in order for the learning to be more self-motivated and problem centered (Merriam, 2001). I also interviewed teachers at the Cardigan Mountain School, as it is similar in size and structure to Eaglebrook (all boys, mostly boarding students) to help insure that the themes being developed were not entirely the concerns of one particular context. To provide for more triangulation, I also conducted interviews of master teachers at the Rectory School. Rectory’s student population is almost half day students, and it is co-educational.
Conducting interviews at these different, though similar, schools allowed me to investigate how much commonality there was between different school contexts within the JBSA category. I did this because, while qualitative research is not particularly effective for generating generalizable data, using a small range of schools helped me avoid creating a set of scenarios that were too heavily influenced by the concerns of a very small sample of teachers from one sort of school environment.

While I obtained some general information about different aspects of these schools mostly from their websites and JBSA materials, more specific data was often hard to obtain. For example, financial aid data for the member schools on the JBSA site was incomplete, although the range listed for the average financial aid award at a JBSA school was from $10,500-to-$28,100. The range for the percent of students’ receiving financial aid at JBSA schools was 25% to 38%. This compared to a national average at independent schools of 30% (Collegebound.com). I could find no aggregate numbers for socioeconomic configuration and racial and ethnic diversity of the student bodies of JBSA schools on the association’s website. Similarly, while aggregate numbers for what are most frequently termed “international” students were not available on the JBSA site, I learned from each school’s individual website that these schools also appear to have significant numbers of these students, ones whose nationality and/or country of residence is not the United States. For example, at Eaglebrook 29% of student body is considered “international” with the most common countries of origin at the school being Korea, Mexico, and China. At Cardigan Mountain School, this figure is 41%. These same schools sites listed the percent of students of color as 26%, 11%, and 4% respectively. Again while there is no published aggregate data available for post-graduation schooling,
most of the students at Eaglebrook, close to 80% last year, attend a boarding secondary school after graduation. Similarly, there was no published data in regards to the financial health of the schools, although I noted that all three schools had recently undertaken significant building projects.

Participant selection. My desire to pursue this study grew out of my long-standing interest in helping new faculty at Eaglebrook, particularly novice teachers, learn about their work in a useful, time-efficient, and supportive way. Therefore it seemed logical to make my school the central site for the study, as it allowed for some generalizability of my findings and analyses within the school. It also allowed some of the participants, both master teachers and novice faculty, to see some tangible results from their participation. Again, because the scenarios that I developed were for use in an Eaglebrook context and details specific to the particular school context were conceptualized as an important part of the scenarios usefulness, it made sense to conduct the interviews of master teachers at schools that were similar to Eaglebrook in significant ways.

To identify master teachers in each of these contexts, I contacted the schools’ administrations to determine if the school was willing to participate in the study. I contacted five of the JBSA school, beside my own, and received replies from two of them. I then asked those that replied if they would nominate potential participants from their faculty who met the following criteria that were meant to identify faculty who could be considered “master teachers” within a junior boarding school context. All of the master teachers selected should have been teaching for at least five years, as Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) use this number of years of service to denote a veteran teacher.
The teachers should have begun their teaching careers at a JBSA school, and they should not have been certified as teachers when they began. I also asked to interview both male and female teachers who met these criteria. In order to develop the focus on experiential learning, I asked that each of these master teachers nominated should have worked at least half of their professional careers in the school in which they currently taught. Further I specified that all of the master teachers should have taught, coached and worked in a dorm for at least half of their careers. The aforementioned criteria were intended to help identify master teachers who had largely learned about their various teaching roles experientially. I then contacted the teachers whom the schools’ administrations identified and gained their consent to participate. I originally contacted seven teachers, but one declined to participate. By studying master teachers from three different schools, I was able to note commonalities in their views, and this allowed for more accurate replication and confirmation of my observations and conclusions.

The cohort of new teachers in the study was formed through a convenience sample, as it was comprised of the entire group of new faculty who were hired at my school that year. All signed consent forms and were, both verbally and in the consent form, given the option of not participating, although clearly, they may have felt pressure to participate because of my role as their supervisor. However, all said they were willing to participate in addition to signing the forms, and some expressed ongoing interest in what might be learned from the project.

**Master teacher descriptions.** To try to insure greater confidentiality for the teachers who participated, I present only aggregate demographic data for them. All of the six master teachers (MT), three women and three men, I interviewed met all of the above
criteria. Further, they had all taught at only one school during their careers, and they averaged 16.5 years of experience as teachers and at their school. The range of their years of experience was from 6 to 28 years. They had all, at some point in their careers or at the time interviewed, worked at their schools in all the relevant capacities of teaching, coaching, and working in the dorm, and they had also all served, at some point in their career, in some type of administrative capacity. All were college graduates, most from smaller colleges and universities in New England, and had earned degrees in subject areas other than education. Two had degrees beyond a bachelors, one a masters in social work, the other a masters in business administration. Five of the six had attended, at some point, an independent school themselves, and two of them had attended the junior boarding school at which they taught. Five of the six had also started teaching at their school in the same year as they graduated from college, while one joined the school when she was in her thirties after she had worked in several different fields for several years. All of the master teachers were white and American citizens, although one was born and raised in another country. All of them were also married and had at least one child. This is significant because, in my pilot study, the teachers I interviewed stated on more than one occasion that being a parent was one of the most important experiences in their lives in regards to their becoming an effective teacher in their context. (Cyr-Mutty, 2015)

In my discussion in chapter four, I use pseudonyms for all the MT and these are Steve Taylor, Daniel Evans, Sue Thomas, Louise Matthews, Ted Underwood and Joanne Klinger.

New teacher descriptions. Much of the following information about the new faculty (NF) who participated was generated through the hiring process and in some
cases the similarities in backgrounds was a result of the criteria for hiring that the school used. For example, the school prefers to hire individuals who have worked with the middle school students, have achieved reasonable levels of academic and athletic success, and have independent school or boarding camp backgrounds (Cyr-Mutty, personal communication, 2016). There was also a significant emphasis on what is termed “fit” with the community, something noted in Smith (2013) as being true at other independent schools. “Fit” is an elusive quality to describe but largely seems to reflect a perception by the group involved in hiring that the candidate’s personality would mesh with the current school culture, another elusive category.

As with the MT descriptions, to try to insure greater confidentiality for the new teachers who participated, I present only aggregate demographic data for them. The new faculty group was comprised of six individuals, four men and two women. Five of these teachers were white and one was Chinese. Four were citizens of the US, and two were citizens of other countries. Three had attended junior boarding schools themselves, with one being a graduate of Eaglebrook. All were college graduates and four of the six had earned their initial degrees in a subject other than education. Four of the NF had graduate degrees and three of these were in education. Three were either currently or previously certified teachers and had significant experience (more than a year) teaching, with all of these having taught middle school students at some point. Two of these three had taught at another JBSA school for two years. One had had a small business built around tutoring students in general academic areas and for standardized tests. Two had no experience in teaching in a school year program, although one of these had been employed as an intern teacher in a boarding summer school program. Two of the new faculty were married to
each other and worked in the dorm together. The two least experienced NF had graduated from college in the same year they joined the school’s faculty. All of the six were hired to teach and coach, although two of these, for different reasons, did not have responsibilities as dormitory advisors. The two new faculty who had never taught before had reduced teaching loads (2 courses as opposed to the standard three) as compared to the experienced new faculty.

In my discussion in chapter four, I use pseudonyms for all the NF and these are: Beth Clayton, Ned Overton, Peter Quinlin, Chris Daniels, Angie Snow and Henry Burton.

Methods and Research Design

Data Collection. To create as rich a data set as possible, given the constraints of time and participants’ availability, I used a variety of data collection techniques. Through a document review, I developed some limited statistical data about the overall faculty and student body demographics, paying particular attention to data about new and novice faculty hiring. I interviewed six master teachers, conducted and videotaped learning sessions with new faculty using scenarios, administered a self-efficacy scale to these same new teachers, and had the NF complete written responses to two scenarios. Finally, I conducted a focus group, which was augmented with a short survey, with the new faculty at Eaglebrook about their perspectives on the effectiveness of scenario learning as a tool for improving their practice and for increasing their feelings of self-efficacy.

Document review. My overall goal for my document reviews was to gain an idea of the priorities of the schools in terms of how they work with students and whether and how those priorities might align with the experiences and learning that new faculty might
I also conducted a more detailed review of texts particularly applicable to new faculty induction at Eaglebrook. These documents included: the school’s *New Faculty* and *Faculty Handbooks*, the agendas for new faculty induction meetings and the weekly New Faculty Meetings, notes from hiring interviews, and the school’s student/parent handbook, *The EBook*. I also reviewed the websites for the two other schools where I interviewed master teachers, and the faculty handbook and some new faculty training materials from one of those schools.

I also examined selected documents from each site to help create a picture of the general school make-up and the type of information and learning experiences with which novice faculty were provided prior to or early in their teaching at the school. For the former, I examined the schools’ websites to generate basic statistical data on school demographics related to this study. To help assess the latter, I examined faculty handbooks and some new faculty orientation and training materials from two of the schools. This range of documents allowed me to view the situation from multiple perspectives (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007) and therefore enhanced the study’s validity. The examination also allowed me to view the master teachers’ ideas in light of the larger institutional contexts in which they worked. In particular, I tried to note the relative alignment between what the master teachers saw as important learning experiences and any new faculty induction and training materials that their school uses. Since my access to the documents at Eaglebrook was much greater, much of my view of this alignment came from these. I should note, too, that, in my role as the assistant headmaster, I had a major role in the writing and editing of almost all the material reviewed.
Interviews. As my primary data gathering technique, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the master teachers’ selected from each school, for as Anderson, Herr and Nihlen (2007) note, interviews are a good tool to use when one wishes to understand how an individual “interprets their reality” (p. 169). This is what I was attempting to do, that is determine what the master teachers view as the reality of the experiences that taught them about the different aspects of their work at their schools. Further, as my views on this topic were fairly well formed, I used a semi-structured format (see appendix one) to leave some space for the master teachers to examine the areas that were of importance to them and help offset somewhat, possible biases that I might have. The semi-structured approach also helped to mitigate the possible effect of assumptions on my part that I knew what the key learning experiences were already, thereby leading the participants too strongly towards certain types of experiences with my questions. This is another attribute that Anderson, Herr and Nihlen (2007) cite as being a desirable feature of a less structured interview approach. However, because I wished to focus this study on the experiential learning events in these master teachers’ development and not on all the aspects of their learning (such as conferences, graduate study, in-service professional development, etc.) were relevant, having some structure helped keep the discussions largely focused on these central topics, another benefit of the semi-structured approach which Rubin and Rubin (2012) note.

As I progressed through the interviews, I modified questions and developed new ones, as I noted emerging themes and topics either in particular interviews or in the interviews as a whole. Also, as I speculated that these schools all would likely share a very similar set of concerns and challenges, I wanted to bring the teachers who work in
them into the research process with me. My goal was to allow them to help determine the areas of focus in the study, so they felt that their participation had real value to their own work. In this way, I tried to create an environment where, as Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2013) state, “Data are not being collected, but rather coauthored” (p. 38). I observed this co-authorship in my own pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015) where I note that some of the experienced teachers I interviewed for that study felt that, just by talking about the topic with me, they had begun to think somewhat differently about their work with new faculty. From these interviews, I also gained a picture of how the master teachers understood their own experiential learning processes, what roles specific learning events played in that process, what factors might have limited their learning in those moments, and how the key aspects of the specific events could be captured in context based learning scenarios. It is worth noting that several of these practitioners expressed interest in using scenarios in their own continuing work with new faculty themselves, and one of the MTs shared some materials with me that reflected this (Evans, personal communication, 2016).

Because of how pressed for time the faculty at JBSA schools are, I kept the interviews concise, completing them each in 35-to-60 minutes. I conducted the interviews in settings of the participant’s choice, one in which they felt comfortable. This resulted in one interview taking place on the sunny porch of a school building, and the remaining four taking place in private administrative offices at the schools. For each interview I prepared five, open-ended questions that sprang from my research questions and earlier interviews. I also prepared one or two follow-up questions for each main question to use if necessary. These follow-up questions were iterative and as I progressed through the
interviews, I noted that I never adhered strictly to the protocol. Instead questions were often developed in situ and reflected the direction and focus of that particular interview.

Because these JBSA schools are spread out geographically, I conducted all interviews at a given school on the same date. All interviews were recorded using the Rev Recorder™ iPhone application and transcribed by the same service. I then sent the transcription of each interview to the interviewee to allow them to review and edit the transcripts for accuracy and increase their sense of coauthoring (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2013). None of the MTs suggested any corrections. I also solicited whether each MT wished to add any information to that collected in the interview. (One teacher did do this and that data was first analyzed separately from the main interview.) I then saved the final, edited versions of the transcripts, which included my corrections, in password protected electronic file and, for data backup, in paper files in locked cabinets in a secure office.

**Scenario workshops.** Once the scenarios had been developed (see p.96), I used them in learning workshops in our new faculty induction process. I used one-to-three scenarios a day at first, including one written response over the course of the five days in the new faculty learning sessions that we conduct annually before the opening of school. Each scenario was read and discussed in approximately 15-to-20 minutes. This allowed me to use seven scenarios in that week, which was a smaller number than the 10-to-15 that I originally thought I might use. I reduced the number because I was cautious about trying to use too many scenarios at once, as there seemed inherent complexity in using numerous scenarios and complexity is a limiting factor on memory (Townsend, 1963).
After a few weeks of not using scenarios due to a lack of time while school was opening, I continued to use scenarios at weekly New Faculty Meetings during the fall term completing eight more scenarios, including a second written response. I also videotaped two sessions towards the end of the term and had transcripts made that I later coded and analyzed.

Over time and with some guidance from the ten steps for scenario development articulated by Schoemaker (1993) and the suggestions for leading case study discussions from Barnes’s *Teaching and the Case Method* (1994), I generated general types of questions for use in the discussion, which took place between each stage of each scenario. These questions sought to focus the participant’s thinking on the key learning experiences articulated by the master teachers for that scenario. In practice these questions became increasingly iterative as NF began to answer some of the more common questions I developed in their initial responses. In this way, I hoped to develop a scenario learning process, which might be more easily replicated.

I led all of the scenario discussion sessions except one. The one I did not lead occurred towards the end of the first term and was recorded, transcribed and later analyzed as above. An experienced colleague and administrator, who was well acquainted with this project and my use of scenarios, led this session. We discussed the use of intra-stage questions ahead of time, and though I provided this session leader with some possible inter-stage questions, I also encouraged the leader to develop questions of her own, which she did. Having another session leader conduct a session facilitated my observations of the sessions. After most scenario learning sessions, I recorded initial impression in short notes.
Written scenario response. Since whether new faculty changed in their approach to scenarios over the course of engaging in the scenario learning process, and therefore possibly changed their approach to their actual practice, I developed a simple written response tool to develop a “before and after” picture of their approaches to the issues presented to discern if any changes could be detected in the whole groups’ responses to scenarios. One of my chief concerns with a measurement tool of this kind was that the new teachers would feel that the evaluation of their ability to assess scenarios would be used to assess their skills as part of their jobs. This would have made their engaging in scenario learning stressful itself and not as envisioned. I decided to address this, in part, by specifically stating, anytime we are doing scenario work, that it was for research and learning and not for evaluation. However, it seemed optimistic to think that the new faculty, who were anxious about making a good impression on their employer, would have internalized such a feeling; thus, I used an anonymous, online “before-and-after” written response format, which was scored using a simple rubric and rubrics are a well-established technique for evaluating writing (Moskal, 2000) although they are not without relevant limitations.

I had each new faculty member complete a written response (see appendix five), of no specified length, using an open-ended prompt in an anonymous survey on the second day of the induction meetings before school opened. By using an anonymous survey format, I sought to develop a collective score for the whole group rather than individual scores for each teacher to ease concerns with evaluation. In these written response surveys, I presented a scenario constructed in the normal way and gave them an
open-ended text box for their responses (see appendix six), which was not dissimilar from the usual discussion format.

I then evaluated each anonymous response using a rubric I developed that was based on a consolidation of the major themes generated in the master teacher interviews, because rubrics are well-established assessment devices that can illustrate the levels of quality achieved in terms of certain specific criteria (Andrade, 2005). This scoring rubric allowed me to generate a simple score for how well that individuals and the group addressed the different aspects of the rubric and by extension the scenario itself. The rubric categories were perspectives, boundaries, plans, resources, culture, and urgency (see appendix six) and these were a consolidation of the 12 mindsets and knowledges categories in the matrix. As I note below, there was some overlap between the M&K categories and these overlaps allowed me to consolidate them for the rubric for the written response. This consolidation was done to make the categories more easily remembered and to simplify scoring.

I averaged the individual scores together for a group score. I did not share any of these scores with the new faculty and told them I would not, so that they would not focus on the metric rather than the overall goal. I also wanted to ease concerns with evaluation, as I was also worried about the potential for adversely affecting each new faculty members’ sense of efficacy with a possibly low score. It seems interesting to note that none of the new faculty ever asked about the scores.

After the new faculty had participated in several learning scenario sessions, had completed the first written response, and had had actual learning experiences with students on their own, I shared the rubric with them, discussing the aspects of the rubric
and why the different areas noted in the rubric were important. This made the rubric more of a teaching rubric and less of a scoring rubric, although it was never explicitly stated to the NF that these elements would be used to evaluate their responses. We then had a scenario discussion using the rubric as a guide. In subsequent scenario discussion sessions, I displayed and occasionally referenced aspects and terminology from the rubric although it was never presented as a “recipe” for how to respond.

The NF then completed a written response that used a different scenario after they had been engaged in scenario learning for two months, and I scored them using the rubric. This comparison of these group scores was intended to show whether the way the group members addressed the scenarios had become more robust, comprehensive and effective. Thus the written response measures were an initial, collective rubric score; a final, collective rubric score; and a question in the survey that was appended to the focus group discussion. This question asked the new faculty directly if they intentionally applied steps, similar to those in the rubric, as a sort of protocol in their responses to actual challenges in their practice. Again, no attempt was made to create a statistically valid measure with this tool, only a rough approximation of progress.

**Memos.** Because memos represent the “most powerful sense-making tool at hand” (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013, p. 95), I wrote short analytic memos, based on a contact summary form, after each interview. Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (1994) suggest the use of such a form, and I completed them immediately each interview. The prompts on the form were linked to my research questions and allowed me to frame my initial analytic impressions around those questions. The contact summary form also prompted me to record new impressions, themes, as well as future interview and focus
group questions. These summary forms were one way I tried to identify the important themes and “emergent patterns” (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013, p. 95) in the interviews. These memos/contact summaries also made it possible for me to begin the analytic process while I was still shaping the course of the study, which, as Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2013) suggest, helped me generate more robust and focused data.

**Focus group.** Towards the end of the fall trimester at Eaglebrook, I conducted a focus group that brought together the entire new faculty. This discussion was intended to allow the novice faculty to contribute their thoughts and opinions about the scenario learning process and effectively coauthor (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2013) a part of the study. As Rubin and Rubin (2012) note, a focus group allows individuals to respond to each other’s points, expanding on and modifying their own and their colleagues’ ideas in the process. Ravitch and Carl (2016) further note that focus groups allow participants to “co-generate” (p.168) ideas about common experiences. Since I was also looking for feedback about the overall induction process at school as part of my normal process as the leader of this program, I also included questions on issues relative to that process. To some degree this was also driven by a desire to minimize the amount of time new faculty were devoting to giving feedback during a very busy time of year.

For the same reason, I also used a short supplemental survey, described below, to complement the focus group questions. Together these two elements, the focus group and the survey, helped create richer data on how the novice faculty felt about the experience of working with the scenarios. As I led the focus group and because of my supervisory role in relation to the new faculty, I was worried the NF might be inclined to tell me what
they felt I wanted to hear, I felt the survey, with its greater anonymity and confidentiality might lead to more honest responses. I did this for, as Ravitch and Carl (2016) note, a combination of supervisors and teachers can create tension and possibly undermine the accuracy of the data.

To some degree, as Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2013) suggest, I used ideas garnered from my interviews with the master teachers as the basis for focus group questions. I prepared semi-structured questions (see appendix one) for the group, mainly on themes aligned with my research questions, so as to help generate data germane to the study, while still allowing the novice teachers to develop thoughts that are important to them (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2013). As noted earlier, because time was in short supply and I had noted that the new faculty seemed fatigued because of end-of-term responsibilities, I limited the focus group to an approximately half-hour meeting. As with the master teacher interviews, I recorded the focus group using the Rev Recorder iPhone™ application and had it transcribed by the same service. I then reviewed and edited the transcript for accuracy. Finally, I coded and then recoded, as codes evolved, these transcripts using Atlas.ti™ software.

Survey. As noted above, in recognition of the fact that the new faculty were tired and under stress at the term’s end, to complement the focus group data in a way that allowed for greater anonymity and also because focus groups can sometimes “inhibit individual articulation” (Stycos, 1981, p.451), I administered a 19 question online survey (see appendix eight). This survey had both closed and open-ended questions that attempted to get simple answers to some questions, such as whether they thought the scenario learning approach was helpful to them, and also allowed them to develop richer,
more personal answers if they wished. Again for reasons of professional expedience, as
with the focus group, some questions on the survey were designed to garner more general
feedback on the school’s induction process. As noted earlier, this survey was not
designed so as to generate statistically valid data but rather as a more convenient and
anonymous extension of the focus group discussion, which might help develop more rich
and diverse data about the New Faculty opinions (Jansen, 2010). Therefore it was used a
qualitative research tool rather than a quantitative one. The entire new faculty cohort
responded to the survey, and ultimately, this tool provided me with data points to use for
some triangulation with their responses in the focus group.

**Self-efficacy scale.** The New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE) as developed
and validated by Chen, Gully and Eden (2001) was administered to the novice faculty
when they first began work at Eaglebrook and before they participated in any learning
events that were part of their induction at school (see appendix three). They also
completed the same scale at the end of the first term when they had worked with 16
different scenarios in various meetings. The NGSE is scored by adding together the total
score for each answer to the eight questions posed with an answer of one equaling
“strongly disagree” and an answer of five equaling “strongly agree.” This generates a
total score range of from 8 to 45, with 8 representing generally low self-efficacy and 45
representing generally high self-efficacy. The NGSE provided me with a tool to assess,
roughly, the individual self-efficacy feelings of the novice faculty participating in the
study so as to have some idea whether they arrived at school with strong feelings of self-
efficacy. Also, by giving them the scale again at the end of the first term, I created a
rough measure of whether there had been any change. Because the scale has been tested
previously and had a high degree of predicative validity (Chen, Gully and Eden, 2001), it provided somewhat useful data on the change in their self-efficacy feelings, although there was no intention to measure novice faculty against statistical norms. I chose to use a general self-efficacy scale rather than a teaching specific scale, because so much of what constitutes the new faculty’s work at school occurs outside the classroom and the teaching self-efficacy scales thus seemed too narrow in scope. I constructed comparison charts for the initial and post first term results (see table 3) but no attempt was made to correlate these scores with any existing data on self-efficacy because I was only interested in relative levels of self-efficacy.

**Data Analysis**

*Memos.* As noted before, the analytic process began after each MT interview with my completing a contact summary form/memo. These notes helped me to not only generate questions I used in later interviews, but it allowed me to initially identify issues that I ultimately addressed in my results. I also wrote a short memo at the end of data collection, another during the period when I was coding the master teacher data and developing the key themes in them, and a third while coding the NF data. These memos allowed me to initially see connections between the different elements in the study and helped give shape to later aspects of the study.

**Member checks.** After the transcription of each MT interview was completed, I reviewed the transcript, comparing it to the audio version, for accuracy and then emailed it to the interviewee. I asked each MT whether the transcript seemed accurate to them or if he or she felt that something was not accurately recorded. None of the MT suggested any changes to the transcripts. I also solicited any additional information that the
interviewee felt was pertinent but was not captured in the interview. Only one MT did provide any additional comment and these comments were largely about how his school had used a process similar to scenario learning in their new faculty induction process. I coded and analyzed this data separately from the interviews and it provided some useful triangulation for the ideas I developed from analyzing the MT interviews.

Coding and matrix. After the transcription and member checks of each interview were completed, I began an initial, descriptive coding (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013) using the open coding technique (Maxwell, 2013). By doing some initial coding while the study was still in process, I had the opportunity to iterate some questions for later interviews that better focused on the significant themes that seemed to be developing. The themes developed in this coding also guided the construction of the scenario matrix (see appendix 3) that was an important guide for planning scenario lessons and for constructing scenarios I developed after I had already begun using them with the NF. I did have to reread/recode some of the interviews I coded first, looking for instances of specific themes or codes I developed later in the process.

Once the data had been coded, I made cross–case comparisons (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013) among the interview data to illuminate any significant areas of congruence in the master teachers’ views of what types of experiences were most important in their learning. These themes also help me generate questions for the new faculty scenario discussions focus group to see if the novice faculty were able to discern similar themes in these events as the master teachers did. I followed a similar coding process with the focus group data and supplemental survey, where the matrix categories became the basis for my codes.
After I completed most of the coding of the initial interviews, I composed a matrix to display the categories and scenarios that were largely based on the key learning experiences that the master teachers identified (see appendix two). I then emailed this matrix to each master teacher, asking them if they felt that the categories and examples seemed appropriate to use as a means for developing lessons around the learning scenarios. I also asked them if they might have suggestions for either categories or examples to add to the list. None of the master teachers suggested any changes. By providing the master teachers the opportunity to “weigh-in” on my initial analyses, I hoped they might feel more invested in the research process, and several expressed interest in reading the results.

For the written responses, I used scenarios I originally developed for use in a discussion format. The two different scenarios I used for the initial and final written responses were divided, as the discussion scenarios were, into three stages that were presented as separate pages of a survey. The NF had to complete one stage’s response before they moved onto the next. I then sent this anonymous survey to the new faculty asking that they complete it within a week. The new faculty were free to write as much or as little as they chose for each stage. All new faculty did so, and all except one did within two days. I analyzed the responses using a rubric, a well-established technique for evaluating writing (Andrade, 2005). To expedite analysis and to facilitate its use of as a teaching rubric (Moskal, 2000), I created this analytic tool by consolidating the analytic categories in the matrix, the mindsets and knowledges, from sixteen separate categories into six composite ones. Thus the M&K categories essentially became the codes for the written responses.
**Scenario writing.** Since writing scenarios required representing how the master teachers understood the elements their key learning experiences, I viewed the writing of the scenarios as an extension of the analysis of those interviews. Using themes developed in the coding and the matrix I developed, I initially followed a multi-step process for scenario development that built off of the one articulated by Schoemaker (1993) for use in scenario planning exercises in business. Key aspects of this development were: articulating time frames for the scenarios, imagining the scope of the decisions envisioned, identifying the key stakeholders involved, specifying the relevant antecedent events, and reviewing any uncertainties that were inherent in the event and should be present in the scenario based on it (Schoemaker, p.11).

Scenario development was also guided by thoughts generated by Barnes, Christensen and Hansen (1975) for the development of cases for use in the case study method for educating pre-service teachers. In developing their approach to building cases, they emphasize creating cases that “lead a character to a central decision point” but then also progress to illustrate what responses the initial actions triggered. This suggested developing scenarios that started with a central problem but were further complicated as new information was introduced. Barnes, Christensen and Hansen also suggest that the final phase of the case feature “lessoned learned” (p.292), but as the point of the learning scenarios, as theorized here, was to simulate a reality which was not predetermined, this final step was not included. Using the process I developed, I wrote 22 scenarios based on either the specific or general experiences (see p.76) recalled by master teachers that represented the themes developed in the analysis of the interview data.
Using the matrix I developed with its areas, people and mindsets and knowledges, I wrote approximately 20 initial scenarios making sure that all categories were addressed in at least one scenario where possible each category. These scenarios were based on specific or general experiences of the master teachers but the details of the experiences were converted to context specific details for my own school, where the scenarios would actually be used. This was intended to increase their relevance to the novice faculty by better situating them in the NF’s own environment (Putnam & Borko, 2000). Each scenario had from three-to-five stages, in between each of which the novice faculty discussed their thoughts before they saw the next evolution of the scenario event. I hoped this would allow for the important aspects of discussion and socially created knowledge between each stage (Nelson, 2007) and also allowed the NF to engage in hypothetical planning or abstract conceptualization (Kolb & Kolb, 2005), another key aspect of the experiential learning process. This also allowed them to both develop the theorized four-stage approach to future experiential learning (Kolb & Kolb 2005) and adopt a more reflective, rational approach (Kahneman, 2013) to future events. Prior to their use, the written scenarios were shared with experienced colleagues at my school, interested master teachers whom I interview, and fellow doctoral students for their input. This input was meant to avoid the my skewing the scenarios developed towards issues that I think are important as opposed to those that a more diverse group of experienced educators felt were significant.
Issues of Validity

Because the general topic of new faculty learning is one that I have been working with for many years in my own school, I needed to take steps to insure that my own established views on the subject did not carry too much weight. This led me to create multiple means to enhance the validity of this study, including the use of rich data, triangulation, and member checks. Further, my own long-term involvement and attention to this issue at my own school, while in some ways a potential liability, also gave me a valuable perspective in regards to the areas with which novice faculty have traditionally had more success or difficulty in the past.

Rich data. I tried to create rich data through data collection that utilized a variety of techniques to help generate validity. Maxwell (2013) notes that this is one of the stronger ways to develop this. My use of semi-structured interviews, member checks, “co-authoring”, memos, written responses, a focus group and supplementary survey, and the self-efficacy scale allowed me to draw from several data streams that helped me to cross reference my findings and facilitated the creation of greater depth and breadth in my analysis.

Triangulation. While some of the individual sources of data were not conclusive in and of themselves, because I deliberately used several sources of data, by examining them together I was able to triangulate my findings (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013) to enhance the strength of my conclusions. This was the specific intention of the written responses, the focus group’s supplementary survey, and the self-efficacy scale. Individually these were not particularly strong measures but together they helped reinforced my primary sources of data, namely the master teacher interviews and scenario
discussion transcripts. Because these last two data sources both featured input from multiple individuals, I was also able to compare responses from different master teachers and new faculty to determine if certain respondent’s views were outliers from the others who were interviewed.

**Member checks.** To address issues of researcher bias, I shared each master teacher’s interview transcript with him or her to have them check it for accuracy. Also, to improve the chances that my analyses were not significantly skewed by my viewpoints, I shared my *Mindset and Knowledge* matrix and an explanation of how I developed it with the MT. My intention with these checks was to allow the master teachers to feel that they were “co-authoring” (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2013, p.38) the data and analysis. This was important because the scenarios needed to broadly reflect the concerns and experiences of a wide range of faculty as the new faculty learning from them might also be similarly broad in terms of their backgrounds, interests and skills. Further, by having the master teachers feel a sense of ownership of the data and analysis I hoped to increase the chances that they would try to use similar approaches, should they prove potentially effective, in their own schools.

**Long-term involvement.** Becker and Geer (1957) claim that long-term researcher involvement helps generate more complete data. Clearly, while my long service at a boys JBSA school probably led to some fundamental biases on my part, it was also the source of a great deal of knowledge about the common experiences, policies, practices and cultures at such schools. This, I believe, enhanced my ability to see connections between themes, ideas, and possibilities more quickly, and develop productive impromptu questions in my interviews and the scenario discussions.
Researcher’s Role

In comparison to the typical experiential learning process of many novice independent boarding school teachers that I described, my own experience in learning how to be a teacher in this context was somewhat unique. Although I attended an independent, boarding high school, while in college, I earned certification to teach English at the secondary level in public schools. Thus, I took a traditional teacher preparation course load, with classes in teaching theory and practice that included a student teaching experience. However, when I graduated college, I decided that I was better suited to independent school teaching, because I found the guidelines and curriculum in my public school experience to be intellectually limiting. My first job in teaching was at a boarding school for learning disabled students that had students in grades four-through-twelve. I worked there for a year-and-a-half, and while doing so, I took two classes towards a masters degree in special education at a state college. I was not particularly happy at this school and ultimately found a job at Eaglebrook School, a “traditional” boarding school for boys in grades six-through-nine.

I began as an English teacher, three-sport coach, and dormitory parent/advisor. There was a very limited new faculty induction program there at that time, which went little beyond the school providing us with a New Faculty Handbook, a document which contained rather limited explanations and information about some school routines and a good deal of reference material about the school (phone numbers, organizational charts, school schedules, and calendars). Nonetheless, I found some passion for the work and benefitted from astute mentoring, particularly from my first housemaster and department chair. After two years working at the school, I became a housemaster myself, a position
that I held for seven years. While a housemaster, I helped develop a dorm faculty
evaluation system—there had been no formal program previously—that was ultimately
used in all the dorms and became the basic framework of the program that is used today.

Ten years ago, I was named assistant headmaster, which made me the overall
supervisor for the entire faculty and one of the immediate supervisors for both the
department chairs and housemasters. New faculty induction was also part of my current
position’s portfolio, and early on I tried to expand it, developing what is now a five-day
new faculty training program in the summer, weekly New Faculty Meetings during the
school year, and a semi-formalized mentoring program. Additionally, I developed a
school-wide new faculty review system whose centerpiece was a team review meeting for
each new faculty member. These teams of four include the new faculty members’
department chair, housemaster, a senior administrator as well as the new faculty member.
This team review program has now expanded to include most of the faculty at school.
Additionally, I lead most of the weekly New Faculty Meetings and meet regularly with
the housemasters and department chairs, often discussing the learning and development
of the new faculty.

I have now taught at Eaglebrook for 30 years, taking on a variety of roles as a
teacher and administrator during that time, including being an English, writing support,
ethics, and SSAT preparation teacher, housemaster, English department chair, risk
management director, and academic director for the summer program. I therefore have
experienced a wide variety of the roles available at school. It is also worth noting that I
have been a classroom teacher, most commonly of a ninth grade honors-level English
class, for that entire period. Further, I have also coached sports, particularly football and
competitive downhill skiing, for 28 years. In sum, I have been immersed in this work and lifestyle for most of my adult life.

This work and teaching history gave me a unique perspective on learning how to work in a boarding school environment. I had much of the fundamental training in teaching practice that many of my colleagues did not, yet at the same time, I had— and valued— many of the same experiential learning opportunities that were the primary education in the craft of teaching for my colleagues. While my pre-service experience in college was certainly valuable, I feel much of what truly helped me become a competent, seasoned teacher was learned through experience, occasionally unpleasant and challenging experience. Thus, while I feel that there is valuable information and theory that can be gained through classroom learning for teachers, I feel strongly that until and unless one applies this learning in a real environment, it is of limited value.

My educational and career backgrounds strongly inform my views on the subject at the heart of this study. Further this background necessitated that I be sensitive to the strong possibility of researcher bias. Therefore, I took steps to address the issue of reactivity, because there is obviously some reason to feel that the new faculty in my school might be inclined to respond positively to the use of scenarios as a way to please me, their supervisor. Hence, I took the aforementioned steps to try to address these issues of bias and reactivity with the overall goal of increasing the study’s validity.
Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

This chapter discusses the data gathered from the master teacher interviews, the development of the scenarios, and the use of the scenarios with new faculty and the data is discussed according to the phase in which they were gathered. These results help provide an answer to aspects of the primary research question of whether or not written, school context-based learning scenarios, based on the actual learning experiences of master teachers, provide effective tools for increasing new and novice faculty’s ability to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school.

The first of these larger sections examines the information garnered from the master teachers. This section is subdivided into two subsections. The first examines some general impressions and themes that I developed from the MT interviews, and the second presents a more specific analysis of the particular major themes from these interviews that I sought to incorporate into the scenarios developed. The data in this section provides evidence to help answer the first research sub-question: What do master teachers in boarding middle schools identify as the most important learning experiences in their development as teachers, advisers and coaches? This data was also used to establish what seemed the key lessons about teaching in a boarding middle school that the master teachers had learned from the experiences they narrated and that I sought to represent in the learning scenarios. These lessons, what I termed the mindsets and knowledges (M&K), became, in effect, the learning objectives for the individual scenarios. These
M&K also provided an organizing and classification tool for the scenarios that were developed (see appendix two).

The next major section of this chapter discusses the results that emerged from the my experiences in converting the information, specifically the key experiences, derived from the Master Teacher interviews into a scenario format for use with the new and novice faculty. This section has two subsections addressing, first, the process of constructing the scenarios, and then, the planning enacted for their use. This second major chapter section addresses the second research sub question: What procedural steps are needed to develop these experiences of master teachers into individual school context-based scenarios that are designed to promote reflection and the construction of possible responses within a cooperative context?

The final major chapter section discusses the actual use of the scenarios with the new faculty. In the first subsection of this part, I discuss the larger induction process in which the scenario learning was embedded. The second subsection presents, first, the results generated by the different elements used to assess the new faculty’s (NF’s) use of the scenarios: the self efficacy scale, the written responses, the scenario discussions in general, and the focus group and supplementary survey. The second subsection then examines in more detail whether the themes generated in the analysis of master teachers interviews, the M&K, were evident in the new faculty’s discussions of the scenarios, whether in the actual discussion or their written responses. These subsections present data that help to answer the third, fourth and fifth sub-questions:

3. Does participating in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help new and novice faculty increase their feelings of self-
efficacy? If so, in what ways did this increased self-efficacy help them when they faced experiential challenges after participating in the scenario learning sessions?

4. In what ways does participation in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help new and novice faculty develop general approaches or guiding principles that they then feel they can use to more effectively address challenging situations in the future?

5. To what extent do new and novice faculty responses to scenarios become more sophisticated and complete after they have participated in scenario learning sessions?

A final section reviews and attempts to cohere and interweave the data from all of the preceding sections to help more effectively target it on an answer to the overall research question of: In what ways do written, school context-based learning scenarios, based on the actual learning experiences of master teachers, provide effective tools for increasing new and novice faculty’s ability to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school?

Master Teacher Interviews

General impressions and themes. The interviews with the master teachers ranged in length from 35-to-56 minutes, averaging 45 minutes, and in general the conversations were relaxed with the participants seeming happy to participate, even expressing interest in the results of the study. While the main focus of the interviews was to have the master teachers develop specific narratives about their key learning experiences, the interviews also touched on general topics related to the subject of the study such as teaching philosophy, pedagogical approaches, and common experiences of
teachers in the junior boarding school context. None of the master teachers ever questioned why I would be talking with them on this topic; there seemed little hesitance and even a significant amount of enjoyment in doing so, although at least one teacher, Louise Matthews, was frequently concerned that she was not addressing my questions and was “just talking.” This relaxed, conversational quality was likely influenced by the fact that the MT seemed to perceive me as a colleague who was engaged in the same endeavor as they, and it was not uncommon in the discussions for me to feel it was appropriate to share some of his own similar experiences with the interviewees to enhance this collegiality. Possibly counterbalancing this apparent collegiality somewhat were the intangible effects of articles in the “Spotlight” section of the Boston Globe (2016) that were published around the time of this study. These articles, which were trying document cases of sexual abuse at boarding schools over the past twenty years, may have had a chilling effect on how candid the teachers were. In fact one potential interviewee declined to participate when asked to sign the consent form, saying in an email that he did not feel comfortable doing so. It seems at least possible that the larger context created by the articles, which my anecdotal observations indicated were much talked about in boarding schools, may have influenced this decision. I should also note, relative to the general tenor of the interviews, that the criteria that established who the interviewees would be and the demographic similarities among them beyond these basic criteria, which are noted below, all applied to me as well. Thus, the interviews often seemed to be conversations between colleagues engaged in a similar endeavor rather than a question and answer sessions with an outsider seeking information.
One of the most conspicuous results that emerged from the MT interviews was the significant amount of commonality they revealed in regards to a number of issues germane to this study. As elaborated on below, particularly in the explanation of the development of the scenario classification matrix, the six master teachers, two each from three different JBSA schools, discussed similar experiences from their early careers that helped them learn about their roles as teachers in the context of a junior boarding school. The data indicates that their experiences were often very similar although these similarities may also be related to the commonalities in their backgrounds. Not only did all the MTs meet the criteria established for the study, but all, except Louise, shared the characteristic of having more than 15 years of experience at their school. The average for all six was 16.5 (with a range of 6-to-27 years); they were all white; they were all were married and had children that they had either raised or were raising while living at these schools. They all had attended an independent school (two had attended one of the junior boarding schools used as sites for the study), and they all had served in some kind of administrative role at their schools, some at the time of the study and others previously. Thus, their perspectives were likely grounded not only in their common learning experiences but also in their common backgrounds prior to these experiences.

Backgrounds aside there, nonetheless, seemed a good deal of similarity in the experiences they remembered from their formative years as teachers. Not only did the events they narrated seem to contain the common mindsets and knowledges I discuss below but they also seemed to possess more general characteristics that were similar. The specific events they narrated tended to be dramatic, humorous, or unexpected ones, and these qualities may account for some of why these particular events lodged in their
memories, rather than their remembering them only because they were important learning experiences. Another similarity was that when the master teachers were trying to illustrate a general point about a “lesson” they learned about teaching, they were not always able to link it to a specific event in their past, and instead, they all, at some point, constructed short vignettes which seemed designed to illustrate “typical” experiences. Some of these general qualities of the MTs’ narrations are ones that presented issues for developing scenarios for use with the new faculty and are discussed below and in chapter five.

While it is not a particularly significant focus of this study, a few words about some differences between the events narrated by male and female teachers seems appropriate here. While the male teachers did not ever really specify how their gender identity affected their practice, it was common for the female teachers to do so. Given that the study examined two all boy’s schools and one that had previously— but fairly recently— been all boys (within the work experience of one of the MT), this does not seems surprising. The female master teachers did not necessarily cite sexism in the behavior of either students or colleagues, but they all noted that their gender identity did seem to influence how they were perceived in certain situations and what their, often unstated, roles were at their schools. For example Louise Matthews noted that, “There are some boys that don't respect me just because I am a woman.” Yet, the more common observation, made by all three of the female master teachers, was that the both boys at the schools and even some of their colleagues viewed their role at the school as being, in part, that of a “mother” to the students.
Another area of diversity or difference in experiences that was not captured in the master teacher interviews, which may represent a significant issue in terms of the use of such reality-based scenarios, is that of different racial or ethic perspectives. All of the master teachers were white and had similar academic histories. Since I used the administration at the schools as a way to identify likely prospects for interviews, this was somewhat out of my control. However, it is also true that faculty of color at such schools often represent very small portion of the faculty. For example, at my own school at the time of the study, of a faculty of 70, there were two African Americans, three teachers from Asian countries or of Asian ancestry, and three faculty members from South American countries. Of the faculty from nontraditional backgrounds at my school, none would have met all the criteria set out by the study to be identified as a master teacher. This suggests that the categories for selecting the teachers may themselves have been a limiting factor in the range of experiences and lessons that were developed. This also suggests that more investigation and research may be needed in order to effectively create learning scenarios that are more focused on issues of diversity and difference.

**Scenario matrix.** In trying to organize the data into some workable format for both identifying what “lessons” that were being conveyed by the scenarios and then for establishing a basis for choosing which scenario to use at which time, I developed a matrix (see appendix three) which included a number of different categories, which I also ultimately used as codes, in order to help understand and classify the material conveyed by the master teachers.

Since this study sought to base the scenarios developed for use with new faculty on the actual experiences of master teachers, I created the first of these categories by
identifying the parts of the interviews where the MT portrayed a distinctive event, a specific lived experience that could be used as the basis for a scenario. I discovered that a single 35-to-50 minute interview tended to yield three- to-five specific experiences, and the recounting of the details of these events were often relatively short. These short, specific narratives were identified as Specific Experiences (SE). However, since these experiences were often similar, it seemed I might not have enough material to develop a sufficient number of scenarios for use with the NF. However I noted early on that every master teacher I interviewed also augmented these specific lived and remembered events with narratives in which the MT generated stories of a general or exemplary nature, when they could not remember a specific event to elucidate the idea or lesson they wished to illustrate. These, usually short and sparsely detailed, imagined interactions that the MTs remembered in some way as typical, I classified as a General Experiences (GE).

It is worth noting here that the MT data contained many remarks that, while not explicitly connected to a Specific or General Experience, nonetheless indicated what the MT believed was important for NF to know or understand. These remarks included discussions of the master teachers’ philosophies about teaching at a boarding school, their remarks about significant college or graduate courses they took, or even pithy sayings from beloved mentors. This, too, was a rich data source, and it often helped elucidate the key details in a variety of scenarios. Therefore, my analysis drew on data from all three of these categories: Specific Experiences, General Experiences, and related discussions, in its analysis of the key issues that emerged from the interviews.

Specific experiences. When examining the Specific Experiences that the Master Teachers remembered and the close relationships of these narrated scenes to themes or
ideas in their more general remarks about teaching in other aspects of the interview, it seemed that the MTs clearly remembered specific events that highlighted certain lessons that they had gained from them. These I categorized as Specific Experiences, which I defined as scenes narrated by the master teachers about a particular experience they had in which they could identify specific details such as names, places, and times. Specific events remembered were often characterized by their being dramatic or unusual, such as rough housing that became a fight (Daniel Evans), having students missing from the dorm for an extended period (Louise Matthews), having an interaction with a colleagues that led to her feeling “betrayed” (Joanne Klinger), or when a squirt gun leaked onto the crotch of a boy’s pants (Sue Thomas). The MT seemed to find the incidents both inherently memorable from an emotional perspective, but they also attached a lesson or reflection to that memory. For example, Steve Taylor discussed the specifics around witnessing an injury to a student and noted that first aid and safety were areas that, when he was a new teacher, he felt he was “not doing well; that I could really learn from. Now, I can be that person for the kid who's hurt or injured.” Sue Thomas, in discussing what she saw as a humorous event involving a student whose squirt gun leaked onto the crotch of his pants, articulated that the incident exemplified a particular quality of “middle school boys.” The emotional valence of these events did present certain issues for the creation of teaching scenarios, as occasionally, the reflections could have a rueful association to them, although they were not usually perceived this way when they were being lived. For example, in discussing an event where he had taken actions that he regretted, Steve Taylor said, “I wish I could take that one back.” This suggested that some care should be taking when writing the scenarios so as to not foreshadow the
progression of the scenario through the scenario’s tone. By the end of the study, I presented ten scenarios to the new faculty that were based on Specific Experiences of the master teachers. I should mention, too, that I was not trying to manage the ratio of SEs to GEs when choosing which scenarios to present to the new faculty.

**General experiences.** While it was certainly clear that the MTs felt that the Specific Experiences they related carried important lessons they had learned from these memorable and unique events, they also all felt it relevant to convey the lessons that they acquired from many routine or mundane events, events that often seemed to be ones that were more frequently repeated, that were also significant. Thus, in addition to very distinct, specific events that the MT related, all the master teachers also chose to narrate, at some point, other more “generalized” scenes that they viewed as being typical or emblematic. These I categorized as General Experiences: short narratives where the master teacher could not remember a specific event to elucidate the idea they wished to examine but for which they could generate narratives of a general nature. In effect, they narrated short, imagined interactions, often involving typical situations that were meant to represent a general class of actual experiences that the teacher had had but which they could not remember one specific incident that embodied it. For example, Sue Thomas discussed how she responded to late assignments, a regular occurrence for most teachers. She narrated the incident as a typical one and included typical dialogue for the scene: "Look, if you're late with your assignment, you get points off." She drew from this GE the lesson that “There's a lot of this being very straightforward, I think that's something across all areas of boarding school life that is very important with students.” Another illustrative example is that Ted Underwood discussed repeated instances of his being able
to “confide in and also socialize with” an experienced mentor on a regular basis. In moving to creating teaching scenarios I used these General Experiences as a basis as well. I should also note that, because I met the master teacher criteria and was familiar with the context of the school and the new faculty where they were to be used, I also occasionally used my own General Experiences as the source for some of these scenarios. By the end of the study, I presented seven scenarios to the NF that were based on the General Experiences of MT, including my own.

**Additional information used in developing the matrix.** There were a number of notable topics that emerged from other aspects of the data but were not captured in either Specific or General Experiences. Part of this is probably related to the fact that these interviews were more than just the master teachers narrating stories. Because these master teacher—and me as well—were involved in the same sort of work at different schools and shared similar backgrounds and goals, the interviews often developed into a “give and take” between colleagues. Thus, the interviews touched on a variety of issues of common interest. Sometimes the remarks made in these statements unconnected to GEs or SEs in the interviews seemed to specifically comment on an issue highlighted in a Specific or General Experience, and at other times, such comments might elucidate another principal that the MT felt was important to his or her work in a junior boarding school setting. For example, Daniel Evans narrated an experience that was focused on classroom teaching and noted that it illustrated the importance of being organized and prepared. Later, Daniel amplified this, again noting the importance of being prepared, but he also said that listening to more experienced colleagues was a lesson in this scenario as well. Therefore, it appeared that while the individual details of remembrances might be
different and inherent to one context, they seemed to present similar reflections or observations on common considerations that they gained through experiencing the same general thing. While there were certainly differences of emphasis and nuance, on the main areas that addressed my research questions, there seemed a good deal of commonality and this information also informed the categories of the matrix.

*Analytic matrix categories.* After coding the six interviews, the lessons, for want of a better term, that many of the scenarios and general discussions conveyed seemed to be classifiable according to the following categories.

*Mindsets and knowledges:* When relating either *Specific* or *General Experiences* or discussing how they learned how to do their work as faculty in junior boarding schools effectively, all of the MTs sought to convey principles about how they went about that work. These could be considered the “lessons” conveyed by *Specific* or *General Experiences.* For example, the lesson in a SE or GE could represent learning about an attitude or mindset that a faculty member at such a school needed to enact in many situations in order to be successful. A remark by Ted Underwood exemplified this, when he discussed the fact that a teacher needed to consider the “different perspectives” when involved in difficult situations. These I construed as *Mindsets.* Additionally, the “lessons” in the experiences sometimes presented as something that a new faculty member needed to learn or know, a set of *Knowledges,* that pertained to a certain aspect of work at such schools. A comment from Joanne Klinger exemplified this when she noted that to work effectively with middle school students you needed to remember that they generally have “short attention spans.”
The most common mindsets and knowledges developed in the interviews are discussed below, but I should note that it is not the point of this research to establish that these are the only M&K that one needs to have to work as a teacher in such schools. Instead, I am seeking to establish that these lessons were suggested by this group of MT and that such lessons can be targeted by learning scenarios for use with new and novice faculty in a deliberate way that, in essence, creates an objective for what might be learned by the teachers who participate in the scenario discussion. In the following examination of the M&K and their origins in the MTs’ interviews, I include some discussion of how the MTs’ seemed to collectively view how a given M&K helped them. The final list of 12 specific M&K generated by these means was:

1. Perspective taking
2. Establishing boundaries
3. Balancing demands and being flexible
4. Using the team approach
5. Understanding middle school students
6. Administering consequences
7. Self-management
8. Organizing and planning
9. Building relationships
10. Role modeling
11. Working with English language learners (ELL’s)
12. Learning school culture
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Perspective taking. I defined the category of perspective taking as a mindset that focused on seeing the importance of understanding the perspectives and backgrounds that individuals might have that could shape their attitudes and actions within a given situation. The MT frequently cited that understanding why an individual, whether a student, parent or colleague, viewed a certain situation the way they did was an important step towards understanding and responding to a situation well. For example Daniel Evans, when discussing his approach to teaching in general, noted that it was important to have conversations with students and “draw out what a student's feeling.” Later, in a similar vein, Daniel, when talking about working with administrators, said that “understanding why decisions are made” and how these were influenced by factors that a young teacher might not know about such as “financial” concerns and “human resource(s)” was a very important learning moment for him in becoming an effective teacher at his school. Ted Underwood noted how important it was for him to learn how to “make connections to the student's lives” and understand “how this (a certain situation he was describing) must feel as a student,” which seems to be essentially the same as understanding their perspective. Louise Matthews seemed to be expressing a similar feeling when she stated that, in order to teach, she needed to learn “how to make something more appealing for them (the students).” Clearly, understanding how to make learning enjoyable for a student is predicated upon understanding what they enjoy, in effect, their perspective. It is worth noting that there is clearly an overlap between this mindset and the knowledge represented by understanding middle school students. By way of delineation, it would seem that understanding a perspective is a mindset that affects how one approaches interactions with individuals, while understanding middle
school students is a knowledge of the developmental and social characteristics of middle school students as a category. This overlap seems visible in Sue Thomas’s statement that “you know, every kid is different” as it seems to imply both the need to approach students as individuals, while at the same time understanding the qualities these students generally possess as a category. Finally, in discussing working with parents, Steve Taylor noted that he felt one of the reasons he was successful was that he “understands” them. He said this was true, in part, because he was “a parent,” and this allowed him to access the parent’s perspective better. It is worth noting that this idea of being a parent being helpful or instrumental in this regard was something I noted in a pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015), I completed previously, and it was also echoed by several of the MTs in this study as well. This mindset of perspective taking was one of the more common M&K present in the interviews, and I identified it as a significant element 21 times in the six interviews (see table two).

Establishing boundaries. I defined the category of establishing boundaries as both a mindset and knowledge that focuses on establishing clear social and emotional boundaries with others, most particularly, with students. I coded remarks as being related to this M&K 23 times in the six master teacher interviews. It is both a mindset and knowledge because a teacher must both bear in mind the need to establish boundaries in many interactions but also know what the boundaries are. A frequently cited example of this (Steve Taylor and Sue Thomas noted it explicitly) being that, while it is very important for teachers to be friendly with students, it is more important for NF to understand and convey that faculty and students cannot be actual friends, because of their different roles. Thus, the main focus in this M&K was on interactions with students. For
example Sue Thomas noted that most new faculty are younger teachers who are “really older brothers in age” in relation to the students, and this means they have difficulty coming to “understand the parental role” of being a teacher. Steve Taylor discussed the complexity inherent in this idea when he said:

You need to have big brother types to help the boys, and yet still be able to tow the line, and maintain the rules, the mores of the community. That's something that some people can do very naturally. I'd like to think I struck a nice balance, but there's definitely a tension, and I've seen since I went through it people err on the side of being too friendly with the boy.

Joanne Klinger explicitly used the term “boundaries” before discussing students who try to be over-friendly with a teacher in a way that might be unprofessional and potentially dangerous for the adult: “There are a couple of kids who just are naturally, you know, want to be in your space.” Ted Underwood said, when discussing missteps with one of his first classes, that he “hadn't been able to necessarily have the appropriate relationships with the students as a teacher.” Similar remarks, in fact, occurred in all the interviews so this was clearly a consideration that these MT felt was developed by their early experiences. I should note, too, that while the main focus of this M&K was on boundaries with students, as several master teachers noted, proper social and emotional boundaries also have to be established with parents and colleagues.

Being flexible and balancing demands. This mindset and knowledge is focused on the importance of a faculty member being able to adjust their expectations within a given situation relative to other factors. This implies an ongoing enactment of an attitude as well as a knowledge of what things are important. This concept seems closely related to learning how to balance what are sometimes characterized as conflicting or competing demands that are made on a teacher. These words, “flexibility” and “balance,” came up
frequently when the MTs’ were discussing their early learning. Given that faculty are asked to act in many different roles often simultaneously, this is not surprising. Ted Underwood connected this to his belief that new faculty often were challenged by “seeing the big picture,” and that they needed to gain an “understanding that it's not always going to be cut and dried, simple.” Daniel Evans stated that “you want that balance, I think, in a faculty that's important,” when discussing how a young teacher needed to balance a role of being both friendly with students and being their teacher. Steve Taylor said, speaking on the same topic, that young teachers need to “balance that: The need of the community to have big brother types to help the boys, and yet still be able to tow the line, and maintain the rules, the mores of the community.” Sue Thomas used the term “flexible” to describe a similar learning event she experienced when she said what she learned was to “understand how to be flexible within my boundaries.” Similar remarks appear in all the other MTs’ interviews as well— I coded remarks as being related to this M&K 19 times in the six master teacher interviews— thus it seemed flexibility was an important mindset that the MTs’ felt that new faculty needed to acquire.

Using the team approach. This mindset was focused on the importance of understanding how to use other faculty, administrators, parents or, in some cases, even students to help create effective responses to challenges. All of the MTs talked of how other faculty helped them to both respond to and learn from specific situations. This drawing upon others as a resource for handling situations and learning seemed characterized by the phrase “using the team approach,” a phrase that is frequently used by faculty and administrators at Eaglebrook. Ted Underwood stated this explicitly saying that the goal is to feel “like you're working as a team.” Daniel Evans even seemed to cite
this as one of the things that made the “lifestyle” of a boarding school teacher a good one, saying “being able to expedite that process (handling a challenge) for a co-worker to me is great leadership and I think it's great.” While getting help from faculty was frequently cited as significant, it was also noted that being able to watch other teachers, other member of the team, perform their job helped the MT learn. Louise Matthews said that, because she had not played a sport she was asked to coach, a relatively common experience in such schools, as she was watching a co-coach, she “was almost learning with them (the students).” Thus, this mindset that you are working as part of a team, not on your own, is both important and multi-faceted. This M&K also encompasses the MTs’ talking of being mentored and then mentoring, accepting help from other and also giving it, as well as learning from others and then teaching others. I coded remarks as being related to this mindset 18 times in the six master teacher interviews.

Understanding middle school students. I defined this knowledge as one of understanding the common developmental qualities and behaviors of middle school students and particularly those that seem most typical (or stereotypical) of the age group. Knowledge of the developmental qualities of middle school students was one of the more dominant themes that were present in all of the MTs’ remarks. Their basic point seemed to be that it was critical for new teachers to know the important characteristics or hallmarks of middle schools students in order to be successful. I noted this M&K 38 times in the six MTs’ interviews, and it also seemed an important but unarticulated subtext in many of the remembered experiences. This knowledge came up most often in discussion of classroom interactions and challenges but was also applied to issues in other areas as well. For instance, in relating a story of her interactions with “ninth grade boys,” Louise
Matthews generalized that “It's very much you're teaching them to clean up after themselves, teaching them that you need to shower.” Louise was illustrating something she considered particularly salient about male middle school students, that is, they need to be reminded to attend to hygiene. Similarly, Daniel Evans remarked that, when he discussing conveying to a younger faculty member advice about how he should talk to athletes as a coach, he said that the younger teacher needed to remember “this is middle school.” This category could probably be further subdivided into what the specific aspects of this knowledge category are such as they are impulsive, playful, and energetic, but it is beyond the scope of this inquiry to do so. I coded remarks as being related to this knowledge 38 times in the six master teacher interviews.

Administering consequences. This M&K was focused on how a faculty member responds to student misbehavior. It seems to entail both approaching the situation with a certain perspective and well as knowing the different factors that might influence the effectiveness of a consequence or discipline response. These consequences often seemed to be characterized as one of two types: informal consequences administered by an individual faculty member and formal discipline situations that involved meetings with other faculty and that resulted in more significant misbehaviors and/or consequences such as being separated from school (suspended or expelled) in some way. Since these situations can be very emotional in nature, it can be difficult for teachers, particularly younger ones to think clearly about them. For example, Louise Matthews spoke of a situation with a student where she assigned a consequence or punishment that led to what she considered a “hurtful” remark towards her on the part of the student. As a result she felt she needed to discuss it with a more experienced colleague. The MT frequently noted
that this emotional response to a discipline situation was something that just had to be accepted, and a teacher needs to, as Louise said, “just move on.” These discipline situations can also sometimes be revelatory for the teachers. Ted Underwood noted this when he described one discipline situation where a student was ultimately expelled, but from which he “learned a tremendous amount.” Steve Taylor tied a similar moment to the issue of balancing the aspects of one’s role with students and being both a “big brother type” as well as one who could still ask students to “toe the line.” It is also worth noting that discipline situations, particularly ones that might involve a significant punishment like a suspension or expulsion, almost always involve interactions with the full range of people with whom a young teacher might interact (parents, colleagues, students, administrators). It is not the role of this study to tease out the specific lessons that each MT felt needed to be conveyed about administering consequences, and given that disciplinary approaches can vary between institutions these could be potentially be divergent. However, it seems clear that the MTs felt that this was an important area for new faculty to learn about. I coded remarks as being related to this in the six master teacher interviews.

Self-management. This mindset focused on the importance of understanding how one’s own emotions and expectations can influence how one responds to a situation and how one should seek ways to control or use those attitudes and emotions in order to create a good outcome in the situation. All of the MTs addressed this in their narratives, and I coded it 18 times in the MT interviews. Ted Underwood portrayed one iteration of this self-management as managing one’s emotions when the larger institution did not respond in the manner that he, early in his career, felt they should. This was something
that was also noted by three of the other MT (Taylor, Evans and Klinger). Several also noted that this ability was needed when teachers responded to students who did or said things that were especially surprising or offensive (Thomas, Matthews, and Klinger). The sense that emerges from most of these discussions of self-management was that a new teacher, really any teacher, needs to control their own emotional reaction to a situation in order to create a better outcome for the student or institution. Joanne Klinger noted this when describing a situation that evinced an emotional reaction from her that led her to pay greater “attention to how I am being, now (in the present of the situation described).”
Daniel Evans, when discussing one of his general beliefs about teaching said, “Sometimes you just can’t let your ego or own beliefs stand in the way” and you have to focus on what “is best for the kids.” Similarly, Sue Thomas spoke of the importance of “not taking yourself too seriously” while Steve Taylor spoke of this as “the need to maintain a sense of dignity” while still being friendly with the students. Though these last two iterations of this mindset seem opposites, they both speak to the sense that a teacher must learn how to control their own emotions and the manifestations of them in their actual words and actions.

Organizing and planning. This M&K focused on the importance of organizing ones life, both work and personal, and having plans or goals for what one seeks to accomplish. It implies both the mindset that a teacher must understand the importance of planning out the many aspects of one’s life in the busy boarding school environment and the knowledge of skills that allow one to successfully accomplish this organization and planning. Every MT specifically noted the need to be organized and make appropriate plans as an important skill of the boarding school teacher. For some, most notably Daniel
Evans and Joanne Klinger, it was a particularly significant theme. Daniel repeatedly spoke of the importance of being “efficient and effective” and revisited the same phrasing later, discussing the importance of being “effectively efficient” and how you “should never do anything twice,” because you had prepared properly the first time and carried that preparation forward. Joanne specified that planning one’s curriculum, its scope and sequence (It should be noted that it is not unusual for independent school teachers to have great discretion in developing the particular curriculum of their classes, and it seemed the norm for them to have such discretion at Joanne’s school), was “the biggest challenge” of her first year even though she did not expect it to be such a challenge. Joanne noted that an important lesson she learned as an outgrowth of observing another teacher was that, “You have to plan where you are going.” As a result, Joanne noted, “That whole next summer, I think, I spent planning my classes.” I coded remarks as being related to this M&K 13 times in the six master teacher interviews.

Building relationships. This mindset focused on understanding the importance of building positive relationships with other community members, whether student or teacher, as a basis for positive, productive interactions in the future. Learning the importance of building positive relationships emerged from all the MT interviews and was mentioned in connection to students by Sue Thomas, parents by Steve Taylor, and colleagues by Daniel Evans. Louise Matthews stated explicitly that this notion of having a strong relationship with her students was a core principle of her work in the classroom, saying, “It's all about building a relationship with them.” Joanne Klinger noted that working with students could be a “hard relationship.” In speaking of parents, Steve Taylor said “When I think about parents at my school, it's pretty positive. I like having
them in my classroom. I love talking to them on the sides of the playing fields, or on the ski slopes, in the dorm. I think I understand parents.” Ted Underwood spoke of the importance of his relationship with a supervisor and mentor, saying:

We both liked sports; we had similar other interests, and he was able to be someone that I could confide in and also socialize with. Being able to have that personal relationship and be able to talk about questions of policy in school, why the school does certain things, is, was really helpful, to have that mentoring from him.

In the end, every teacher spoke about the fact that developing relationships was an important part of their development as a professional and teacher. I coded remarks as being related to this mindset 14 times in the six master teacher interviews.

Role modeling. This mindset is focused on understanding the importance of a faculty member’s position as a role model for students and/or peers. A basic definition of role model is “a person whose behavior, example, or success is or can be emulated by others, especially by younger people” (dictionary.com). Role modeling was a term explicitly used by most of the MT in conjunction with their work with either students or colleagues. The term also seems to connected to the concept of a “family-like atmosphere,” a phrase that was used on all three of these teachers’ schools’ websites.

One of the schools referred to the “shared life” of the students and faculty and another spoke of the “good role models.” Steve Taylor noted that he had been a student at a boarding school and the teachers there had provided a model for how he developed his own practice in teaching. He also said, when referring to his job, that part of the “big challenge” for new teachers was, “You're a role model.” Addressing a similar theme of it being a challenge for new faculty to be role models, Ted Underwood spoke of the fact that there is always, “going to be a lot of pressure on you and you have to think about
what that role looks like and how you'll be a role model to these students.” It is also worth noting that the term is used explicitly in the induction handbooks for new faculty at two of the schools. It seems, then, that learning to be a role model was both a personal goal for the MTs as well as an institutional priority for the schools. It is somewhat surprising then that I only coded remarks as being related to this mindset 6 times in the six master teacher interviews, although it the concept seemed implied in many other categories such as *establishing boundaries* and *building relationships*.

Working with English language learners (ELL’s). This *M&K* focused on the sometimes unique challenges in teaching and advising ELLs, such as setting and enforcing clear expectations for them when their conversational and written English are limited. It is a mindset in that several MTs seemed to feel that a teacher must approach interactions with most ELLs bearing in mind the language and cultural factors, and a knowledge because the teacher needs to know what these factors are. Interestingly this may have been one of these least developed *M&K* in my interviews with the MT although all of the schools where I conducted interviews have ELL support services and substantial ELL populations. It seemed worth presenting it as a category as junior boarding schools have increasingly large international populations (at Eaglebrook it is roughly 40%). It also seems worth noting that the NF Beth Clayton, in responding to a survey question about which scenarios were most memorable, cited one where a parent in the scenario made a derogatory comment about a student’s ethnicity (scenario #12). None of the MT narrated issues related to this *M&K* in either a *general or specific experience* they narrated, although three of the six master teachers did allude to working with international students as part of their job. I coded remarks as being related to this *M&K*
only 5 times in the six master teacher interviews. However, since this area likely represents a growing concern for these schools, I included it as an M&K category.

Learning school culture. This M&K focused on the importance of understanding how a school collectively, although sometimes informally, views certain issues and then use that knowledge to help guide the choices that an individual faculty member makes within a situation. It therefore represents both a mindset—a teacher must consider school culture in their responses—and a knowledge—what that culture around a certain issue is. As school culture is, to some extent, the sum of a multitude of factors: the school’s explicitly stated mission, the faculty’s attitudes, the students’ perceptions of the faculty and school, and the attitudes and perceptions of parents, it is therefore a rather broad and somewhat ill defined thing. However. Daniel Evans discussed how he experienced “culture shock,” adjusting to life in the boarding school environment, when he was a student, because he came from a different background. Similarly, Ted Underwood spoke of how it took him “three-to-five years to really understand the school’s culture.” This seems even more significant given that Ted had attended the school at which he was working. Therefore, increasing knowledge about school culture and to a lesser extent the mindset that it is a fluid, often ill-defined but nonetheless important thing made it an important category on which to classify and target scenarios. I coded remarks as being related to this M&K 38 times in the six master teacher interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mindset and Knowledges Category</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences in Master Teacher Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Boundaries</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing Demands &amp; Being Flexible</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Team Approach</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding MSS</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering Consequences</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing &amp; Planning</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with ELLs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Mindset and knowledge code occurrence.

Other analytic matrix categories. Given that one of the goals of using the learning scenarios was to help new and novice faculty with all aspects of their work, in particular the aspects of the “triple threat,” it seemed appropriate to create categories that helped insure that this was being done. Two of the more important of these categories were the area of school life (the aspect of the “triple threat”) a scenario featured and second, the significant categories of people who were involved in the challenge represented.

Areas. The matrix also classifies each scenario by the area of school life in which it takes place. As noted in discussion of the literature, the term “triple threat” denotes that a boarding school teacher regularly works in three major domains: residential life (advising), athletics (coaching), and the classroom (teaching). For example the MT often started recollections with statements like he or she had more memories from “in the dorm” (Daniel Evans) or “in the classroom” (Joanne Klinger) or that “another case comes to me immediately in the athletics realm” (Steve Taylor). While some of these categories could be further subdivided— for example the category of “dormitory” includes issues related to fulfilling the job of an advisor to students as well as managing all students adherence to dorm schedules— I used the larger categories of the “triple threat” in order not to make the matrix too much more complex. However, based on my talks with the MT, I have added the area of other duties to the ones normally identified as part of the “triple-threat,” because some experiences narrated by the MT did not fall...
neatly into the those categories. Examples of *other duties* task might be: experiences in the dining hall, on a non-sport school trip, during transition times between triple-threat areas, and communication. Many of the events narrated touched on more than one of these major areas. For example, the acts of writing and making phone calls to parents seemed to frequently cut across all of the preceding areas, particularly advising and classroom teaching.

People. The scenarios were also classifiable by the types of people with whom the MT was interacting in a given *Specific* or *General Experience*. The main categories of *people* were *students*, *less experienced colleagues* (peers), *more experienced colleagues*, *administrators* (there seemed some overlap here with the category of *experienced colleagues*), and *parents*. Because, in some cases, there seemed a distinction worth noting between interactions with other new or less experienced colleagues and those with more experienced colleagues, I created separate categories for these. Among other things, this is meant to capture, in some way, the issue of mentoring, the importance of which was noted in many of my interviews, both for this study and for my pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015). It is germane to note, too, that the types of *people* identified could include nonparticipants in the immediate challenge, who might, nonetheless, ultimately have a significant stake in the outcome of the event. To some extent it seemed the MT felt that each of the categories of *people* involved in a situation might call on the respondent to access a different mindset or knowledge. The MT frequently included in remembrances phrases like “she was a pretty pivotal teacher (speaking of a colleague) for me” (Joanne Klinger) or that a certain child was an “underperforming student” (Steve Taylor). Thus it seemed useful to frame the scenarios that were created for use in facilitating new faculty
learning with these categories of people in mind as the type of individual or group involved in the scene seemed to influence the $M&K$ that were most relevant.

One group or category of people who did not factor significantly in any of the MTs’ interviews were the members of the nonteaching staff, the people who work in the dining hall, maintenance, health center, or non-academic offices. This seemed a significant omission, as school staff play a significant role in the smooth functioning of such schools’ communities, and NF often interact with them. However, since this category did not emerge in any of the MTs’ interviews in any significant way, I did not develop any scenarios for this category. However, this would seem something that should be rectified in any future practical application of scenario learning in this context.

It should be noted that the $M&K$ crosscut the above categories. For example, Daniel Evans cited perspective taking as important in relation to his work as a coach and Sue Thomas noted it as significant in her work as a classroom teacher. The same can be said for the $M&K$ application to working with different categories of people. Steve Taylor noted that self-management was important in his work with parents, while Louise Matthews noted its importance when working with students.

Complexity. The category of complexity was meant to capture the difficulty level of the scenario. Since the number of factors in a given situation, as represented by the number of analytic categories present, seemed to create greater complexity, I used the number of analytic matrix categories checked as a simple metric for this. The complexity score was created by simply counting up the number of analytic columns preceding it in the matrix (see appendix two). Thus, a score of 23 would be one of maximum complexity. This maximum is probably hypothetical, as it seems hard to imagine an
incident that checked-off all the columns and a score of three would be the lowest and equally hard to imagine. Complexity may equate with difficulty somewhat, and I used the score to help determine the order in which I presented the scenarios to new faculty. As explained below I did not want to present new faculty with very difficult scenarios early in their work with them. Thus, the average complexity score for the first seven scenarios that were completed during the week of pre-sessional new faculty meetings was 10 with a median of 9.5 and the last seven scenarios used over the course during the weekly new faculty meetings was a 12.5. However, what ultimately determines the difficulty of a challenge may be different than this, and it is an issue that warrants further examination.

Urgency/aggravating factors. The column “Urgency/aggravating factors” was meant to capture the fact that some narrated experience seemed to feature what might be called “aggravating factors” that made the responding to situation effectively more urgent and possibly stressful. These were aspects of the situations that increased the difficulty or importance of the challenge beyond the simple metric developed for the complexity score. The main aggravating factors seem to be a time, the safety of the people involved or the wide-ranging effects of the outcome of the situation. These issues often overlapped as an aggravating issue often created a greater sense of urgency.

“Time” seemed a particularly significant aggravating factor that was present in a variety of forms in the MT narratives. For example, time could mean the lack of time to do a certain task, the influence of time of year, time of day or place in the week of a situation. Other aggravating factors could include issues of perceived and actual power in a situation, aspects of the location where an event occurred, and being a female faculty member in the context of an all boys school. It seems worth noting that none of the
scenarios where the aggravating factor was noted as “being female in context” were used even though two of the NF were female, which seems an oversight on the my part.

**Non-analytic matrix categories.** The matrix also contains columns that were not the result of any analysis but rather were meant to allow me to track several factors that might have some relevance to the overall study.

*Notes.* The notes column in the matrix specifies significant information related to the use of the scenario such as its place in the order of a multiple scenario day, whether it was a written response, whether the rubric categories were used to frame the discussion or if the scenarios was aligned with specific contextual factors at school that led to the scenario being used on that day.

*Date used.* This column specifies the date when the scenario was actually used with the NF.

*Basis.* The basis category denotes which of the two main classifications of the master teacher narratives (*GE & SE*) were used to create the scenario.

*Source.* The source column denotes which MTs’ interview the scenario was drawn from. I used a numbering system to help insure confidentiality of the participants. As can be seen, I used a scenario that was based on the experiences of every master teacher save one. An *R* means that the researcher used his own experiences, whether general or specific as the source.

*Time Frame.* This column represents an approximation of amount of time covered in the stages of the scenario. This was a consideration articulated by Schoemaker in regards to creating case studies for use in teacher training. Numbers are presented as
hours (< denotes “less than”) unless specified as days. The events in most scenarios (10 of 16) used took place in less than one hour.

**Learning scenario development**

The forgoing analysis was then used to frame the construction of the scenarios that were used with the new faculty at Eaglebrook in their induction. As I began this development process I saw, through my coding, that capturing the experiences in the MTs’ narrations in a way commensurate with my conceptual framework would require significant alterations to the source material.

**Contextual details.** Since my conceptual framework argued that the scenarios I created needed to be specific to the general school context(s) in which they would be used, deciding which were the most salient but also common (to junior boarding schools) aspects and which were the relatively unimportant ones that could be discarded, required some thought. Adult learning theory (Merriam, 2001), posits that adults, in this case the new faculty, need to see the relevance of what is being learned to their actual lives. This meant then, that I needed to eliminate details and language that were specific to the context in which the MT experienced them and, if necessary, replace them with details and idioms from the context where they would be used. Adapting such details sometimes included changing terminology so it was consistent with the use of such terminology within the NF’s context. For example, Sue Thomas and Louise Matthews, who worked at the same school, used the phrase “on dorm,” while the other MT, used the phrase “in the dorm.” Interestingly this issue of the understanding of idioms became a factor in one scenario discussion. Another relevant contextual detail could be what certain
administrative positions were called. For example, four of the MT referred to “dorm heads,” but Ted Underwood and Joanne Klinger, who worked at the same school, spoke of “housemasters.” This factor made it somewhat easier to develop scenarios that were drawn from MTs’ narrations from Eaglebrook, as these required changing fewer contextual elements. As a result, 10-of-the-16 scenarios used with the NF were based on the narrations of MT from Eaglebrook, including me. I was also careful to eliminate details that might possibly lead to the source MT being identified. This was not only important for protecting the confidentiality of the MT—some of the events they narrated they clearly found embarrassing or extremely sensitive within their context—but it was also necessary for trying to foster the feeling in the new faculty that these scenarios did not have outcomes that could be ascertained and would, thus, make them more like case studies. Ultimately, this was part of the reason I created the matrix that allowed me to note what the salient issues that seemed to be present in the MT’s narrations of specific or generalized incidents, so they could be recreated in an analogous incident that was specific to my context.

**Scenario time frames, scope, stakeholders, antecedents, and decisions.** My conceptual framework articulated that key aspects of scenarios development would be: articulating time frames for the scenarios, the scope of the decisions envisioned, the key stakeholders involved, the relevant antecedent events, and the important uncertainties inherent in the event (Schoemaker, 1993). For the first aspect, articulating time frames, I used the time frame of the original as much possible. If I had some discretion, because the goal was to help new faculty to deal with events that they might actually encounter and the perspectives of the new faculty at school can be limited, I kept time frames
covered in the scenario narrow, usually less than an hour. Only two of the scenarios narrated events that took more than one hour, and two featured events that took a day to take place.

On the second aspect, the scope of the decision envisioned, the source material was the main guide, and I used the M&K categories to determine this. Since all the source material seemed to involve more than one M&K and potentially several small decisions relative to judgments about each category, ultimately I was developing the scope of multiple decisions that occurred simultaneously. When I had discretion, I again kept this “scope” more limited so as to focus better on what the new teachers might actually be able to do themselves, if the challenge were a real one.

On the third and fourth aspects, the key stakeholders and antecedent events, these were largely provided by the source material and could largely be used with the small changes in terminology noted earlier to make them relevant to context and to protect MT confidentiality.

For the final aspect of case study development posited by Shoemaker, I construed “uncertainties” as an offshoot of the number of M&K that were present in an event and, where applicable, the category of urgency. This seems valid based on the fact that the MT recounted scenarios to illustrate how they came to understand something better and therefore, at least partially, resolve an uncertainty they about some area of their practice represented here by the M&K.

Barnes, Christensen and Hansen’s (1975) suggestion, for the development of cases for use in the case study method, posits that the cases “lead a character to a central decision point” (p. 292) was less instrumental. It seemed the MT often narrated events
that were embedded in a more complex web of events that did not necessarily hinge on just one decision or action. Further, it seems unlikely that an individual would view something with this sort of isolation. As a result and as noted in my framework, I tried to develop scenarios that started with a central problem but were then further complicated as new information is introduced thus generating other questions. To some extent this mimics the quality of boarding school life that Joanne Klinger called the “grey areas,” that is where the decisions involve incomplete information or flexible policy directives which leave considerable discretion to the individual teacher. Similarly, I did not follow Barnes, Christensen and Hansen suggestion for case studies to have a final phase which featured “lessoned learned” (p.292). As I theorized earlier, because the scenarios were intended to simulate a reality, that did not have a predetermined or neatly summarized end, the final stages of the scenarios did not present clear closure a summation or action points.

**Difficulty.** Another scenario development issue was the apparent difficulty of many of the incidents that the MT narrated. While I expected that the events the MT remembered would be drawn from difficult moments, since my framework argued that scenario learning was meant to enhance teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy, it did not seem logical or appropriate to me to start the scenario learning process with particularly challenging scenarios. Therefore, to address this, I created the ”complexity” score that was the simple sum of all the analytic columns of the matrix (areas, people, the mindsets and knowledges, and urgency) that a scenario “checked-off.” The logic here was that the more factors a situation involved, then the more complex and difficult that scenario would be. This score allowed me to compare one scenario to another in a basic way.
However, after calculating the complexity scores for a few scenarios based on the experiences of the MT, I saw that most of the events yielded scenarios with more complex situations than seemed appropriate for early use in scenario learning. Therefore, I felt I needed to supplement the root experiences I garnered from the MT’s narrations with more straightforward and less challenging experiences. To do this, I used some of my own experiences or ones that I had garnered from talks with other experienced colleagues at my school as the basis for some of the scenarios. This allowed me to better create scenarios that were appropriate to my context and were not too challenging. In the end, 6-of-the-16 scenarios I that used with the NF were drawn from my own Specific and General Experiences.

**Master teacher review.** Once I had created a group of eight sample scenarios, containing at least one based on each MTs’ interview, I shared these, as well as the matrix and an explanation of how I created the matrix, with the MT in an email, asking for their feedback. My goal here was to try to ascertain if the MT felt the scenarios accurately represented the basis experience. I received few responses to this email but Daniel Evans wrote that they were “all real experiences that we come across in our profession.” I also shared this group of scenarios, plus a few more, with another administrator at school to check both if they seemed to address significant initial experiences that new faulty might have and also if they met my own criteria. I received some feedback from my colleagues that confirmed that they did. Also, since the themes the MT expressed in the interviews paralleled and confirmed, to a great extent, my own ideas, which I developed my pilot project last year, I felt confident that the scenarios were well tailored for their purpose.
**Ongoing scenario development.** As the term progressed I continued to develop more scenarios, using the above process, although, with the exception of the scenario led by another faculty member, I did not share them with colleagues for their feedback prior to their use. Also as I came to know the NF and their individual strengths and weaknesses as teachers better, I felt I should tailor the scenarios to better address concerns about their work that they had expressed. Therefore, I did not confine myself to previously written scenarios or exclusively to scenarios that were based of the experiences of the MT.

Once I wrote each scenario, I created a PowerPoint™ where each successive slide (see appendix five) represented a stage, and could therefore simulate the passage of time and/or the learning of new information by the protagonist in the scenario. By the end of the study, I had completed drafts of a total of 24 scenarios and had used 16 of these.

My initial plan called for me to cover 15 scenarios in the first week. However, because the scenario discussions took from 15-20 minutes, in most cases, the process was a bit more time consuming and draining of faculty energy than I thought it would be. Thus I only used two scenarios in a day twice and three scenarios in a day once. After this, I used one scenario in most of the weekly New Faculty Meetings, with the rest of the time in the meeting being used to cover other topics relevant to the NF’s work. I often made an attempt to align the topic and M&K of the scenarios to the other topics in the meeting. For example, prior to the time the NF were writing their first formal “advisor” letters to the parents about their children, we normally conduct a review of important reminders about formal writing. For that occasion, I used the scenario “innocent comment” that featured an incident where a teachers had used the statement “I know how you must feel” in a letter to a parent and the parent had vociferously objected to the writer’s
presumption. Thus, by the end of the stage of actually using scenarios with the new faculty, I had used only 16 different scenarios, including the two used in written responses. Eleven of these were based on the SE or GE of the MT; five were drawn from my own SE or GE, which means a total of 13 were drawn from the Eaglebrook context. This disproportionate representation was not intended, but it does seem to reflect the importance given to the alignment of the scenarios with the context in which they would be used.

**Planning for scenario lessons.** The matrix was an instrumental part of planning the scenario learning sessions as it allowed me to see what aspects (areas, people and M&K) a given scenario addressed, so I could select one for use at a given time because it aligned well with the real context at school at that time. The matrix also allowed me to see that certain M&K were visible more frequently in the MTs’ narratives (boundaries, planning, perspective taking) and thus I deliberately addressed these M&K more often in scenario learning sessions.

**Questions.** Prior to the first session I compiled a group of inter-stage questions (see appendix five) to be used to prompt discussion and to focus the thinking of the new faculty on the M&K that I intended to highlight in a particular scenario. While I did use several of the questions from the list with some regularity, most of my questions were generated from ideas or questions that came up in the discussions and were only loosely based on the original question list. Of the questions on the list, my notes indicate that the ones I most frequently used were: “What are the different perspectives that the participants might have?” which was meant to focus the groups thinking on the M&K category of “perspective taking,” or “Might your response to this situation be affected by
he school culture that surrounds this particular issue?” which obviously is meant to focus the NF’s thinking on the issue of the role of school culture.

However in practice, even these preplanned questions often proved unnecessary and were not used. As each discussions was allowed to develop organically with the new faculty themselves largely determining its course, as the new faculty often had already brought up the $M&K$ that were the focal points of the scenario. Further they sometimes took the discussion in different directions, examining different $M&K$ than the ones that the matrix had identified as the central issues. As one of the essential aspects of the conceptual framework was that information must be relevant to their own experiences and interests, I did not attempt to redirect the conversation to a specified lesson plan other than to ask a question such as the two above.

After the NF had worked with 11 scenarios over the course of five weeks, including their first written response, this function of guiding the new faculty towards discussion of the $M&K$ in a scenario was also served by the categories of the written response rubric (see appendix seven). Before all of the later scenario discussions, the NF saw a slide with the rubric categories listed on it before they read the first stage/slide of the scenario. As noted earlier, this was done to see if the scenario learning process might allow the NF to internalize the concepts in the matrix, recalling them when they encountered challenging situations in their own practice. I was not explicit about the fact that I was trying to accomplish this larger goal, as I was interested in whether the new faculty would develop such a pattern in their own responses. While I did not detect the use of a such a pattern or protocol in the learning scenario discussions, in the survey which augmented the NF focus group, the new faculty were asked if the rubric categories
that were presented at the beginning of all the later scenarios were helpful. Three (49%) answered “a little,” two (33%) answered “usually” and one 16% (1) answered “always,” which suggests that the NF had found these categories useful enough to use them on their own.

**Scenario sequencing.** Once the scenarios had been drafted and checked, and the inter-stage questions developed, three main considerations governed my choices of which scenarios to use when: first, the difficulty of the scenario; second, the specific contextual relevance of the scenario to the professional lives of the new faculty; and third, my desire to touch on all aspects of the NF’s professional lives at school (e.g. classroom, sports, dorm, working with parents).

**Difficulty.** Since a guiding theoretical construct of this study was that scenario learning would foster the new faculty’s self-efficacy, it seemed logical to begin with scenarios which featured fewer mindsets and knowledges and thus could be posited as being easier. Since self-efficacy theory generally argues that positive self-efficacy is developed by the successfully completing challenges (Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy, 2007), then it seemed logical to begin with scenarios about which the NF might find it easier to develop a confident response. In turn, as the new faculty gained more experience, both through the scenarios and in reality, then the difficulty of the scenarios generally increased. As noted earlier, the average complexity score for the first seven scenarios that were discussed was 10 with a median of 9.5, and for the last seven scenarios, the average complexity score was a 12.5.

**Contextual relevance.** As the idea from the adult learning that the learning be clearly relevant to the new faculty’s actual lived experience (Merriam, 2001), the
scenarios were also selected for use based on how well they addressed areas, events or issues that might be occurring within the school’s normal functioning at that time. Thus, for example, a scenario involving writing to a parent was presented just before the new faculty would write their first letter to parents, and later a scenario about parent-teacher conferences was presented just before they would have those conferences.

*Area of school life.* The final consideration, having the scenarios address different areas of school life, was governed, to some extent, by the contextual relevance. For example, prior to the opening weekend of school, we examined a scenario that looked at homesickness, a common occurrence at that time of year and one that is usually most relevant to a faculty member’s work in the dorm. Similarly, prior to the first day of classes, we examined two scenarios about experiences that featured an occurrence in a first class.

Ultimately achieving this variety of difficulty, contextual relevance, and contextual diversity was both relatively easy to achieve and significantly useful. For example, one of the new faculty, Chris Daniels, noted that the alignment of contextual relevance was particularly helpful, as he cited our examining a parent-teacher conference scenario the week before we had our first parent-teacher conferences as particularly helpful to him.

*Session length.* After the week of induction meetings, during which there were not significant time pressures on either the new faculty or me, I needed to pay attention to the length of scenarios sessions. In order to fit them into a regularly scheduled meeting that also needed to convey other information, scenarios discussion needed to be kept to less-than 20 minutes. This proved relatively easy to do, but it was another reason that I
did not use any inter-stage questions that I had prepared. There were no scenario lesson sessions that exceeded 25 minutes in length throughout the study period.

**New faculty scenario learning data**

This section discusses the use of the scenarios with the new faculty. In the first subsection of this part, I discuss some overall considerations in my presentation of the data and then the second subsection examines the larger induction process in which the scenario learning was embedded. The third part of this section first discusses observations related to the different elements that attempted to assess changes in the new faculty’s self-efficacy or approach to scenarios: the self-efficacy scale, the written responses, the scenario learning discussions, and the focus group and related survey. I then examine, in more detail, whether the M&K generated from the analysis of master teachers’ interviews were evident in the new faculty’s discussions of the scenarios. This subsection presents data related to the third fourth and fifth sub-questions:

3. Does participating in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help novice faculty increase their feelings of self-efficacy? If so, in what ways did this increased self-efficacy help them when they faced experiential challenges after participating in the scenario learning sessions?

4. In what ways does participation in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help novice faculty develop general approaches or guiding principles that they then feel they can use to more effectively address challenging situations in the future?
5. To what extent do new faculty responses to scenarios become more sophisticated and complete after they have participated in scenario learning sessions?

Overall considerations with new faculty data. This study attempted to use a variety of tools to gather data on whether learning scenario discussions were an effective tool, but as this study was taking place at a time when the NF were adjusting to a stressful and time consuming job, certain considerations affected the operationalizing of the various elements of the study. One of my primary concerns was to not create too much additional stress in the lives of NF with tasks that were not related to the NF being immediately successful in their actual work and lives at school. Although all the NF voluntarily signed consent forms and generally expressed interest in the study, the possibility that elements of it would create additional work for them that distracted them from their main role as a teacher at the school, led me to modify plans based on what appeared to me to be the emotional and physical state of the group. For example, as I noted earlier, one of my primary concerns was that the NF would feel that the scenario process was something by which they were being evaluated professionally. Although I repeatedly assured them this was not the case, because of my position as their “ultimate supervisor,” this danger seemed quite real. This led me to not record early sessions, fearing that doing so would reinforce their concerns with being evaluated, although I did have them complete an early written response.

The general context in which the NF were working also created similar issues at the end of data collection. Because that final collection of data, particularly the focus group and supplemental survey, the NGSE survey, and final written response were all
being implemented at the end of the first term at school, it seemed some common effects of the end of term on faculty were present. The end of term period is generally considered quite stressful (NF meeting agenda). For example, students, anxious about the upcoming vacation, are often harder to manage, and teachers have end-of-term comments to write for students in their classes, sports and dorms. This often necessitates end-of-terms assessments and their grading. In addition, the cumulative effect of living so closely with the students for a two-and-a-half month period, a period in which the faculty work every other weekend, contributed to what seemed to the me to be a significant level of NF fatigue (New Faculty Meeting agenda, 2016). This fatigue seemed visible in the new faculty’s demeanor and was part of the reason I shortened the focus groups’ protocol’s scope. Further, this level of fatigue and stress could also have influenced how they responded to the final scenarios, the focus group prompts, and the supplemental survey’s questions. All of this suggests that the data collected might be strongly influenced by the context present when it was being collected as it was by the actions of any element of the induction or scenario learning process.

**Overall induction process as context.** It seems important that the reader view this discussion of the data about the NF’s engagement with the scenario learning approach at Eaglebrook in light of the larger induction process at the school, as any changes in the NF’s approach to either the scenarios or their jobs in general were no doubt affected by the various elements of the induction program at school. There were many elements to this process, which were intentional and grew out of the research-based idea that a “package of supports” (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004) is critical to successful new faculty induction.
**Interviews.** Eaglebrook’s induction process, in truth, begins with a number of administrators, usually at least nine in the first visit (Interview schedules, 2016), interviewing the candidates before hiring them. While doing so, these school leaders regularly attempt to convey to the prospective faculty member information regarding school culture and philosophy (Hiring notes, 2016). For example, in my own discussions with new faculty during this process, I always discuss how we take an individualized approach to discipline, which necessitates our working together as a team. Because one of the M&K is *using the team approach*, it seems worth noting that the new faculty had heard that this was significant issue from early on in their relationship with the school. After they were hires, many of the new faculty also attended our end-of-year faculty meetings, which included department and dorm meetings. In these meetings, they had the opportunity for many informal discussions with other faculty where information about the school’s philosophy and policies would likely have been conveyed (End-of-year meeting schedule, 2016).

**New Faculty Handbook.** Before they actually started working each NF also received a *New Faculty Handbook*, of which I am the primary author, that lays out policies and procedures in a number of areas including “academics,” “discipline,” “athletics,” and “advising” (*New faculty handbook* index, 2016). Particularly in the advising section, several concepts that were also M&K were discussed, including that it is “expected that advisors will make every effort to have a very close relationship with their advisees” and that “building relationships” is important (*New faculty handbook*, 2016, p.55).
**End-of-summer induction week.** At the end of August, the NF had their first formal induction meetings and learning sessions over the course of five days. These sessions included presentations by various administrators on different aspects of a faculty member’s work, such as teaching, working in the dorm, and athletics (New faculty meeting schedule, 2016). In addition, this was the time they did their first work with learning scenarios. There was a good deal of policy and procedure covered in these meetings, which ran the gamut from how to handle “calling in sick” to the guidelines for running a dining room table (New faculty meeting schedule, 2016). Additionally in these sessions, the presenters regularly discussed issues like “understanding middle school students” (an M&K) and the importance of building communities within classrooms (the building relationships M&K) and the importance of being organized (New faculty meeting schedule, 2016). During the course of the week, there were seven different faculty and administrators who conducted sessions with the new faculty, so the NF were also being introduced to a significant number of new resources and potential informal mentors. In the survey at the end of the first term, which also asked questions about scenarios and is discussed below, five (83%) responded that these sessions were “generally helpful” and one (16%) responded that they were “very helpful.” It should be noted too, though, that at least one NF, Peter Quinlin, wrote in a survey response that there was “a lot of sitting and lecturing” in that week. As a result of all of the above, it seems probable that this week of meetings had some influence on the NF’s thinking and approach, as the sessions often addressed issues related to the M&K such as planning for classes and responding to discipline situations (New faculty meeting schedule, 2016).
Because it indicates that the use of scenarios for aiding NF learning resonated with other administrators at school, it also seems worth noting that, during one of the sessions in the week, one of the other presenters used a single stage “scenario” (New faculty meeting schedule, 2016) without any direction or input from me. Also, later in the term at a weekly faculty meeting, the faculty presenters of a learning session for the whole faculty on issues regarding diversity also used a short scenario (Faculty meeting learning schedule, 2016). Thus, the NF’s work with scenarios was being augmented in ways that were outside the official purview of the study. These non-study generated uses of scenarios may indicate that, prior to any results being generated by this study, other experienced faculty and administrators may have felt that the scenario learning idea was effective. Further evidence of experienced teachers’ appreciation of the scenario approach was that one of the master teachers whom I had interviewed earlier in the study at another school, shared with me “case studies” and “role plays” (email from Daniel Evans, 2016), that his school had used for several years with their new faculty, although he had not mentioned these in our interview.

**Cohort meals.** Given that the new faculty discussed in the focus group that establishing relationships with other faculty was particularly important in their adjustment to life and work at school, I will also mention that prior to each of the weekly new faculty meetings, the NF ate dinner together, separately from the students and other faculty. Chris Daniels noted in the focus group that “the time we get to spend together as a new faculty group, it's kind of like a little break.” They also had one dinner with faculty who were in their second year, and Beth Clayton made informal comments to me about how valuable this dinner was to her. Thus it seems clear—— and this observation is
consistent with the findings of my pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015) — that the less formal social support provided to the NF was quite important to them personally, and it also seems likely that this social support influenced how they approached their work and the scenarios.

**Weekly new faculty meetings.** Similar effects on the NF’s development as professionals were also likely present as a result of the weekly New Faculty Meetings that occurred on most Monday nights, of which there were a total of ten. In addition to the scenario learning sessions that I conducted in all ten of these meetings, the NF also received, from the other faculty, administrators, and me information about events at school and their associated policies and procedures (New faculty meeting agenda, 2016). These presentations, which were led about half the time by faculty other than me, always followed the scenario learning sessions. It is worth noting that the presenters occasionally referenced what was discussed in the scenario, and two of these presenters even participated in a limited way in the scenario discussions themselves. This linkage between scenario and New Faculty Meeting presentations was deliberate, as the different presentations were specifically timed to coincide with contextual events on campus, and the scenarios were chosen to match that context. For example, in the meeting the week prior to parent teacher conferences, the scenario discussed in the New Faculty Meeting addressed an event in a parent-teacher conference, and then the director of studies presented information and suggestions about “parent-teacher conferencing” and (New faculty meeting agenda, 2016). On the end-of-term survey, the NF cited these meetings as either “a little” (2 participants, 33% of sample) or “usually” (4 participants, 66% of sample) helpful.
Full faculty meetings. The new faculty’s learning was also likely affected by their exposure to ideas and concepts in a number of regularly scheduled meetings that were not specifically intended for the NF. These would include weekly full faculty, department, and dorm faculty meetings. In most of the weekly full faculty meetings, there was a “faculty learning” session. These sessions frequently addressed issues that might influence how a new faculty member would handle a given situation. Of particular note, in this regard, were the sessions on the “anti-bullying program,” “diversity” and “parent-teacher conferences” (Faculty training log, 2016). There were also professional development presentations by outside presenters that touched on issues that would have an impact on how faculty dealt with challenges in their work. At the beginning of the school year, there was a two-hour presentation on establishing and maintaining proper social emotional boundaries, and later in the year, there was a presentation on relational teaching strategies, which emphasized the importance of building relationships in teaching adolescent boys. Further, department and dorm faculty meetings, as I noted in an earlier team study of a dormitory team (Cyr-Mutty, 2014), often deal explicitly with how to work with individual students or how to respond to other challenging situations and the contexts in which they occur.

Conferences. In addition to the induction elements that Eaglebrook offers the NF at school, all of them also attended the JBSA’s “Residential Life Conference.” This day-long conference took place in the same week as the new faculty’s first induction meetings at school and which the NF traveled to and from as a group. The sessions in this conference covered some of the basic aspects of life as a teacher in a JBSA school such as “preserving professional teacher-student boundaries” and “conflict resolution” (JBSA
conference agenda, 2016), and the presenters were usually experienced teachers and administrators from these schools. The NF generally spoke well of this day-long session and found it helpful, although one of the new teachers, Peter Quinlin, did comment in the focus group that he thought that the Eaglebrook new faculty were already better prepared than their peers from other schools because of the sessions they had already had that week at Eaglebrook. In addition, the three new teachers, who had not previously taught, attended the “New Teachers Conference” sponsored by the Association of Independent Schools of New England (AISNE). This conference focused on classroom teaching, presenting some general guidance about good teaching practices. The new teachers also met with master teachers from other schools for specific discussions about teaching within their academic discipline (AISNE conference advertisement, 2016). The three teachers who attended the conference commented informally to me that much of the general information presented at the conference was material they had already learned at Eaglebrook, but they found the discussions with the master teachers in their discipline helpful.

*Mentoring and advice from experienced faculty.* Contact with more experienced faculty was something that the NF cited as being particularly influential in their induction. Peter Quinlin said that “just talking to people was a great help” to him as he sought to understand his job better. Angie Snow and Henry Burton agreed that the times in the dorm when all the faculty were on duty helped them a great deal with understanding school culture and in adapting their approach to situations to the way that other faculty handled them. Henry also noted that the “faculty area” a central, open floor plan office space in the main school building, was a significant help, because he could
consult with experienced peers on an *ad hoc* basis about matters both great and small. He amplified this further, saying that he felt that teachers that he knew who worked at other schools were “envious” of this quality of the school. It is also worth noting that faculty, both new and experienced, regularly cite the support from colleagues as particularly beneficial for their learning about their work at school in the previous team and pilot studies I undertook in the past two years.

**Assessing change in new faculty attitudes and approaches.**

In this section I examine to what extent change in the NF’s approach to scenarios could be detected, using the various instruments explained in the methods discussion.

**Helpful aspects of scenario learning.** The question of whether the NF felt that their work with scenarios was helpful and why was addressed directly in the focus group. While the survey elicited their basic responses, in the focus group they developed a bit more depth about why. Certain larger themes emerged from their responses, particularly that the scenarios were helpful in increasing their confidence, that the interaction with their colleagues was very important part of the experience, that the relevance of the specific context in the scenarios was an important element, and finally that the scenarios seemed clearly connected to their actual experience.

**Confidence.** Several of the new faculty directly addressed the issue of confidence, which seems analogous to self-efficacy, and argued that working through the scenarios helped them feel more of it. Chris Daniels noted, “I think that talking about it (the challenge in the scenario) gives you a sense practice so that you feel more confident about it.” Angie Snow noted that the scenarios were useful “as a thought process,” and that “it's (discussing the scenarios) good because going into a situation, you feel
confident that you're going to make the right choice because you feel like you have this type of experience or practice with it and you can test yourself.” Peter Quinlin also said that the scenarios helped him get “a sense of the school culture so that I knew I would make the right decision.” This seems to mean that he felt more confident in actions he might take, because of his discussion of similar challenges. Henry Burton noted that they were helpful for “diving deeper” into issues that were the same or similar to ones that he had already experienced, which allowed him to consider things that might “have never crossed my mind.” Peter Quinlin (NF3) noted that while his initial response to the basic questions of whether the scenarios were useful said “about half-and-half” also said that he found certain scenarios (in this case the one addressing parent teacher conference) “get you ready for what you want to say and stuff like that.” He later added that he felt, after reflecting on it afterwards, “they're (the scenario discussions) definitely helpful.”

There was some dissent expressed on this point. Beth Clayton said that, while “I learned a lot” particularly about school culture, “I didn't really learn about how to handle situations.” Others in the group also noted the open-ended nature of the discussions, which was posited as part of the conceptual framework, was detrimental to the overall scenario learning experience. Chris Daniels said that having “bullet points” at the end of each session that laid out some guidelines for handling similar situations in the future would have been helpful.

Importance and helpfulness of listening to others. In the focus group and survey the entire new faculty made some comment that alluded to the importance of hearing the ideas of others. Henry Burton commented, when asked what benefits he derived from the scenario learning process, “I like hearing other people's ideas. Obviously, I'll have my set
of ideas, but then, even just tonight, people bringing up things that never even crossed my mind I think is helpful.” Similarly, Ned Overton maintained, in response to the same question, “I got to see a bunch of different views on a scenario” which allowed him “to see paths that I could have taken, so that was great.” Chris Daniels agreed, saying, “I think it's been useful to see how other people would approach it, to be like, ‘Hey, do I want to do it that way next time?’” Thus, this learning from others’ perspectives seems one of the primary aspects of the scenario learning process that the new faculty valued. This also seemed consistent with the general view they expressed about the major influences on their learning at school in general. For example, in discussing aspects of the induction process that she found valuable, Angie Snow said, “getting to meet and interact with so many different people was helpful.” Further, Henry Burton, in response to a question about what had been particularly helpful in aiding him with meeting the challenges he faced learning about his work at school (question 9) said:

    Just leaning on older faculty, whether it be on dorm, being with older guys in sports or all around campus and just relaxing. The nice thing is that I haven't come across yet a person who has denied helping me out. I think just relying on everyone else to help you figure things out has been the most beneficial for me.

This comment was echoed and amplified later when he also spoke of the virtues of our having a largely communal faculty area where all teachers have a desk and “any teacher can always find someone for advice or to answer a question.” He even noted that this was something that faculty of his acquaintance from other schools “were very impressed” with.

    Importance of context. The new faculty also noted that the scenarios that were most closely linked to the context that was present at school at the time when they were discussing the scenario were also very helpful. Henry Burton said that, “Obviously, it's
(the scenario discussion) going to be more meaningful when it's (a challenge) approaching rather than (learning something) at the beginning of the year.” Peter Quinlin noted in the focus group that rehearsing a scenario about parent-teacher conferences “allowed me to be prepared for what could happen, so that way I feel like it went a little smoother and I could redirect the conversation based off what (the scenario discussion) we had in here.” Angie Snow stated that this alignment with context was also important for how it influenced her attitude towards her own ability. She said “it's good because going into a situation, you feel confident that you're going to make the right choice because you feel like you have this type of experience or practice with it and you can test yourself instead of like, ‘Uh-oh, what do I do?’” Thus it seems that having the scenarios address the immediate context they were in was an important part of any benefit they might have derived.

*Connections to new faculty's actual experience.* Another common theme that developed from the data was that the NF tended to quickly connect the events in the scenario to experiences they had had in reality. For example, one scenario, which presented an event that became a physical fight, led quickly to a discussion of some of the effects, such as real conflict between students, of a recent snowstorm and students throwing snowballs during it. The same scenario discussion led Ned Overton to connect the scenario to an experience he had had in an independent school, saying about the scenario “this actually happened to me.” The NF frequently connected scenarios to experiences they had actually had in schools saying, “I had actual experience with this” (Henry Burton), and he went on to recount hat had happened in the incident. Further, because four of the six new faculty felt that they had had experiences that would make
good scenarios, there seems indication that many of them saw in their own experiences important lessons. This tendency to connect the scenarios to their actual experience seems to establish a close link to one of the precepts of adult learning (Merriam (2001)) which posits that for learning to be useful to adults it must have relevance to their lives.

*Use in actual practice.* As to the question of whether the scenario learning sessions might have affected the practice of the NF, which is ultimately the *raison d'être* for any professional development technique, there is some data that speaks to this. Some of the responses in the survey suggested that the NF’s approach to the scenarios had developed somewhat, but this study was not designed so as to assess their actual practice and thus the answer to this question remains unclear. Speaking to this point, Peter Quinlin noted that he felt that he had seen change in how the group had collectively approached the scenario sessions saying, “I thought it was funny how our answers went from ‘What's Paul want to hear?’ to ‘All right, well, I've seen this happen and this is what we've done.’” This indicates an increased level of confidence in his own ideas and a perception that others had experienced similar changes. On the other hand, Ned Overton said that, while “You realize that there's so many ways to resolve a situation or to go about a scenario, but at the end of the day, I'm still going to probably do it the way I feel most comfortable with.” This implies that his approach had remained constant and based on his prior experiences. However, he also said that the scenario discussions had “allowed him to see paths that I could have taken” which seems to suggest that he processed at least some new experiences by comparing them to other experiences. That most of the new faculty also remembered specific experiences that they thought might make good learning scenarios also indicates that the vicarious experiences were now a part of the
store of experience that they might use in choosing their responses to future challenges. Thus, there does seem some evidence to suggest that the scenario learning process mimics to some degree the powerful effects of experiential learning noted in the literature (e.g. Bandura, 1971).

**The new general self-efficacy scale.** The New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE) (Chen et al, 2001) was administered twice to the new faculty, once on the second day of the week of new faculty induction meetings before school began and a second time during the last weekly new faculty meeting in the fall term. On the first administration of the scale, the cohort average was a 34.66 and on the second administration, the cohort average was 34. As noted earlier, the total possible score range was from 8 to 45, with 8 representing generally very low self-efficacy and 45 representing very high self-efficacy. No attempt was being made to evaluate these scores against any established averages, but rather it was used to establish a rough measure of relative self-efficacy as a baseline for the second administration. The two administrations of the scale show that there was a slight, downward change in the composite self-efficacy scores, with an average decrease of less than a point (-.66). Of the individuals in the cohort, three individual’s scores went down (by 6, 2 and 1 points respectively) two individual’s scores went up (by 2 and 3 points respectively) and one stayed the same (see table three). It should be reiterated that a general self-efficacy scale, as opposed to a teaching specific self-efficacy scale was used; thus, it could be that the group’s average could have been higher or lower on a scale for teaching. Because of the aforementioned concern with having new faculty feel they were being evaluated, these scores were not shared with the new faculty, nor did any of the NF ask for the scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Faculty Number</th>
<th>First Administration</th>
<th>Second Administration</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Average</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: New General Self-Efficacy Scale Scores

Many considerations could have influenced these scores. In the initial administration, the new faculty had only been working together and with me for a day-and-a-half, and this could have led them to either respond more positively or negatively than they might have had at another less important time to them. Similarly, since the second administration was during the stressful end-of-term period, similar effects on responses could have been present. Further, whether self-efficacy can change meaningfully in sustained way over the course of three months is debatable and beyond the scope of this study. Finally, because the new faculty’s adjustment to school was influenced by so many induction elements, linking any change in self-efficacy to the affect of scenario learning would not be valid. Thus it appears that, while the scores show some decrease in self-efficacy, which would be at odds to the conceptual framework for the study, because of the above issues, it does not seem appropriate to credit ascribe too much value to this small average decrease.

**Written responses.** In an attempt to create an instrument that might show growth in the new faculty’s ability to respond to scenarios, I also developed a tool intended to assess written responses to scenarios. As noted earlier, this necessitated the NF responding, in written form, using a online survey response format, (see appendix six) to
two scenarios. One of these was completed during the second day of the new faculty induction meetings, and the second was completed during the last week of the term. The scenarios used as the focus of the written responses were originally developed using the same techniques as the other scenarios as noted above and were not specifically crafted to be written responses. Scores for these responses were developed using the rubric explained in the methods section, and the potential score range for the written responses was from 0-to-12, although this range could potentially vary based on the number of M&K in a scenario. The 0-to-12 range applied to the scores for the two scenarios used.

On the first administration of the written response, the cohort average was an 8.5, with a range of 5-to-12 and two of the respondents earned scores of 12. On the second administration, the average score was 9, with a range of from 5-to-10. Although none of the respondents earned scores of 12 on the second administration, three earned scores of 10.

Since no attempt was being made to create a statistically valid measure for written responses, these scores are suggestive rather than conclusive. Although they do suggest some slight positive effect, there are clearly significant issues with attaching any great significance to the scores. For one, since the scenarios were not the same, there could have been a difference in difficulty, which was unidentified in the complexity score that influenced any change. While they theoretically drew on the same number of elements of the rubric, the particular elements used and each new faculty’s individual backgrounds and experiences might have made that scenario more or less accessible to them. Additionally, the contextual issues noted above, relative to the NF’s state of mind and stress level whether when first starting at school or at the end of the term, could also have
affected scores. Even the idioms used and how the new faculty might read them could have affected scores. Thus, while the cohort average for the written response did increase, because of the various factors that could undermine the validity of the scores, they cannot be viewed as anything more than suggestive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Faculty Number</th>
<th>First Written Response</th>
<th>Second Written Response</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Average</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Written Response Rubric Scores

The focus group and supplemental survey. The focus group discussion was conducted in a regularly scheduled weekly meeting at the end of the first term (Monday, November 14, 2016; 6:35 p.m.), after the NF had worked with scenarios for two-and-a-half months. The group discussion was intended to help me understand how the new faculty felt about both the general induction process that they had experienced at school, as well as, more specifically, how they felt about the scenario learning process. The original plan for the study was to just conduct the focus group; however, concerns with asking the new faculty to devote a significant amount of their limited time at a stressful and hectic time of year to more discussions of scenarios seemed unwise and possibly detrimental to the new faculty’s state of mind and to their attitudes towards the scenario learning process. I also felt it was important to convey to the them that their views as professionals on the induction process were important, and I did not want to ask them to complete separate reviews. Thus, to allow more flexibility to the NF in how they responded, some the questions that were originally in the focus group protocol were split.
between a shorter focus group protocol (see appendix seven), which ended up taking 35 minutes, and a survey that all the NF completed within the following week on their own time (see appendix eight), all save one taking no more than three days to submit their survey responses. As with the focus group, I also added elements to the survey that sought to assess the new faculty’s feelings about the school’s induction process as a whole, not just the scenario learning element.

**Self-efficacy or confidence in the survey.** While no attempt was being made to assemble statistically valid data through the survey, which the NF completed after the focus group, the questions in it, were intended to provide data relative to the third and fourth research questions: research questions:

3. Does participating in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help novice faculty increase their feelings of self-efficacy? If so, in what ways did this increased self-efficacy help them when they faced experiential challenges after participating in the scenario learning sessions?  
4. In what ways does participation in the discussion and construction of responses to such learning scenarios help novice faculty develop general approaches or guiding principles that they then feel they can use to more effectively address challenging situations in the future?

In regards to the first of these research sub-questions, the survey asked “Have the scenarios sessions been helpful to you in learning to teach, coach, and work in the dorm at Eaglebrook?” (question 8) To this question two (33%) replied “a little”, three (49%) said “often,” and one (16%) said “always.” While this does not address question three directly, there were also questions about the NF’s relative confidence levels, both when
they started at school and at the time when they were taking the survey. Responding to the question about whether they were confident when they first started working at Eaglebrook (question 1) one (16%) replied “a little” and the remainder of the cohort, five (83%) replied “confident.” All of the new faculty then answered, in response to question two, that this level of confidence was either “a little justified” (one, 16%) or “usually justified” (five, 83%) Thus it seems that, as a group, they had entered their work with some level of confidence, although not extremely high levels of it, something that is somewhat supported by the NGSE scores. They also seemed to feel this moderate level of confidence was appropriate. Finally when asked if they felt more confident now (question 3) one (16%) replied “a little,” two (33%) replied “more confident,” and three (50%) replied “much more confident.”

It seems worth pointing out that the new faculty were also asked if the rubric categories that were presented at the beginning of the last three scenario discussions were helpful (question 13). Three (49%) said “a little helpful,” two (33%) replied that they were “usually helpful,” and one (16%) said they were “always helpful.” On a related question about whether they used the categories to “guide them in their work” (question 13a), four (68%) replied “a little” and two (33%) said “frequently.” This seems to indicate that at least some of the new faculty believed they were using skills developed in scenario learning in their actual work. Four (68%) also noted that they remembered at least one particular scenario we had discussed. This gives some indication that “vicarious experiences” (Bandura, 1971) may be present in their memory, alongside their memories of actual experiences, possibly serving a similar role. Four (68%) also replied, “yes” to a question as to whether they had had experiences that would make “good learning
scenarios” (question 17). This seems to help affirm that they saw similar features in their actual experiences with their work as they did in the scenarios they discussed. When asked which scenarios they remembered, they tended to note those that had particularly dramatic content (verbal and physical fights, a serious injury) which seemed consistent with the type of events the master teachers remembered from their actual experiences.

As to whether they felt evaluated by their work with scenario learning (question 16), four (68%) replied “a little” and two (33%) said “not at all.” This does indicate that the feeling of being evaluated was definitely present although not to too great an extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>“Not at all”</th>
<th>“A little”</th>
<th>“Confident”</th>
<th>“Very Confident”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How confident were you when you started this year that you would do a good job teaching in this context?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do you feel that level of confidence justified?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do you feel more confident now than when you started the year?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Have the scenarios sessions been helpful to you in learning to teach, coach, and work in the dorm at Eaglebrook?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Was the presentation of</td>
<td>“Not at all”</td>
<td>“A little”</td>
<td>“Usually”</td>
<td>“Always”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>categories to consider helpful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>Have you used these categories at all to guide you in your work?</td>
<td>“Not at all”</td>
<td>“A little”</td>
<td>“Frequently”</td>
<td>“Always”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 16 | Did you feel you were being evaluated by me or Eaglebrook based on how you responded to the scenarios? | “Not at all” | “A little” | “Frequently” | “Very much” |
|    | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5: Key supplemental survey responses

**Suggestions for improvement of scenario learning.** Many of the new faculty had suggestions for changes or additions that might make the scenario process better. The most common of these was that many of the new faculty felt that there should have been more closure at the end of the sessions, which somehow encapsulated or summarized a best practice or standard approach to a particular type of incident. Chris Daniels suggested “bullet points” as a final slide of each scenario that provided keep advice about handling the scenario so he would not “miss something,” if he encounters a similar situation in the future. He further stated, “Some of those scenarios are so open-ended. I mean, we're tossing out even more questions than ones that spoke to how we're going to deal with it.” Three others echoed this desire for some kind of closure, and it may be significant that of the four who advocated for this, three had the least actual experience with teaching. Angie Snow, who had significant teaching experience, actually argued against such an inclusion saying, “I feel like for me, necessarily writing things down
wouldn't help because I feel like the way I approach something in many cases is different than the way other teachers might handle the same situation.” It is worth noting here that I did often find myself answering questions about what school policy was on an issue during scenario discussions, so it seems this suggestion for improving the teaching/learning structure of the scenario learning sessions is worth strong consideration.

Another observation made by more than one of the new faculty was that doing too many scenarios at one time was a bit overwhelming. There were three multiple scenario days in the week of induction meetings before school started, with two days having two scenario discussions and one day having two scenarios discussions and a written response. Henry Burton said, “it’s tough when you do multiple, back to back.” He expanded this saying, “I think that's when you start to get a little irritated and you're obviously not thinking straight by the second or third one or fourth.” Even just doing one scenario a week was perceived by some as having negative effects. For example, Ned Overton, while generally praising the scenario process, said, “Don't get me wrong. Every week kind of got repetitive.” While this fatigue or irritation was observed by me as well, it’s might be worth considering whether this is more of a feature than a defect. This “not thinking straight” might accurately reflect the state a new teacher would be in when responding to a real challenge and thus be something that future applications of the scenario learning approach could use with intention.

One suggestion not made by the NF but which my observations suggested as having merit was that particular care be used in regards to using idioms in writing the scenarios. Figures of speech and slang can be very useful to aligning a scenario with its
context, but such language can also be interpreted variously by different individuals and can affect his or her understanding of a scenario. For example, when discussing a scenario that focused on roughhousing that developed into a fight, in the first stage of the scenario the faculty member says to the boys who were roughhousing, “Let’s keep a lid on this.” I wrote this phrase with the intention that it would be read as saying, “Let’s not let this get too noisy or rough.” One of the NF, however, interpreted it as saying “Let’s keep this between you and me” which implies keeping it a secret. This would be an indication of an important student-teacher boundary being crossed. Others, however, read it as intended. While this was easy enough to clarify in the discussion, it did mean that this NF’s framing of the scenario might have been affected by the vague diction. The implications of this are even more significant if such idioms are used in a written scenario, as the opportunity to clarify would not be present. While the vagaries of language are a real part of any relational moment, if the intention of a scenarios is to focus thinking on a certain, M&K such vagaries could be an unproductive diversion.

**Scenario learning sessions**

As this study was largely an examination of whether and how the pedagogical technique of scenario learning was effective, it seems important to review the data from the scenario discussions themselves in some detail. In particular, I want to examine whether the lessons identified in the MTs’ narratives were present in a significant way in the NF’s scenario discussions.

**General observations.** Taken as a whole, the scenario learning discussions were relaxed and collegial. They all lasted between 10 and 20 minutes although some scenarios seemed to be less generative than others. Most discussions proceeded easily, and the NF
even seemed to enjoy the exchanges, as laughter was not uncommon. While some questions were planned ahead of time, they were often not used, as the discussion arrived at the key issues without them or it proceeded in a different constructive direction. All faculty participated in every session, although as time progressed, there did tend to be some dominant voices. It seems worth noting here that the two faculty whose general self-efficacy scores were highest, were also the two whose voices that tended to be the most prevalent in the scenario discussions.

Despite my efforts to the contrary, the new faculty did feel that they were being evaluated somewhat on their participation in the discussion. Four (64%) responded that they felt “a little” evaluated although two (36%) responded that they felt “not at all” evaluated. Given my role as their ultimate supervisor, this level of feeling on this point does not seem to be surprising. Although they reported feeling somewhat evaluated, by and large, the NF seemed to view the scenario sessions as positive learning experiences with four of the six ranking the scenario learning sessions as being “often” or “always” helpful and the other two saying they were “a little” helpful.

I did take one opportunity to observe a scenario session led by another experienced teacher on which I took notes. I provided this teacher with typical questions I might use between stages but encouraged her to develop her own and/or allow the developing discussion to suggest questions. The teacher did allow the discussion to evolve largely on its own and did not guide it too much. Since the scenario involved a discipline situation that suggested to the new faculty that they wanted to know school policy on the issue, I was drawn into the discussion in a limited way. My watching this session allowed me the opportunity to observe individual faculty and the dynamics
between and among them. One of the primary notes I took on that session indicates that the new faculty were fairly tired. This was confirmed by a video of the same session. I also noted that the discussion itself seemed to be very similar in character to those that I led.

**Facilitators' roles in discussion.** As part of the usefulness of scenarios may lie in the fact that it takes experiences that new faculty might have in isolation when they were working alone and moves it into a space where they can discuss it with others, including an experienced faculty member, some data relative to the role of the facilitators of the discussions, who, with one exception, was me, seems appropriate. In the recorded discussion that I led, I was involved in the discussion on a regular basis. I contributed to the discussion 36 times with the NF making a total of 47 contributions among the six of them. The most contributory NF made 13 contributions. Around 23 of the researcher/facilitator’s contributions were questions of some kind, and these questions were often embedded in affirmations or statements. They ranged from simple encouragement to expand on thoughts such as “OK. Anything else? Any other observations at this point in time?” or “What are some of the other issues you guys are thinking about?” to more directed questions that sought to draw out the NF’s thoughts on specific M&K. An example of this would be “Well, do you think it might, in any way, point towards questions about… well, not necessarily questions…. but issues about school culture?” I also used terms from the M&K in two other statements, those terms being “consequences” and “perspectives.” In the course of the discussion, there were ten affirmations like “exactly,” “good” or “right,” which seem to show the facilitator trying to steer the conversation by agreeing with the direction it was headed. I also asked five
questions of particular individuals, such as “Ned, that’s a good question. We are jumping right in at the end of that, and how would you intervene if you needed to intervene?” These directed questions all seemed to be asking the NF in question to expand on a statement they had just made. In response to questions from the NF, I also made ten statements which sought to convey either what I thought to be the institutional expectation towards an issue, such as “I would say the expectation is that we will try to break up something like that,” or acknowledging that there might not be a specific policies that covered the issue: “This is one of those areas where how you draw lines, where you draw lines can become more difficult.” Thus, it does seem the facilitator was using his involvement in the scenario discussion to steer the conversation towards certain issues, providing a more experienced perspective; however, there never was any prompting to ask faculty to say concisely and clearly what exactly their specific response would be. This fact seems to reinforce the idea, expressed by some of the NF, that the scenarios were, as Chris Daniels very “open-ended.”

Data on specific mindsets and knowledges. In order to establish whether the M&K developed in the master teacher interviews were detected and/or developed in the discussions of the scenarios, I coded the transcripts for two scenario discussions using the M&K categories as codes. While the potential overlaps between categories made this coding somewhat subjective, there did seem reasonable differentiation, and the M&K seemed to be present on a regular basis in the NF’s comments. In my discussion of the results, I note what categories seem to overlap in this way. I also had a colleague from another institution code a section of one of these transcripts and he concurred on most
points. Below is an examination of the extent to which the new faculty noted the various 
*M&K* in the scenario discussions and in their general comments.

**Perspective taking.** The practice of trying to ascertain or better understand the 
perspectives of others within a given situation seemed to be one of the most common 
mindsets utilized in the new faculty’s response to scenarios. This suggests that it is one of 
the mindsets that seemed to be most important to the NF. For example, in discussing a 
scenario, which addressed a fight that occurred before a vacation, Henry Burton 
mentioned that the proximity to the vacation made the students, “ready to go home.” This 
seems to show the new faculty member was trying to understand what psychological 
forces affected the student. In the same discussion, Ned Overton noted that such times of 
year “create a general feeling” among the students. In a written response to a scenario, 
Beth Clayton spoke of asking a “student to put into words” what had happened, clearly an 
attempt to gain the perspective of the student on that event. Similarly Ned Overton wrote 
of the fact that “perhaps” the student who had the difficulty “was not aware” of the 
teacher in the scenarios expectations, and that that teacher needed to find out if this was 
true.

The new faculty also applied this mindset to the faculty in scenarios. Angie Snow 
posited that the way a scenario had evolved “might make him (the teacher in the 
scenario) feel like he is ineffective.” This *perspective taking* of other faculty was also 
sometimes presented as a technique for the new faculty to learn more about their jobs. 
For example, when Beth Clayton spoke of wanting to “take advice” from “experienced 
faculty” as part of her resolution to a challenge, she seemed to be saying that she wanted 
to get other faculty’s perspective.
This strategy of assessing issues from a variety of viewpoints is one of the more commonly discussed at Eaglebrook and can be seen in things like the advocacy for “individualizing” of the academic program at school for specific students (Faculty handbook, academics, 2016) or the commonly used school cliché that teachers need to “meet the student where they are at” (Conversation with researcher, 2016). While this prevalence of deliberately assessing different perspectives cannot necessarily be attributed to NF’s work with scenarios, that work does seem to have clearly reinforced the practice. This category seemed to overlap with understanding middle school students, working with English language learners, establishing boundaries, and self-management.

Establishing boundaries. Another commonly cited M&K was that of establishing boundaries. The process by which a new faculty member, particularly those who had only recently graduated from college, establishes themselves in the role of teacher to students is clearly a significant one for the new faculty, as it had been for the MT. For example Angie Snow spoke explicitly of boundaries when discussing a scenario about something that had developed into physical fight saying that the faculty member in the scenario was setting up “a potential boundary crossing.” Chris Daniels spoke of the challenge inherent in establishing boundaries with students, when he averred in the focus group discussion that “Sometimes I have to be the bad guy, but I don't want to be the bad guy, but I want to hold them to a certain standard, but I want them to see fun, caring.” Clearly, he was considering the need to establish a specific type of relationship with students even though it was not consistent with some of his basic impulses. Chris used similar language later, saying, “Being the bad guy is maybe the duty.” This seems to imply that, although being the disciplinarian is not something one desires to do, Chris
was realizing that a clear understanding or boundary with the students in regards to your role is necessary. It also seems worth noting that this particular term was not used by any of the new faculty in their first written response, which they completed before any significant discussion of this idea in any forum.

This focus on boundaries, however, may have also been significantly influenced by other experiences the new faculty have had at school. In the meetings for all faculty at the beginning of the year, an outside presenter gave a two-hour presentation on “establishing clear social and emotional boundaries” (Opening play by play, 2016) and the importance of establishing appropriate boundaries is also stressed in the Faculty Handbook (2016). Regardless of the source of this awareness, the scenario discussions indicate that this is a consideration that several of the new faculty brought to their evaluation of incidents that they discussed in the scenarios. This category seems to have overlaps with building relationships, perspective taking and self-management.

**Balancing demands and being flexible.** Given that faculty are asked to do so much in the course of a day, that they develop a sensitivity to assessing what is possible or appropriate within a given context or time frame seems unsurprising. This was evident in their discussion in the focus group where Angie Snow spoke explicitly of having to “balance” different aspects of her work and that this led to her feeling some pressure to “do it all well.” Beth Clayton echoed this when she referred to the need for “juggling” in order to handle the demands on her time. The metaphor of juggling is one that faculty at school often use, and the metaphor has been extended into the idea that part of the skill of “juggling” in this context is knowing “what the glass balls are and what the rubber balls are.” (Conversation with researcher, 2016) This balance, flexibility or “juggling” seems
to speak to the need for all faculty to understand which are the things that can be ignored, if only temporarily, and which are those that must always be attended to almost immediately. Chris Daniels also seemed to be speaking to this when he said while discussing a scenario, “In a way, that if you allow for something to be okay part time, you are setting yourself up. People around you think, ‘I guess that's acceptable,’ and that it's tolerable. You don't want to set the wrong expectation.” He seems to be implying that he needed to balance his need to establish a friendly relationship with students, what the school’s mission refers to as being there for the students “when they need a friend,” (EBook, p.ii) with the need for him to establish clear boundaries and expectations. This type of conflict between M&K often seems at the heart of challenges that a boarding school teachers faces. This M&K seems to have clear overlap with the M&K of self-management.

**Using team approach.** The new faculty also seemed to readily apply the idea that they needed to work as part a team. When discussing the various scenarios, the NF often made reference to the other faculty who were mentioned in the scenario, with the NF often identifying them as a source of assistance. In responding, to one scenario, which featured a group meeting to decide on a discipline response for a student, Ned Overton said:

> Just based off the people that you're with, you've got the director of res life and the assistant headmaster, two people who I'm guessing aren't brand new. I would turn around and be like, "Well, what have we done in the past for incidents like this?"

Clearly this seems to show he is thinking about how he can draw on these human resources to help him understand a situation better. This also seemed present when Chris Daniels said, in regards to a scenario that involved two students who were fighting, that
the "Housemaster should be involved." This shows that the teacher realizes that such situations are not ones that he could or should try to handle on his own. This seemed echoed in Beth Clayton’s statement, about the same scenario, that "there might be a faculty member that's upstairs. I'd probably send another student up stairs to go get other faculty." This clearly shows her seeking to get help from other faculty. She noted further “Even if I am going to get in the middle of two boys fighting, just to have someone else there” would be something she wanted. In a written response, Angie Snow wrote that one of her first actions if she were the protagonist in the scenario, would have been to have “told the advisor” and “spoken with him a few times” about the student in the scenario. This mindset that one needs to call on other “team members” at challenging times also seemed borne out by comments in the focus group. In this setting Chris Daniels said:

We, as a community or the staff, are very open among ourselves and especially about the kids. I find that amazing because we really have to know our stuff, and I learn a lot about kids that I haven't had the chance to meet.

This use of a team also extended to emotional support, for as Peter Quinlin observed in the focus group, “just talking to other people” helped him to better understand how to keep the various pressures in his life in perspective. This category seemed to overlap with building relationships, organizing and planning and self-management.

**Understanding middle school students.** Another knowledge that seemed to be frequently detected in the scenario discussions by the new faculty was how important it was to assess what a typical middle school student was like and how these somewhat predictable behaviors might be influencing their actions and statements in the scenario. For example Henry Burton said “A lot of times that we've found in our dorm, later, after
a little bit of time thinking about it, they (a middle school student) finally do come up and
tell the truth.” Peter Quinlin revealed an emerging understanding that a more gentle
approach to working with an adolescent can be efficacious when he wrote in a written
response that talking to a student was better than “threatening with grades” (as the teacher
in the scenario had done), and he later noted that a student might be engaging in “self-
preservation” in a situation like the one described in the scenario. Ned Overton seemed
to be creating a general knowledge set for himself about students this age when he related
an actual story from his own life to support his idea that the protagonist in the scenario
really needed to look more into a situation when a student told him that something was
“stolen.” Ned said about an analogous situation which he had recently been involved with
in the gym, “Kid went back, checked lost and found, and he realized he actually just
never put them in his locker, and they were left out on the floor the day before.” Finally,
Beth Clayton said in reference to how the boys in a scenario were likely to act, “I think
that these boys don't have frontal lobes.” While this statement is hyperbolic, it seems
another example of a developing understanding of the behavior of middle school
students, namely that their frontal lobes and the connections to them are still developing.
This M&K seems to overlap to some degree with perspective taking as it represents the
teachers trying to understand an individuals actions by assessing common developmental
characteristics of students this age.

*Administering consequences.* Discouraging misbehavior by administering
consequences or punishments for infractions is a regular part of the work of a teacher in
this context. Its significance may be greater at Eaglebrook because there are few
institutionally prescribed responses to specific infractions of guidelines because the
school adheres to an individualized approach to discipline as well as to academic learning. The school does not use an accountability system, whereby specific infractions receive specified consequences (Faculty handbook, discipline, 2016). Instead faculty are asked to develop consequences for more common misbehaviors on their own, in consultation with colleagues (which is part of using the team approach), although some guidance is provided by the Faculty Handbook section on “discipline.” In this section there is also a suggested response matrix that offers some thoughts about and suggested responses for certain infractions. It explains, too, that more serious infractions, such as drug use or significant bullying, are to be handled by an Incident Response Team, which would include administrators and any other faculty who were directly involved. In the case of serious infractions, it is this group that would develop the response.

A limited number of the scenarios would have had this M&K because many challenges do not involve something that requires a consequence or disciplinary response. Nonetheless, this issue was one that new faculty discussed in several scenario sessions, and they were often particularly interested in what school policy or culture was in regards to developing a consequence for a given situation. In the scenario that featured a formal discipline response meeting, Ned Overton said that he might ask the assembled group, “’Hey, what has happened in the past when this has happened. What were the punishments?’” in order to come to “the fairest solution.” In the same discussion, Beth Clayton said “Maybe the punishment seems like a lot, especially going with the Eaglebrook way of letting kids make mistakes and learning from them.” In a scenario where an NF had mentioned a snowball fight, by way of analogy to the incident in the scenario, Chris Daniels explicitly asked, “What is the school policy about this?”
As with many of the M&K, there was sometimes an overlap with others. In discussing how she might respond (administer a consequence) in regards to a scenario about a fight, Beth Clayton couched her thoughts in an assessment of what might be normal behavior for a middle school student:

I think that these boys don't have frontal lobes, and they don't always make the best choices. I think you are right; these things are going to happen. But I also think I'd certainly place those consequences to remind them of the lasting effects when they then make a decision next time.

It is worth noting, that the new faculty rarely offered what they thought the specific consequences should be, although Ned Overton said, in speaking of a response that was mentioned in a scenario, “It kinda seems a bit seems serious to me, but I think it's a fair punishment.” It seems important to mention that, in practice, this M&K can overlap with most, if not all, of the other M&K as a faculty member could potentially need to consider all of them in a discipline situation. In such a situation a faculty member needs to: take perspectives, utilize clearly established boundaries, balance demands on their time and be flexible, draw on the help of team members, understand what is typical of middle school students, manage their own emotions, plan and organize, understand the dynamics of different relationships, model appropriate behavior, understand how a situation might be different for an ELL, and understand what school culture on a issue is. The complexity of administering consequences is affirmed by the fact that “discipline” is frequently cited as a major stressor on new teachers (Veenman, 1984).

Self-management. Because faculty at a junior boarding school can be faced with challenges to which they must respond immediately at any point in the day, regardless of the emotional state they are in at that moment, managing their own emotions so they those emotions do not affect how one responds to a given situation is very important. In
the two scenarios that I coded, this M&K was discussed, although it was only a posited as a significant element in one. In the scenario discussion about a fight between students, Peter Quinlin spoke of the situation as being one that was likely to “get you amped up” or agitated. He was asserting that this emotional state would not be effective for handling the situation well. It also seemed to be referenced by Ned Overton when discussing a scenario about a student being involved in a stealing incident. He said that the protagonist in the scenario needed to “Try to not go around accusing people,” because this would not help this situation. This seems to reflect his consideration of the basic impulse to act on limited evidence, which might have counterproductive results, which seems to be a form of self-management. This was also evinced in a comment that he made in the focus group, where he said about the challenges he has faced that, “I don't really get upset at them.” This seems to indicate that he is considering his emotional state as an important factor. This sort of self-management also seemed to be present in Peter Quinlin’s statement that he was developing the ability “to put the ‘stern face’ on,” that is, affect an emotional demeanor that was based on the situation rather than his own emotional reaction. Angie Snow seemed to be speaking to this issue at a more global level in the focus group when she said she had to balance many areas, both personal and professional, in which she wanted to perform well. Angie further stated that these competing desires, however, could lead to stress that she needed to be manage, saying, “That's the pressure that I put on myself to try to do everything really well, and when it doesn't happen, it sets me back a little bit.” This mindset about the importance of self-management also seemed present in Angie’s second written response where she said about the protagonist that the way the situation evolved in the scenario “might make him feel like he is ineffective.”
This M&K overlaps with those of *perspective taking* and *establishing boundaries* and also to a lesser extent with *organizing and planning*.

**Organizing and planning.** As noted earlier, the life of a junior boarding school teacher is a very busy one, so that the new faculty considered issues related to being organized and making plans was expected. Often this consideration seemed to be manifest in the NF commenting that a faculty member in a scenario should have done something before the events of the scenario in order to be better prepared. This would seem to constitute planning ahead. For example, Angie Snow, referring to how the protagonist responded to a situation of a conflict between students, which may have been generated by the teacher allowing an activity to take place, said that, “It's better to be pro-active.” Peter Quinlin spoke to this, too, about the same situation saying, “maybe step before this and kind of talking to the kids and getting that, ‘Well, let's set this precedent’” would have helped to make the situation less likely to end in a fight. In his second written response to a scenario Chris wrote of having an actual written “contract” with students in his classes that he could refer to if there were issues, a clear example of his understanding the importance of planning. This understanding also seemed reflected in the NF articulating the need to anticipate an outcome in choosing a course of action. An example of this was when Henry Burton discussed the choosing of a time to interview a student about a stealing incident in a scenario, he rationalized that he would not want to do it immediately, because “you might even be coming off as sort of blaming him for something that he has nothing, or no idea about.” Angie Snow also spoke about the importance of organization and planning in the focus group when she said:

I'm already a very organized person, but constantly juggling all different aspects, dorms, sports, academics. Luckily, I've had experience doing it before, but getting
back used to it. It takes a lot of time to make sure you're on top of everything and prepared and all sorts.

Henry Burton expressed similar sentiments in the focus group when he said, “It takes a lot of time to make sure you're on top of everything and prepared.” This knowledge seems to have clear overlaps with the M&K of balancing demands and being flexible.

**Building relationships.** As the majority of faculty at school live on campus and therefore not only work with but also live with the students and the other faculty, it seems logical that establishing good relationships with both students and faculty would be important to them, and this mindset was reflected in their responses to scenarios, the focus group, and the survey. Henry Burton stated this explicitly about a teacher in a scenario saying, “The teacher needs to work to build a working relationship.” When discussing the scenario about the fight, Angie Snow said of how the behavior of the protagonist in the scenario towards the students was “setting up the expectation that it is okay for these boys to interact with each other, and with other people physically, in that way. For them it probably seems okay and logical to have that interaction.” This seems an indication that she was considering the relationship that was being built. In the focus group discussion, Chris Daniels spoke of some of his difficulties here, when he said, “You try to teach the students same way you would to your kid, (Chris is a parent) but again, you try not to be the parent, but you want to show them what is the right thing to do.” This seems to show that he was considering the specific type and nature of the relationships he was building with students were.

Similarly, the new faculty talked of building relationships with colleagues. In discussing her adjustment to working in a dorm, Angie said that it was important but sometimes difficult to do so:
It's also all the different people you have to work with. If you are enacting it a certain way but other people are doing it differently, like figuring out where you sit and how you do it together and get along, I think that's been really good, but I can see how that can be tricky.

Henry Burton echoed this sentiment, saying “I think just relying on everyone else to help you figure things out has been the most beneficial for me.” Similarly, Peter Quinlin, in a survey response, wrote of how important the “bond” was that he was developing with his fellow new faculty. He went further to say that creating more “unstructured” time for them to develop that bond “would be helpful.” When discussing the overall induction process, Angie spoke of how important “just getting to meet and interact with so many different people was,” and Beth Clayton echoes these sentiments in several conversations with me outside of these meetings. Thus it seems that the new faculty felt that building relationships with colleagues was an important part of what they needed to do in learning about their jobs. This mindset seems to have overlap as well with role modeling and perspective taking in regards to both students and faculty and with using the team approach.

**Role modeling.** The mindset of role modeling is something that is explicitly discussed with new faculty not only in the first day of the induction process but also in the interview (Assistant Headmaster interview notes, 2016). It is commonly stated that being a role model is the “first job” of an Eaglebrook teacher (New Faculty Handbook, 2016). In fact, this sort of statement is one that has been axiomatic at the school for a very long time as I can recall similar statements being made to me when I was first hired 30 years ago. Therefore, being a role model or behaving in way that sets a standard for others to follow is something that was embedded, both explicitly and implicitly, in many of the statements the NF made. Peter Quinlin used this term explicitly in the focus group.
where he said that one of the important transitions for him in working in this context right after he graduated from college was an adjustment “to now having to be the role model all the time.” This also seemed to underlie Beth Clayton’s remark in discussing a scenario response, “that these boys don't have frontal lobes” and therefore a teacher needed to help them anticipate outcomes by modeling that sort of anticipation. Ned Overton spoke of how his own experiences might serve as a model for a student in a scenario who was homesick, when he wrote in a written response “I could talk about my own experiences as a boarding student” in order to help the homesick student in the scenario. Clearly he was thinking about how his experiences might serve as an example or model for the student in the scenario. Angie Snow seemed to be addressing this M&K as well when she spoke of the teacher in a scenario “setting up the expectation” by the way he interacted with the students. Angie seemed to be arguing that the teacher in the scenario, who had roughhoused with the students himself, was modeling the expectation that such a rough, physical interaction was acceptable. Additionally, Angie also seemed to view role modeling as something that applied to adults as well. When discussing the things that helped her learn about her work at school, she said, “If we were just thrown on duty without any real guidance or somebody to model it for us, I feel like it would have been a lot more difficult.” That suggests that not only did the NF feel they were role models for the students but also that the more experienced faculty were role models for the NF. Role modeling overlaps significantly with the M&K of establishing boundaries and building relationships. It seemed that when talking about one of these the NF seemed to be implicitly talking about the other two as well.
**Working with English language learners (ELLs).** References to the M&K of working with ELLs was not something that played a large role in the new faculty’s discussion of the scenarios as a whole. This could be explained in part by the fact that, for this issue to come up, the scenario needed to explicitly feature an ELL in it and, significantly, only three of the scenarios used had this element: “First class” (scenario 1), “Cynical colleague” (scenario 9), and “Room change” (scenario 12). Therefore, there are no specific references to this M&K in the scenario discussions that were recorded and transcribed, which were “Stolen headphones” (scenario 14), and “Pre-vacation conflict” (scenario 14), or the two written responses “Homesick campout” (scenario 5), and “Sent to office” (scenario 16). My informal observations noted that in the scenarios that did include ELLs, the new faculty did consider issues such as the language ability of the students or the cultural context from which the student came. An example of this would be when Beth Clayton wrote of a scenario dealt with student from a non-traditional US background (not an ELL) that the “variety of ethnic backgrounds” at school was something that she would consider in developing a response. Nonetheless, this M&K did not resonate enough with the new faculty that it became a discussion point in the focus group or their survey responses. This is somewhat surprising given that issues surrounding students from different cultures in often a discussion point in meetings at school, whether department, dorm or full faculty (Cyr-Mutty, team study, 2014). Its relative absence in the NF data, however, suggests that it was not among the most pressing issues for them, but given the numbers of ELL students at JBSA schools, it likely warrants a more prominent role.
School culture. School culture is something that came up frequently in the discussions, often in the form of questions about it. This may be because Eaglebrook deliberately articulates its policies as “guidelines,” rather than rules, and advocates that individual faculty “respond in a way that helps the student learn that what they did was wrong” and does not have a specific set of detailed responses for infractions. Instead school publications offer “suggested” (Faculty handbook, 2016, p.151) responses that faculty can consider when developing a discipline response to a situation. Thus the NF were often interested in what the school’s attitude, what Chris Daniels called the “Eaglebrook way,” towards the handling of a given situation was. Sometimes this questioning was an actual part of the NF’s approach to the scenario. In discussing the scenario that had a formal “discipline committee” meeting, Ned Overton said that one of his actions would be to find out “what has happened in the past when this has happened.” Henry Burton spoke of doing in his actual practice. When discussing a scenario where a specific consequence was a likely action, he said, of a similar situation that occurred to him recently in his actual work, that he “asked NM (his housemaster) ‘What's Eaglebrook's policy?’” Similarly, Chris Daniels said, in discussing a response to the same scenario, that he would ask “How did we handle situations like this as far as creating risk to the school?” However, Chris Daniels also said of the scenario learning process: “I think it helped me get a sense of the school culture.” Beth Clayton clearly spoke of the presence of a specific culture at school and how it might affect her response to the scenario saying that the response articulated in the scenario seemed appropriate to her given “the Eaglebrook way of letting kids make mistakes and learning from them.” In a similar way to administering consequences, school culture is an M&K that has overlap
with all the others because there is “culture” that is likely be attached to every one of the other M&K, although understanding school culture seems to play a particularly significant part in M&K such as role modeling, organization and planning, understanding middle school students, and administering consequences.

As I noted earlier, not having a defined outcome or lesson for the scenarios was articulated as part of the conceptual framework, but I learned, through the focus group and survey, that the NF felt this absence of a final response or lesson was a deficiency of the scenario learning process. This seemed particularly true in regards to issues of school culture. Chris Daniels said on this point that it would have helped if the discussion facilitator had explained what “really happened” as a result of the events of the scenario or how such a similar situation was handled in the past, “That might sort of eliminate some of those possible questions.” Ned Overton agreed with this, saying, “Yeah, like ‘That's the way it was done in the past.’” Here, the NF seem to be seeking what the institutional attitude or school culture in regards to a certain type of incident. On the other hand, Henry Burton said that he liked the open-ended quality of the scenario discussions because ultimately, “when things come up or I hear about them and if they relate to what we talked about, it will at least ... you recall some of those things and what were some of the possibilities or directions you could go” rather than remembering one set response. He seems to be saying that his understanding the general attitude or school culture towards a situation is a more relevant guide to his actions than a prescribed set of approaches or responses would be.
Conclusion

The forgoing chapter documents the data which spoke most clearly to the main research question as to whether written, school context-based learning scenarios, that are developed from the actual learning experiences of master teachers are an effective tool for helping new and novice faculty to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school.

The data regarding the master teachers clearly suggested that the learning experiences they mentioned from early in their careers, both specific and general, contained many common themes about key aspects of being a teacher in this context. These common themes were present in all of the teachers’ narrated experiences and are often reflective of important aspects of the school’s approaches to working with and teaching students this age. Further, it also seems true that the learning scenarios, even though modified from their original form so as to match the school context in which they were used, were capable of illustrating these common themes, the M&K.

Additionally, the data presented regarding the new faculty’s engagement with scenarios, shows that the NF generally found the scenario learning process helpful, because it gave them practice in responding to real-seeming situations, which generally increased their confidence with future challenges. They felt they benefitted a great deal from working with colleagues to do this, because they were able to see new options through listening to different perspectives. As part of the scenario process they were also able to get information about the school’s approach and culture in a context where it was clearly linked to a situation where it was needed. Thus, based on adult learning theory
(Merriam, 2001), because this learning was self-directed, it should be more likely that the NF would retain it because it arose from a context to which they had significant connection.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

For many independent boarding schools, particularly the small group of junior boarding schools that is the focus of this study, the practice of hiring faculty who are not certified teachers and who have little or no previous teaching experience, has been common for many years. Since these teachers lacked pre-service training or experience, many of them were learning much of what they needed to know about their jobs while they were already working at them. Moreover, the induction processes for new teachers at these schools has traditionally used a less structured approach to educating new faculty about their jobs, one that relied a great deal on experienced faculty mentoring and guiding younger faculty. Because this less structured approach did not have many systems in place to support new teachers, it often led to high attrition rates for new faculty (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Smith, 2013). Nonetheless, the practice persisted to a significant extent, although the programs for new faculty induction at JBSA schools seem to have become somewhat more robust in recent years. However, the new faculty themselves still seem to value highly the benefits of working with and learning from experienced colleagues. Thus it seems that transmitting the lessons of experience was and is a critical part of their learning their craft as teachers at such schools, but it remains hard to know or track when or if such lessons are actually being conveyed.

Because this traditional approach of new faculty learning from senior faculty was unscheduled and lacking clear structure, it was hard to guarantee that a young teacher facing a difficult experience would have access to a senior faculty members’ knowledge when the younger faculty member needed that knowledge. This is because, as is true for
many teachers in all types of schools, much of a faculty members’ work time is still spent working with students without other faculty present (Bobbitt, 1993). The experiences of new teachers, from which they might be able to learn, will most likely happen when they are alone. Thus, it made sense to investigate how schools could incorporate those important master teacher learning experiences into the induction of new and novice faculty so that such learning from the experiences was less “hit or miss.” This study investigated whether it was possible to package and convey the experiences of master teachers in such a way that novice faculty could gain the benefit of those experiences in a way that was emotionally relevant and socially embedded.

Because there were several distinct sections to this inquiry, it was necessary to gather data sequentially in the different phases and then analyze the data from one phase prior to entering the next. This was because one data set was often used to develop aspects of the next phase of data collection. Given this overall structure, to organize a synthesis of the data into some conclusions, I will follow this sequence of phases and use the research sub-questions most applicable to each stage as a guide. However, I will address the sub-questions first, as together the answers to these questions help to build the answer to the overall research question of whether or not school context-based learning scenarios, based on the actual learning experiences of master teachers, provide effective tools for increasing novice faculty’s ability to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school. In addition to generating a basic response for each of these questions, I will also discuss some of the issues I encountered in trying to excavate the answer as well as offer some thoughts on if or how this process might be implemented in other schools in the future.
Discussion of master teacher results

The first of my research sub-questions focused on what master teachers in boarding middle schools identify as the most important learning experiences in their development as teachers, advisers and coaches. The goal of this question was to establish, if possible, what lessons the MT learned from their experiences that allowed them to become well-regarded, senior teachers in their contexts. This question was necessary to ask as teachers learning experientially has been the norm independent boarding schools for many years (Cyr-Mutty, 2015; Smith, 2013) so this experiential learning has, in effect, created the template for what faculty need to learn. While the old saw “experience is the best teacher” is certainly widely accepted, experiential learning and teaching has also been the subject of considerable research (Kolb, 2014), much of which points to its substantial and enduring effect. It also seems worth noting that there seem some relationship here between experiential learning and the recent focus on problem-based learning which allows students to learn by experiencing and actual problem (Schmidt, 1984). Therefore, it seemed worthwhile to examine whether there was a technique for helping new teachers learn that could be gleaned from master teacher experiences as these experiences might contain many of the lessons that could be derived from the MT’s experiential learning in a form that was more systematic and consistent than the “hit or miss” approach.

Commonality. The data collected on master teacher experiences at JBSA schools experiences points to their possessing a great deal of commonality in the way the MT conceptualize their work. As I noted in the preceding chapter, this is not surprising for not only are the schools themselves similar but the backgrounds of the MT interviewed
were very similar as well. This latter fact is particularly significant for, as Haney and McArthur (2002) observed, new teachers are more likely to teach according to their formative educational experiences than their beliefs. Even though there is not a great deal of interaction among the faculty of these schools, outside of sports competitions, they all seemed to have similar approaches to working with middle school students. This was borne out not only by my interviews but also by my document review where the faculty handbooks from at least two of the schools articulate similar approaches, and the agenda of their common “Residential Life” conference for new teachers offers common lessons on similar topics. Thus while the induction and experiential learning of faculty at these schools may have a “hit or miss” quality to it, there are aspects of it that have led to the development of what seems a fairly clear and cohesive ongoing approach.

**Types of incidents remembered.** At the most basic level, it appears that the incidents the MT remembered or chose to relate were often made memorable by their containing some type of emotional overlay. The incidents were humorous, unexpected, or difficult or some combination of these. However, as noted in the results, these memorable experiences seemed also to center on issues to which their was no clear solution, which was apparent to that teacher when he or she experienced them, and this precipitated their learning some sort of lesson from it. Because of the complexity of the challenges that were frequently involved in the actual experiences, it was also not unusual for the MT to describe situations where they felt that they had made a mistake in how they handled the situation.

When viewed together the MTs’ experiences and the lessons that they drew from them appeared to focus on common mindsets and knowledges that were important, if not
essential, to being an effective teacher in the context of a junior boarding school. In fact, it seemed that many, if not most, of the situations required the teacher to call on several M&K, and this fact often seemed to be one of the reasons that the situation was challenging and/or memorable. The MT did not recall specific, quotidian events—these they recounted in unspecified, general experiences—but rather ones that required them to access or develop skills or knowledge in more than one area.

Probably because of the important role that their experiences played in their own developing practice, the MT also seemed to believe and understand that these experiences would have meaning and relevance to the learning of teacher who were new to the junior boarding school context. Given the literature background on the importance of such formative experiences (Nomore & Floyd, 2005) this is not surprising. The idea I noted in my pilot study (Cyr-Mutty, 2015) that many experienced teachers feel that it takes three years to become a good teacher in this context, seems to imply that not only is experience a good teacher, in might be the teacher that matters most. The fact that none of the MT I interviewed pursued a graduate degree in education may confirm this somewhat. One might even suspect that the stories I gathered from the MT have already been used as teaching tools to some degree. As Nomore and Floyd (2005) point out, it is often the case that experienced teachers are one of the primary sources of guidance for new teachers, even without any formal structure for that guidance. Thus given that the MT I interviewed felt they had learned important lessons from their experiences, these same “learning experiences” were already likely shaping what and how these experienced teachers guided the new faculty they worked with in learning about their jobs. Further, as I noted in my finding, these interactions with senior teachers are among the most
important to new teachers. However, given that new faculty attrition rates remain high (Pugh, NAIS, 2002) and that the faculty at such schools commonly refer to the experience of being a new teacher as a great challenge, it is also clear that many faculty never have the opportunity to learn these lessons. Thus the MTs’ narratives and discussion did seem to support some of the original rationalization for the study.

**Development of mindsets and knowledges.** As I needed to capture the learning that master teachers had acquired through their experiences in some way in the learning scenarios, it was important to the development of the scenarios that what the master teachers felt they learned be identified. By analyzing some of the MTs’ narrated learning events or experiences, I was able to develop a fairly consistent and defined group of *mindsets and knowledges* that the MTs seemed to feel were important for faculty at junior boarding schools to have in order for them to be successful in them. I did not note any of the master teachers articulating a significant type of “lesson learned” that was not also represented, in some form, in at least one of the other MTs’ narratives. For example, I coded *establishing boundaries, self-management, and perspective taking* at least once in all six transcripts, usually multiple times. *School culture* was noted in four, and *balancing conflicting demands and role modeling* in three each. The one M&K, as I noted earlier, about which this was not true was *working English language learners* although that too was mentioned by three teachers despite the fact that I only saw four references to this category in all six interviews. Further, I noted in my document review that many of the M&K concepts were also presented to new faculty by other means, such as handbooks, conferences, and professional development, so it seems that these capture, reasonably well, some of the important learning areas for new faculty.
Since creating such an enumeration of skills and knowledges was not really the intent of the study, further inquiry into this topic might investigate other possible M&K categories. A few of possibilities of other important M&K categories might be perseverance or grit, a sense of humor, or creativity, possibly even something as potentially ephemeral as optimism. Because I noted overlaps between the M&K, it is also worth investigating whether some M&K were sub-categories of others, and it might be possible to develop a hierarchy of these skills. One might be able to create larger more general and inclusive categories into which the M&K categories could be sorted such as interpersonal skills and technical skills.

Relational teaching connections. It might also be useful to investigate whether these M&K could be used in connection with conceptual constructs that were not part of the original conceptual frame of this study. For example, towards the end of the study period, Michael Reichert author of I Can Learn from You: Boys as Relational Learners (2014), visited Eaglebrook to discuss relational teaching approaches with the faculty. Relational teaching emphasizes that teachers need to form productive learning relationships with students in order for the student to truly succeed. Reichert calls on schools to foster the development of teachers' interpersonal abilities, and it would seem that many of the M&K categories, such as building relationships, establishing boundaries, role modeling, perspective taking, emphasize these interpersonal abilities. This call seems echoed in the introduction to “A manifesto of relational pedagogy: learning to meeting, meeting to learn” (Lang ed., 2004) in which the various authors collectively state that one of their “principals of relation” that “teaching is building relationships” (p. 7). As many, if not most, of the M&K seem to identify skills that
address qualities involved in relations with others, the *M&K* categories and the scenario approach might be a way to foster the learning of relational teaching strategies, in essence forming the outline of a curriculum for it.

**Limitations with using master teacher narratives.** Since the MTs’ experiences were to form the basis for a tool for learning that would, as all tools do, have limitations, it is worth recalling what the narratives did not convey. The MTs’ narratives about their formative experiences did not seem to illustrate the importance of specific pedagogical approaches or techniques. The narrated experiences generally seemed to convey the need for or importance of a specific mindset or knowledge more than they did specifics about that mindset or knowledge. As currently conceptualized, scenario learning might not be the best technique for trying to convey specific knowledge about teaching, advising or coaching pedagogy. Further, while a scenario discussion could illustrate the importance of acquiring a greater knowledge base in a certain area, say the qualities of a middle school student, they did not seem to provide a particularly effective way for providing that knowledge in any specific or comprehensive way. Scenario learning does seem useful for illustrating a small subset of information about a larger knowledge set, for example that adolescent boys frontal lobes are still developing, but the scenario discussions did not develop that knowledge in any systematic way. This might be the area where the “bullet points” that some NF proposed might be useful. However, while this might suggest a weakness in this approach, since the principles of andragogy (Merriam, 2001) posit that adults will learn better if they see the relevance of what they are learning to their lives, that the scenario learning process might foster the illustration of the importance of a mindset or knowledge is no small matter.
The commonality in the MTs’ narratives discussed earlier also presents issues in terms of conveying lessons about racial and ethnic diversity, an issue with which independent boarding schools sometimes struggle (Brosnan, 2001). It seems likely that because all of the MTs were white, their recollections did not show them grappling with issues of race or ethnicity. Thus, the need to embody such concerns in scenarios may represent another imperative to create non-MT based scenarios. In fact, the two scenarios that I did develop to highlight this issue were both ones that I generated from my own general observations— one (scenario 5) was about helping a homesick African-American student and the other included a potentially racist statement about a student’s roommate by another student’s parent (scenario 12). While issues of racial diversity in independent schools are frequently discussed (Brosnan, 2001) and the attraction and retention of faculty of color leads the Association of Independent Schools of New England and placement agencies such as Carney, Sandoe & Associates to hold conferences and job fairs for this express purpose, this commonality may point to a reason why this issue may be a durable one for independent schools. Since many, if not most, independent boarding schools have relied on their ongoing work experience to help teach their faculty about their jobs, even their most senior people might be ill-equipped to guide African American faculty as they learned because they had not had those experiences. This is particularly significant because learning to work at such a school is not just acquiring knowledge about a job but it is also about adapting to a fairly unique lifestyle. Thus the interaction between the commonalities in the MTs’ backgrounds and experiences and the MTs’ role in helping new faculty from non-traditional backgrounds learn might be an important area for further investigation.
What seemed to make events memorable to MT also seemed to make scenarios memorable to the NF. In the NF supplemental survey, when they were asked which scenarios they remembered, four responded citing scenarios that were based on specific experiences. The most frequently cited were the parent-teacher conference scenario that featured an argument between the parents about the child (scenario 11), the scenario that involved a serious injury on Mountain Day (scenario 2), and the scenario that involved a fight (scenario 1). This seems to support the idea that faculty remember particularly dramatic events. Interestingly, using the complexity scale explained earlier, these scenarios were only slightly higher than average in their rating. These three scenarios averaged a rating of 12.3 while the average for all the scenarios was an 11.5. This might be further indication that this difficulty measure may not be an entirely reliable. This also points to the fact that relying solely on actual experiences would leave out some of the more mundane, straight forward learning that might be present in M&K categories such as organization and planning or building relationships.

All of the foregoing seems to argue that, while exclusively basing the construction of learning scenarios on the specific and general experiences remembered by the MT is not without its problems, the narratives do provide a rich source of data for them, as the events they noted included a wide range of experiences and challenges that might be important for young teachers to encounter themselves. Because they present specifically identifiable attitudes and information that the MT felt were important to their learning about how to be a teacher in the context of a junior boarding school they can be used in an intentional and focused way.
**Use in other contexts.** As the learning scenario approach shows promise, it is worth discussing issues related to the possible use of scenario learning in other contexts. In regards to collecting the experiences that are the basis for the scenarios, it would seem that the process of interviewing master teachers within one’s own context to form a basis for the actual learning scenarios would be illuminating although not necessarily required. Such interviews with master teachers could illustrate which issues were most important within a given context and could therefore allow the scenarios to be tailored in that direction. Also interviews with master teachers within a specific context could reveal areas in that context where greater efforts need to be made to develop programs and learning, such as in diversity.

However, given that the interviews and their analysis can be a time consuming process, it might be more expedient to form a focus group within a given context to draw out the important areas for learning in that context’s scenarios. However, it might also be possible to generate *M&K* categories that were important in that context *a priori* and then inquire of the group whether they had specific experiences that featured these issues. The quality of focus groups that allows its participants to build on the comments of others (Rubin & Rubin, 2012) might be particularly useful in this regard and could lead to the development of both a greater store of specific base experiences as well as to ones that were better targeted on illustrating certain issues that were important to that context. Because I was able to successfully adapt the experiences that occurred in another school using contextual details from my school context, it does also seem possible that one could also develop a set of basic narrative frames that other schools could then adapt to their own uses. It seems reasonable that a group of pre-written scenario frames or simplified
scenario events, for example “a student falsely accuses another student of stealing,” could be used effectively in many different contexts. However, it would always be important that they be modified or developed in such a way that they incorporated details from the specific context in which they would be used.

**Learning scenario development**

My second research question inquired about what procedural steps might be needed to create effective, specific-context focused learning scenarios that were based on the real experiences of master teachers. This question was designed to ascertain whether one could develop a simple process for developing learning scenarios for new teachers based on the experiences of master teachers, so that the general process could be used systematically in other contexts. This proved to be relatively simple. The commonality of experiences of the MT indicated that many of the events at one school could easily have happened at another; therefore, creating learning scenarios from the base scenarios was often just a matter of changing names, inserting details from the context and using context specific idioms. Following a process similar to the one documented in this study or a similar modified process, such as using a focus group rather than interviews, within just one context should be something that most schools could do (see page 160 for scenario development steps). Going even further, I would speculate many teachers who have some experience could develop useful scenarios from scratch based on their own experiences. This was something that I did on more than one occasion in order to align the scenario being used with the contextual events at school.

**Mindsets and knowledges.** The $M&K$ that I developed from the MTs’ narratives seemed reasonably accurate in capturing some of the key skills of the junior boarding
school teacher, as these M&K were visible both in the MTs’ experiences and in the approaches that the NF took to the scenarios. These mindsets and knowledges seem to represent the “craft knowledge” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) that teachers at such schools have traditionally acquired through their experiences. Further, the NF’s statements that they all used the categories of the simplified rubric at least “a little” in their actual practice indicates that such a categorization might be helpful. However, a complex matrix, such as I constructed for this study, would likely not be necessary. A matrix that specified areas of school life, the people involved, and a basic list of the M&K, like the rubric’s, might be sufficient. While not all the M&K came up in the scenario discussions very often, the categorization of the “lessons” to convey with each scenario provides a tool for insuring that a teacher educator was able to all address all of them over time. Thus, in any future use of scenarios, some form of categorization of the lessons of the scenario would be useful as it provides useful guidance in developing the scope and sequence of the scenario learning sessions. By creating a framework that identifies learning objectives for the “experience” of each scenario— something unmediated or “real” learning from experience might lack— the teacher-educator is able to target lessons on areas where the new faculty has expressed concern and/or interest or from which the teacher-educator feels, based on his or her assessment of their approaches to other scenario discussions, the NF might benefit.

I can also envision that the creation of a set of standard but flexible relational teaching mindsets and knowledges, ones that might be important to teachers in any context, might be possible. With such a guiding list, those responsible for facilitating the learning of new faculty could build or shape scenarios around these more general
mindsets and knowledges. Further, as I noted, because there is a great deal of overlap between categories, a more general category list could feature a smaller range of mindsets and knowledges, more like the ones in the written response rubric. Since the scenario format does not seem conducive to presenting a body of knowledge—the conversations tended to quickly move from one topic to the next—about a subject but rather the awareness of the importance of that body of knowledge, broader MK categories would seem sufficient for guiding the use of scenarios.

My writing of scenarios also indicated that it is hard to write scenarios that address only one issue. Most events that were viewed as challenging by the MTs seemed to involve multiple \( M \& K \) and so creating scenarios that are more narrowly focused can be difficult. Thus, Barnes, Christensen and Hansen’s (1975) notion that the scenario moves toward one key question did not seem feasible. Even when not based on specific—and therefore likely more complex and challenging—experiences, because boarding school life involves so many factors, trying to limit these factors might only succeed in making the scenarios seem less real. I should also note that the NF’s comments about using more than one scenario at the same time is something that should be done rarely if at all. Such use of multiple scenarios on the same day seemed to cause fatigue which might also dilute the ability of new faculty to retain their learning. The complexity that seemed inherent in the memorable experiences suggests that some time is needed to digest and assimilate the lessons learned from them.

**General experiences.** The use of general experiences was also important to creating a sufficient number of contextually targeted scenarios. Since the MT commonly presented such imagined but typical experiences to illustrate their important learning
experience, they seem a valid tool for the creation of scenarios. Given that all teachers with some years of experience will have acquired a host of such experiences, then even one individual could likely generate such experiences to create more purpose built scenarios.

**Difficulty level.** One of the interesting challenges that emerges from my study is the matter of how the difficulty level or complexity of an individual scenario can be established in order to develop an effective and supportive scope and sequence for scenario learning. Determining the difficulty of the scenarios seems important in regards to insuring that they are targeted effectively within the NF’s *zone of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1938/1978). The tool I used in the study for this—a simple sum of the areas in the *M&K* matrix that a scenario was intended to highlight—seems, at best, a rough and not particularly accurate way to assess difficulty of the scenarios. In future inquiry, determining which scenarios that MT and NF identified as the most difficult or challenging would certainly help to inform this. Given that experiential learning theory argues that “mastery experiences” (Bandura, 1971) are the most important sources of feelings of self–efficacy and, for teachers, these mastery experiences come from successful moments in actual teaching (Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy, 2007), it seems important to the success of the use of scenario learning to develop a better measure for assessing the difficulty of scenarios that might be used.

**Specific contextual details.** Given how important that context specific details seemed to figure in the NF’s work with the scenarios, creating scenarios with these sorts of details does seem important. This is something that resonates in the discussion of andragogy in the literature, because adult learning appears most effective when it is based
on accumulating experience, is related to changing social roles, is problem centered, and is motivated by internal rather than external forces (Merriam, 2001). Based on the NF’s comments about the scenario learning process in general, this appeared true for them both in terms of the difficulty of issues presented and the timing of their presentation. Therefore, a good deal of thought should go into the sequencing of the scenarios. Although none of the faculty commented on any scenario as being too difficult, they did comment on the importance of the connection to contextual events. Since the NF noted that the scenario learning process could be tiring and difficult at times, then some mindfulness to their difficulty seems worthwhile, particularly with the first few scenarios.

**Assessing new faculty progress with written responses.** A few words about creating written scenarios that are to be used to assess the NF’s acquisition of the *M&K* seem appropriate here, because the assessment of faculty performance is a concern in virtually all school settings. As this tool was developed specifically for assessment— and does have potential in this regard— I would reiterate that the scenarios written for them be written with particular care. The variables of difficulty and familiarity with the specific context in the scenarios could strongly influence a faculty member’s response. Further, because there is not opportunity to clarify points, the language used needs to be chosen carefully so as to avoid misinterpretation by the respondents. Finally, if one intends to use initial written responses to scenarios as a baseline for a later administration that is intended to measure change in their ability to respond, then the difficulty level and *M&K* addressed in the scenarios to which they respond would need to be carefully aligned in these regards if the measures are to be at all accurate.
**Scenario discussion session closure.** The deliberate absence of closure called for
by my conceptual framework for scenario learning is another aspect about which further
investigation would be useful, as whether such closure would add or detract from the
discussion process seems unclear. As I noted, several faculty, generally the less
experienced ones, desired it; however, others saw the value of the scenario discussion
being open-ended. Although I posited that the open-ended quality of the scenarios more
accurately reflected the open-ended nature of reality, it seems like some features that
helped create some sense of closure could be usefully incorporated. The written response
rubric, when ultimately used as a teaching rubric rather than an evaluative one, did this,
to some extent, although this rubric was more focused on aiding the NF in analyzing
scenarios than in articulating an outcome. It would seem fairly easy to include “bullet
points’ at the end of some scenarios, particularly those that are used early in the scenario
learning process. These bullet points need not be answers per se to the scenarios, but
could list be particular considerations that the NF should apply to future challenges
and/or specific policy or school culture information that might be important and
applicable. However, too great an emphasis on this aspect of closure could be
disadvantageous as it might reinforce a perception of the scenarios requiring a certain
right answer rather than the scenario being a prompt for the consideration of a variety of
actions and approaches.

**Negative aspects of repetition.** Based on the feedback from the NF, it also seems
that the repetitive nature of the scenario format is worth taking steps to alleviate, as
boredom has been shown to negatively impact cognition (Wallace, Vodanovich &
Restino, 2003). That “scenario fatigue” might be present was reinforced for me when I
observed that, in the first meeting in which I did not use a scenario to begin the meeting, the new faculty appeared relieved. While further investigation is needed here, initially there seem a few ways that this fatigue could be reduced. One of these might be to have a greater number and variety of non-new faculty lead scenario discussions. Another might be to have the NF themselves lead discussions, which might lead them to think about the scenario from a new perspective. Others would be to have the NF generate questions for the discussions or have the NF write scenarios based on their own experiences. All of these would enact good principles of andragogy (Merriam, 2001) and also often accommodate the NF’s expressed interest and appreciation for the advice of their colleagues, both experienced and new. It might also be constructive for them to complete a scenario using an online discussion board format, which could conserve time in face-to-face meetings, while simultaneously allowing for some of the assessment advantages of the written response format. The NF could also give input on the sort of scenarios they would like to do. For example, in his feedback on the scenario learning process, Ned Overton made such a suggestion, saying that he would have liked it if we had done one that addressed a student misbehaving during a sports practice. One could also simply not do as many, but as the idea behind this technique is to accelerate the NF’s learning, finding ways to vary how the new faculty learn through the scenarios might be preferable to reducing the number of scenarios used too much. Eliminating multiple scenarios days and/or using one only every-other-week would have meant that only eight scenarios would have been discussed during the course of this study. While doing fewer scenarios might encourage greater depth of exploration, given the number of M&K, areas and
people that probably need to be addressed, completing a much smaller number seems to offer rather limited acceleration to new faculty learning.

**Broader application for learning scenarios.** Throughout this study I have framed the use of scenarios as a tool for teaching new and novice faculty. While this study did not attempt to study the question, one might legitimately ask if scenario learning could be similarly helpful to all teachers. Given the results from my NF analysis and the principles of andragogy, my tentative answer would be affirmative. The apparent benefits derived by the scenario learning process such as the socially constructed learning and the immediate applicability to one’s experience would likely be helpful for all faculty. In fact, that this is true is part of the reason I started this study in the first place. As I noted earlier in describing the background for this study, I witnessed the positive reaction of experienced faculty to an outside presenter whose presentation used scenarios as a learning tool. It seems evident then that scenario learning could be used fairly broadly among different types of faculty as a professional development technique.

**Proposed procedural steps.** The above discussion leads me to offer the following as a basic set of procedural steps for converting the experiences of master teachers into individual-school, context-based scenarios that are to be used to help new faculty learn about some of the important mindsets and knowledges relative to their jobs:

1. Gather base scenarios (both general and specific) using either interviews or a focus group.
2. Analyze the base scenario event for the key the mindsets and knowledges that it seemed to present.
3. Determine which details and antecedent events in the original scenario are most germane to developing the focal mindsets and knowledges and need to be represented using analogous details from the context in which they will be used.

4. Convert these important details and antecedents to specific analogs from the context for which they will be used.

5. Develop the scenario using additional specific details from the application context that align the scenario to an imminent context at school.

6. Have experienced teachers review scenarios to insure that they illustrate situations that effectively suggest the mindsets and knowledges that were supposed to be highlighted.

7. Establish a sequence for presentation of the scenarios that aligns the events captured in the school with the actual, real events that are occurring at school.

**Discussion of new faculty results**

**Self-efficacy.** Research sub-question three asked whether the use of scenarios positively affected the new faculty’s feelings of self-efficacy. Based on the NF’s focus group and survey responses, there are clear indications that it did as the new faculty spoke of how the discussions helped give them confidence: Chris Daniels spoke of becoming “more confident” and Angie Snow spoke of how they gave her “a sense of practice.” However, assessing the extent to which working with scenarios was the main agent for change in the NF’s sense of self-efficacy was difficult to do. Because of the myriad factors that were involved in the new NF’s induction, ascribing changes in self-efficacy, if they were clearly found, to any one thing does not seems possible using this
study’s structure. It seems plausible to suggest that scenario learning did have some affect on NF self-efficacy, but more investigation would be necessary to say it with confidence.

To some extent, the open-ended conclusion to the sessions may have worked against increasing self-efficacy. As noted in my examination of the literature, self-efficacy is increased by successful completion of mastery experiences (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007), and the fact that the scenario discussions did not result in a specific "successful" conclusion might undermine this sense of mastery. As the NF reported, they sometimes left the sessions not knowing exactly what they should learn from the scenario, and it does not seem unreasonable to think that this uncertainty might undermine their confidence or self-efficacy. While including some form of summation might detract from the reality of the scenario or the social construction of the response, it might be a useful compromise to make when a NF’s confidence in him or herself might be most important, such as when they are just starting their work at the school. Thus, in any further use of scenarios, having some key “take-aways” at the end of scenarios might be important early on in the process of using them. This inclusion might also serve to reinforce the development of a response protocol for each NF that was investigated somewhat through the use of the evaluative rubric as a teaching rubric.

**Social construction of knowledge.** Ultimately, the data I collected may point to self-efficacy not being the most important theoretical frame from which to view scenario learning as the socially constructed aspect of scenario learning may have also increased their confidence. The NF themselves commented on how important their learning from their colleagues was. By their hearing what others had to say and their being able to see if their responses might be consistent with those of the others, the new faculty might have
felt reassured that their ideas and responses had reasonable validity. They may have felt that, because others discussed similar responses to their own, the NF’s confidence in their own response might increase. The socially constructed nature of the knowledge the NF acquired and their espoused reliance on the guidance of the experienced faculty around them at school, both suggest that, by embedding their learning about their jobs in a social milieu, there was a greater chance that it might affect their actual practice.

Also, given the significant amount of research on the negative affects of new teacher isolation on a new teachers’ emotional state (Lortie, 1971; Flinders, 1988), the fact the scenario learning process takes an interaction that might be totally invisible to others at school if the experience were real, and allows a new teacher’s approach to it to become visible to others seems important. This surfacing of largely invisible interactions might allow experienced faculty more opportunity to provide help and guidance to new faculty learning seems a positive function of scenario learning. If such experiences as those in the scenarios were encountered in reality and in isolation, with no feedback or contextualization available, the chances that a NF might second-guess their response seems greater. Because the scenario learning process allowed each NF to compare and construct their responses with the help of other new teachers, it seems more likely that they would have gain more useful knowledge from the vicarious experience than they would have from a real experience. This is because, given how busy their lives are in reality, after a real learning experience, they might quickly be on to the next challenge or job and never seek out any guidance from others. My analysis of my own role in the scenario discussions seems to support this. In my role as facilitator of these discussions, I was able to focus NF thinking on key aspects of scenarios, something that would likely
not be done when they were in a real challenge. To some extent this social aspect of scenario learning might be the basis for the *using the team approach* being a significant *M&K* in the first place.

**NF questions about school culture and policy.** One ancillary benefit related to whether this learning process affected the NF’s actual self-efficacy may be that the process allowed experienced teachers to share their knowledge about school culture and policy with the NF in a setting where that knowledge had specific relevance to the NF’s actual work lives. This might have been be supportive of the NF’s developing self-efficacy as well, because it would enhance their feeling that they had developed tools needed to more effectively meet challenges in the future, because the scenario learning process also gave the new faculty opportunity to ask questions about school policy and culture in a way that was immediately relevant to them. In my past work with NF, much of the transmission of policy and culture was presented through a more of a lecture format. As noted earlier, starting early in the NF’s career at Eaglebrook, the NF are frequently told or advised that a given thing is important at school or that there is a certain policy that applies to a specific issue. However, this type of delivery was not particularly effective as the NF often did not have a particularly resonant reason for acquiring this knowledge, and even if they did acquire it, it could be months or even years before they might actually need to apply it. Thus, such learning might often be short-lived. Because of the NF’s involvement in scenario discussions, in which such information would have more immediate relevance and purpose, the NF might more quickly understand the need for such information and retain it better. Scenario learning
could therefore enhance the NF’s acquisition of specific knowledges, even if it was not
the ideal tool for the delivering such specific policy or pedagogical information.

Developing a personal, standard protocol. Sub-question four asked if the NF
developed a standard approach or basic protocol for addressing challenges in their work
through their work with learning scenarios. Ultimately and in conjunction with the fifth
research sub-question, this question was trying to ascertain whether the scenario learning
sessions affected the NF’s actual practice. This desire that NF use such a process for
evaluating situations in their actual practice is an attempt to have them draw more heavily
on their rational thought (“System 2” in Kahneman, 2013) and less on their instinctual or
emotional response (“System 1” in Kahneman, 2013). This is something that the
literature notes is often difficult for many forms of professional development to do
(Desimone, 2011), and this study was not able to answer it with any great certainty. As
noted, the new faculty did self-report that they used some of the techniques, such as the
rubric categories, in their approaches to challenges at least “a little.” There also seems
further evidence that the learning scenarios had some effect in that the NF clearly began
to juxtapose real experiences they had had with those in the scenario discussions. This
seems to imply that, because they were connecting the scenario experiences with real
experiences, that those experiences have a greater chance of becoming part of the store of
experiences that NF would draw on in the future when faced with challenges. However,
as there was no direct observation of NF practice, it is impossible to say if this were true.
Nonetheless, given that supervisors would normally have little input on how NF
responded to important challenges in their actual work lives until after an event had
already occurred— if even then— the scenario learning process at least seems to offer a
proxy that might help supervisors understand better how an individual NF actually approached such challenges. Scenario learning, therefore, seems a potentially useful, if imperfect, tool for accessing important aspects of new faculty practice that can be very hard to feasibly access in other ways.

Assessing scenario learning effects on new faculty. The fifth sub-question, which queried whether the quality of the responses to scenarios of the new faculty became more sophisticated and complete after they have participated in scenario learning sessions, again presented challenges for measurement. Not recording and transcribing an early scenario discussion played a significant role in this, as there was not a baseline with which to compare the responses of the NF in the two recorded scenario discussions that took place at the end of the term after the NF had worked with 14 other scenarios. While the rationale that the NF might feel overly evaluated by such a recording seemed reasonable, this made the study wholly reliant on the written response to assess change, which was a problematic tool. However, even if this data were available, it remains a fairly complicated question as a whole. The variables of the personal relevance of a topic to a specific NF, a particular NF’s experience with that topic, and an individual’s related level of confidence might influence how much a faculty member participated in a discussion. For instance, if the scenario discussion was about a situation that was unfamiliar to an individual NF, he or she might choose to participate less in a discussion and thus not really provide much data to analyze. Plus, some individuals might be more introverted and less inclined to participate in discussions as a general principle. Of the three most experienced faculty in the new faculty cohort, one regularly made the most comments, (13 in the second recorded scenario discussion) but the two others made the
least (four and two respectively in the second recorded scenario discussion). Further, assessing whether a new faculty member had changed or improved his or her approach would be an inquiry that would involve some question of “value-added,” that is how much an NF had progressed from where they were, and this further complicates the assessment. While this question focused on whether one could detect change in the NF’s responses within the scenario learning sessions, ultimately it seems this question is driving at a similar goal as the previous two questions, and that is whether the scenario learning process actually changed the NF’s practice.

As noted earlier, written responses to scenarios might have some potential as a NF assessment tool, although not one that is without significant issues. While never intended to be a valid measure of the NF’s ability to respond to challenges, the tool did indicate some slight growth in the NF’s ability to address different aspects of the scenario challenges. It also provided a record of the individual thought processes of the NF in regard to a situation. However, because of weaknesses with this particular instrument that I discussed, the small improvement noted does not seem to be a particularly strong or useful indicator. The results here were not consistent and were fairly small, which undermines my confidence in their ability to accurately portray the NF’s skill in responding to scenarios. It does seem that a more carefully constructed instrument might allow a supervisor or researcher to assess individual changes; however, such an instrument could only provide a proxy for the real characteristic that is intended to be measured, which is the effectiveness with which a NF responds to an actual challenge in their practice. Responding to a written prompt is far different from handling an actual challenge with all of its potential complexity and emotional overlay. All of the
aforementioned problematizing issues with assessing performance in scenario discussions would apply to written scenario responses as well, but added to all those issues is the potentially obscuring element of the varying writing abilities of the subjects and how this might manifest itself in more or less complex or sophisticated written responses to scenarios.

Therefore, creating an accurate written response measure would require considerably more investigation, and whether such an investigation would be worth the effort is worth questioning. Since the goal of the scenario learning process is to enhance the new faculty’s feeling of confidence or self-efficacy and possibly create a positive cycle of self-efficacy improvement, using the process as a tool to assess how skilled they are at developing responses to scenarios seems problematic. While it does provide the opportunity for a supervisor to better see what is normally hidden—and this makes it attractive for assessing an aspect of a teacher’s work that is often hard to assess—it also frames the scenario learning experience as another stressful aspect of their jobs and this might lead to a certain amount of competitiveness between the new faculty. To have the scenario learning process become a proxy tool for assessing new faculty performance, therefore, strikes me as being something of a perversion of the idea. Because using the scenario learning process as a technique for assessing new faculty performance might actually lead to their feeling less self-efficacy if they felt that their assessment was not a positive one, although for this to be said with much confidence more research would be required.
Overall effectiveness of scenario learning process

The forgoing responses to the research sub-questions provide the basis for the ultimate response to the primary research question of whether learning scenarios, which are based on the actual learning experiences of master teachers and are tailored to the details of a particular school context, provide effective tools for increasing new and novice faculty’s ability to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school. On this larger question, the data do seem to indicate that the scenario learning process shows some promise as a tool for independent school educators.

Firstly, the narratives of some of the experiential learning events of master teachers in JBSA schools proved to be a rich source of material that illustrated important mindsets and knowledge that a teacher in such schools needs to possess. There seemed remarkable consistency in these lessons, which suggests a skill set or corpus of “craft knowledge” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) that is consistent between school settings that was developed through the years of these schools and their faculties learning from their experiences with children of middle school age. Secondly, it proved a relatively straightforward matter to convert these real, or as discussed earlier, typical events into short multi-stage scenarios that presented issues that fairly consistently led the new faculty, who were discussing them, to consider the mindsets and knowledges, the knowledge of craft, that seemed to be the lessons-learned from the master teachers’ original narratives. Next, while the study could not ascertain, using standard measures of self-efficacy, if participating in the scenario learning process had a measurable, positive effect on their feelings of self-efficacy, it did seem, particularly when the evaluative
responses of the new faculty were considered, that participating in such discussions helped them feel more confident in their ability to handle similar situations in reality. This confidence seems a close analog for self-efficacy, and some of the new faculty reported that they approached issues they faced in their actual work with a feeling that they had had some practice in responding to such situations. Further, it also seems to have encouraged the new faculty to begin developing a standard approach to challenging situations, as they reported using the rubric categories at least “a little” in their actual practice. Finally, while the development of a measure that would help an administrator or teacher-educator to confidently assess whether the new faculty had developed more robust approaches to the scenario challenges proved difficult, several new faculty did state they felt that they had developed more thorough understandings of how to approach challenges through their engagement with the scenario learning process, and this improvement found some, albeit rather tentative, support in my evaluation of their written responses.

Thus, it seems that various indicators in the data, which were used to respond to each of the study’s sub-questions, point towards a fairly confident, affirmative response to the main research question: A process of regular group discussions among new faculty and teacher-educators that is centered on written scenarios, which are based on the actual learning experiences of master teachers and are tailored to match the contextual details of specific schools, do provide an effective tool for increasing novice faculty’s ability to feel successful and learn in their first year of teaching at an independent junior boarding school. By allowing them to learn about the importance of certain mindsets and knowledges while interacting with supportive colleagues and being guided by
experienced faculty, the new faculty were able to develop greater confidence in their own ability to do their jobs. Further, this process allowed the NF to have guided practice with challenging situations, which the NF would likely encounter in their work anyway— but most likely while alone—and thus benefit from some of the wisdom of experience to which they would not otherwise have ready access. Scenario learning discussions also seemed to allow them to begin development of a specific protocol or approach to situations that relies more on rational analysis than on instinctual response. In sum then, the learning scenario process shows real promise as an effective and administratively feasible technique for accelerating the learning of new and novice faculty in junior boarding schools.

Since the intent of this study was to investigate whether a tool could be developed that allowed independent school teacher-educators and administrators to facilitate and accelerate the learning of the new faculty in their schools, with all of these schools’ contextual individuality, it seems important to view this potential tool from their perspective. Within this frame, the technique may have particular merit. Foremost in this regard may be that scenario discussions provide administrators and educators a way to develop new faculty skills in areas that are often difficult to even observe. By surfacing the new faculty’s thought processes, if only in proxy form, to challenging but relatively common experiences, the teacher-educator could at least have some, reasonably valid indications of how a new teacher was performing in these sorts of situations. This would then allow the teacher-educator to better support and guide the NF’s learning. Further, such a process could likely be implemented using already established meeting times, and offers the prospect of allowing new faculty to learn lessons that might take years to learn.
in a less structured form of learning. Additionally, the new faculty seemed to find the process reasonably enjoyable, and other experienced faculty, both in my school and at others, have shown interest in and experimented with the tool. This indicates that teachers themselves find the tool useful. While this technique seems similar to the use of case studies, a well-established technique for facilitating learning in a number of professions, it has features that seem to make it particularly beneficial for use with adult learners in this context. Among the more important features of this process is that the socially constructed quality of their responses, reinforces using the team approach, one of the primary mindsets that appears important at these JBSA schools.

It also seems true that the process could be fairly easily implemented in almost any context by following a less complex process. Even a less involved process, particularly for gathering the source scenarios themselves, could potentially help schools to develop important relational skills and knowledge of the craft of teaching in their new faculty in areas in where it is often hard to help them learn. However, it also seems worth pointing out that the more involved development process that this study documents could help schools to clarify and better understand the priorities and values of its faculty, thus allowing for a clearer picture of the school’s culture. Additionally, the learning scenario process takes only a modest amount of time, requires few resources, and costs little, never bad qualities in the professional development realm where significant sums can be expended on conferences and visiting presenters. Finally, and not insignificantly, the learning scenario process makes excellent use of what may be a boarding middle school’s most valuable and renewable resource, its experienced and dedicated faculty.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Master Teacher Interview Protocol

Master Teacher Interview Protocol

Interviewee: ___________________ Date: ___________________
Interviewer: ___________________ Location: ___________________

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me. I appreciate your help with this, and I hope that what I develop out of this and the other interviews that I am doing will prove useful to you.

My goal for this interview is to learn more about what you see as the most important experiential learning events that you have had as you developed into the teacher you are today. I am trying to identify, as much as may be possible, the types of experiences that master teachers feel helped them the most to develop into skilled and confident professionals. There are no right or wrong answers; I am seeking to learn as much as I can about how good teachers have developed their practice while they were engaged in that practice by trying to locate and understand their key learning experiences.

In the final write up of this study, no teachers will be identified by name or school. Pseudonyms will be used and, as much as is possible, all personal and school identifying information will be removed.

With your permission, I would like to record this interview. The recording will then be transcribed, and I will share that transcription with you to make sure it is accurate.

Brief Background Questions (if necessary):

How long have you been a teacher at an independent boarding school?

Was this school your first job in teaching?

When during your career were you first given some administrative responsibilities?

What coursework in teaching, if any, did you have in college or graduate school?

Questions

1) In your current position at school, what role do you play in helping novice faculty learn about there jobs? Please provide 2 examples and explain.

2) What were the biggest challenges you faced when you began your teaching career?

   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   a) How confident were you that you would do a good job teaching in this context?
   b) Did you feel adequately prepared to be a teacher when you first started working in an independent boarding school? Why or why not?
   c) Were there particular skills or knowledges that you felt you lacked? What were they? Please provide two examples and explain.
   d) Do you feel that you acquired those skills? If so, how long did it take to do so? Please provide two examples and explain.
3) Can you describe in some detail four or five experiences that you had in the first two or three years of your career as a teacher at a boarding school that you feel were particularly important to your development as a professional in all aspects of your work (classroom, sports, dorm)?

Follow-up questions and prompts:
   a) Can you give me a few more specifics about that incident (time of year, time of day, others who were present, etc.)?
   b) Can you articulate a general or abstract lesson for each learning experience that you then applied to your future work?
   c) Were there specific points in your career when you had more of these sorts of experiences? Do you still have them?
   d) Was there any information that you could have been provided with that would have supported or accelerated your learning?

4) If they reply that they play some role:
   4a) When you advise novice or younger faculty, do you cite experiences from your own career? If so, which experiences do you cite and why? Please provide two examples and explain.
      Follow-up questions and prompts:
      i) Do you feel that you are able to convey what you learned from these experiences to novice teachers? Why or why not?
      ii) How do you try to do this? Please provide two examples and explain.
   4b) Do you feel that you're sharing of your own experiences with novice faculty helps them? If no, why not? If yes, in what ways? Please provide two examples and explain.
      Follow-up questions and prompts:
      i) Are there particular experiences that you relate to novice faculty more often than others? Which ones?
      ii) Do novice faculty ever ask you if you have had an experience that was similar to something they are dealing with? If yes, Please provide two examples and explain.

If they reply that they do not play some role in helping novice faculty learn about their jobs:
   4c) In your opinion, what knowledge or training do you feel would help novice faculty most to learn about their work at school?
   4d) What are the biggest obstacles to novice faculty learning about their jobs? Please provide two examples and explain.

5) Is there anything else you would like to add, such as suggestions for improving how schools help new teachers learn about life and work at school?

Conclusion
Thanks for taking the time to meet with me. I know how busy you are. I will get a copy of the transcript to you as soon as possible for your review, and I hope we can quickly check in, after you have had a chance to look at the transcript, to discuss its accuracy and whether there is something that you feel needs clarification. Are there any questions about anything that I can answer for you now?
## Appendix 2: Key Code Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering Consequences</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of administering consequences (discipline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing Conflicting Demands and Being Flexible</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of balancing conflicting demands that might be generated by an event/situation and/or being flexible in their responses to an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of building relationship with others (students, parents, colleagues, administrators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Boundaries</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of establishing social/emotional boundaries with students, colleagues, and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and Planning</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of being organized and having plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of considering different perspectives/viewpoints (parent, student, other teachers, administrators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of being a role model for other students or colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School culture</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of considering the particular culture of the school in regards to a situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of managing one's own emotions and how they are manifested in one's actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Approach</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of working as part of a team with other faculty, parents and administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Middle School Students</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of understanding the developmental qualities of middle school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with English Language Learners</td>
<td>Descriptions of events/things that helped the respondent learn about factors involved with or the importance of understanding issues related to being an English language learner with in the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: General Self-Efficacy Scale

General Self-Efficacy Scale

Name: __________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________

Instructions
Read each of the statements below and check the box that best fits your level of agreement with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Preference</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will be able to achieve most of the goals I set for myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When facing difficult tasks, I am certain I will accomplish them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I think I can obtain outcomes that are important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even when things are tough, I can perform very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5: Sample Learning Scenario with Prompts

Introduction
• Throughout the year, we will use short scenario workshops to help you anticipate some of the challenges you might face in the near future and throughout your career. These scenarios will touch on different aspects of your teaching life at school.
• In doing so, we hope to help you recognize and understand some of the different factors that will affect your work with students, parents and colleagues. Further we hope that you might develop a pattern for response or protocol that will aid you in meeting a variety of challenges over time.
• There are no right or wrong answers to the scenarios. Most situations can be addressed effectively addressed in a number of ways.
• We want you to honestly express your ideas and questions about each scenario, testing out different approaches you think might be effective. We also want you to listen carefully to the questions and ideas of others, looking for their helpful insights.
• We hope that by thinking through these scenarios together, we- and this includes the session leaders as well- all will become more effective teachers in the different areas of school life.

Learning scenario for novice faculty to be used immediately before first weekend.
Stages will be presented on individual slides of a PowerPoint presentation so “where it is going” is uncertain. The prompts are questions for a session facilitator to ask and are not on the slides.

Stage 1
It is Sunday morning at 9:45 on the first weekend of school, and you are on duty on the second floor of Kravis House. The new students returned a few hours ago from a somewhat soggy New Student Camp Out, and the dorm is largely quiet. You are sitting in the common room, preparing for the next day’s classes, with a few students there who are on their computers. Bill, a returning Sixth Former whom you have been told is a good leader, comes up to you and says that he just walked by a Third Former’s room and the boy, whose name he doesn’t know, is crying.

Prompts:
- Does this seem like something that requires action? Why?
- What resources do you have right now?
- What potential problems could you anticipate?
- Are there issues that might call for some special attention?

Stage 2
There are no other faculty on the dorm floor at this time, so you go to the boy’s room and see that the Third Former is Nick who is an African American student from
Brooklyn. The door is open, and he is alone in the room, with no lights on, lying face down on the bed, clearly sobbing. You do not really know Nick at all, except by name, and you have not heard any discussion in the dorm faculty meeting that he is homesick. However, he has been called a “bit of an itch” by one of the senior faculty in the dorm.

Prompts:
- Has anything changed your assessment of whether action is required?
  Why?
- Are there resources that seem particularly applicable?
- What potential problems could you anticipate?
- Are there issues that might call for some special attention?

Stage 3
You pull a desk chair over to his bed, which is the lower bunk of bunk beds, and ask him if there is anything you can do. At first he doesn’t reply, and then when you say his name again, he lifts his head up and almost shouts, “I hate it here and I want to go home.”

Prompts:
- What might you want to learn?
- What types of information that you learn might influence your course of action?
- What resources might you possess as a specifically new teacher that would give some leverage?
- What potential problems could you anticipate?
- Are there issues that might call for some special attention?

Intentional aspects of scenario:
- Incomplete information
- The faculty member is alone
- The potential for “bad” information
- Lack of established relationship with the student
- The need for a prompt response
- Other students being present
Appendix 6: Scenarios Discussed with New Faculty

Scenario 1: First Class
Stage 1
It is the end of second period on Friday, September 9, and the bell will ring soon to mark the start of the transition to C block and your first class of the year. It is a Colonial History class with 11 students in it. In the class there are 4 new students who are repeating the eighth grade, 4 returning students, and 3 new ELL students.

Stage 2
As you head out of the faculty area in the LC just after the bell rang, you encounter Jim, one of your new student advisees, who doesn’t know where he needs to go for his next class. You ask him to show him the schedule you gave him but he does not have it.

Stage 3
When you arrive in the classroom, 7 of the students are already there and seated, 3 more arrive shortly after you do and take seats together and one student arrives just as the bell rings.

Scenario 2: Meeting Parents
Stage 1
It is the day new students arrive and you are hanging out in the common room with your housemaster, Erica and another non-dorm faculty member from the dorm. At 11:45 a.m. a pair of what seems to be parents and their Eaglebrook age son walk in from the foyer.

Stage 2
After Erica introduces herself and you, the parents, who aren’t wearing their nametags, introduce themselves and you realize that they are the Millers, the parents of one of your new Fifth Former advisees, John. They are from Chelmsford, MA and you know from reading their file that they are new to boarding school. The parents have described their son as apprehensive about going away to school.

Stage 3
Since you don’t have your own apartment in the building, Erica says that you can use her apartment to talk with the Millers, and you all walk together to Erica’s place on the first floor. You can see John peering into rooms as they walk by, but he looks to you to be more inquisitive than scared.

Scenario 3: First Practice
Stage 1
The first day of practice for the fall season is coming up. You are coaching Thirds soccer. Although you never played the sport, you were a two-sport athlete in high school and consider yourself pretty athletic. However, it’s been several years since you have even
kicked a soccer ball. Your co-coach, Gene, has been coaching the team for several years, but you do not know him well and have had little interaction with him in the fall, and the first practice is tomorrow afternoon.

Stage 2
You and your co-coach decide to have a meeting to decide on the plan for the day’s practice. Unfortunately you don’t share a free period and have to meet quickly after lunch. Gene says not to worry about it as he’s got a plan. After a warm-up jog and some stretching you’ll have a team meeting to talk about the goals for the year. He then rushes off to his class.

Stage 3
As you are conducting the meeting, one of the boys asks, whether you played in college. Your colleague interjects, seeming to you to clearly intend to be facetious in a lighthearted way, that you were the MVP and scoring leader on your team at Bates.

Scenario 4: First Night’s Homework
Stage 1
It is Friday September 9, the first day of classes. You are assigned to teach a Beginning French class that meets in block C. You arrive early for class, set up your computer and project information about the class on the white board including an assignment for the night. After you introduce yourself and write the night’s homework on the board—reminding them that it will also be posted on Google Classroom, Bill, a tall mature looking Sixth Former, raises his hand and says politely that you are not supposed to give homework on the first night.

Stage 2
You respond to Bill saying that you’ll look into it, but for now, everyone should assume that the work you have just assigned is due the next day. Leon chimes in, maybe a bit aggressively, saying, “Bill’s right. We’ve got no study hall tonight and none of the other teachers have assigned them any homework because everyone’s taking the summer reading tests tomorrow in their English classes.”

Stage 3
Calmly, you say that you were not told this, and you will look into it after class. Further you say that if it turns out that you were not supposed to assign homework that night, you will let them know on Google Classroom. With that, you turn to the work you had planned for class and the rest of the class proceeds without incident.

Scenario 5: Late for Light’s Out
Stage 1
It’s 9:55 p.m. on a Monday towards the end of January in the Flagler House where you live. You are tired as you were on duty the preceding weekend and you are looking
forward to flopping on the couch and putting your feet up you’ve been going around the floor to each room asking the Sixth Formers to get ready for bed. Almost everyone on the floor has been fairly compliant and looks about ready for bed except for the double at the far end of the hall where Jorge and Dan, who is your advisee, live. They don’t seem to have moved from their desks. You’ve always told them that being on time for bed is a “non-negotiable” because getting proper rest was critical for everyone, students and faculty alike. You have stated that if someone fails to meet their bedtimes, then you will wake them up early in the morning.

**Stage 2**
When you return to Jorge’s and Dan’s room, you can feel yourself getting a little angry. Jorge is a student from Monterey, Mexico and Dan is from New Hampshire. They have been good kids for most of the year and they are one of the easier rooms to manage on the floor. As you walk in the door of their room you say, “I can’t believe that you are not ready for bed. This is something we have talked about many times. Haven’t you two been listening? Dan, you in particular, you know the rules and you got a lot at stake right now with secondary school acceptance coming out soon.” Dan rolls his eye, an unusual act for him, and he says, “Why don’t you talk to my bio teacher about it. He gave us tons of homework and if I fail bio, I’m not going to secondary school anyway.”

**Stage 3**
You finally say, “You’ve got 10 minutes to get ready. If you are not in bed within that time, I am going to wake you up at 6 in the morning for the rest of the week.”

**Scenario 6: Cynical Colleague**

**Stage 1**
In the first full faculty meeting of the year, you sit at a table in the library with two other faculty. One is Cheryl, a Spanish teacher in her 3rd year at EBS who lives in your dorm, and Ryan, a history teacher who lives off campus and has been at EBS for 30 years. Cheryl has been particularly kind and helpful to you in the first few days, but you have not really met Ryan before. The admission office is doing its presentation on the new students, and they beginning to talk about Ricardo a new ninth grader from Mexico. You hear Ryan say, “Jesus, another Mexican? Aren’t there enough at school already?”

**Stage 2**
After this statement you look up and see Cheryl rolling her eyes, but Ryan acts as if nothing remarkable has been said and he goes back to flipping through the magazine on the table. Throughout the meeting Ryan seems bored and disengaged and there are a few other moments where he mutters something cynical about what is being discussed.

**Stage 3**
The meeting, which ended up lasting about 2:30, ends, and you head up to alone lunch and Cheryl joins you.
Scenario 7: Homesick Campout (written response)
Stage 1
It is Sunday morning of the first weekend of school, the new students returned a few hours ago from a somewhat soggy camp out, and the dorm is largely quiet. You are sitting in the common room, preparing for the next day’s classes, when Bill, a returning Sixth Former, comes up to you and says that he just walked by a Third Former’s room and the boy, whose name he doesn’t know, is crying.

Stage 2
You go to the boy’s room and see that the Third Former is Nick, an African American student from Brooklyn. He is alone in the room, lying face down on the bed, clearly sobbing. You do not really know Nick at all except by name.

Stage 3
You pull a desk chair over to his bed and ask him if there is anything you can do. He replies very quickly, “I hate it here and I want to go home.”

Scenario 8: Innocent comment
Stage 1
Rich, the parent of Fred, a new Third Former, emails you, very concerned about how his son is adjusting to life at school. You had a good conversation with both parents at the opening of school, although they did seem a bit worried about how Fred might fare socially. In the email, Rich says their specific concern is that they are worried that Fred is not making friends and feels isolated in the dorm. Because you are off that afternoon, you respond with an email that tries to explain your view of Fred’s adjustment and puts their mind at ease. You write, “I know how you must feel with your son so far away from home, but from what I have seen in the dorm, Fred is doing fairly well and seems happy most of the time. The only time I have seen him upset is after he talks with you on the phone.” You go on to say that, you hope that you can talk with them soon about this.

Stage 2
Rich writes back almost immediately, that he is a bit insulted that you presume to know how he feels, and he wants to know right away what you plan to do about this situation.

Stage 3
You quickly reply by email that you think you should speak directly with them, and ask them what a convenient time to talk would be.

Scenario 9: Mountain Day Injury
Stage 1
It’s Mountain Day and you’re on the White Dot Trail with the Underformers. You have been hiking with Jamal and Dan, two Fifth Formers from your dorm, and made it about halfway up. You’ve been walking steadily yourself and are amazed at some of the boys who speed past you. In particular, you notice that Adrian, a “high-energy” Fifth Former whom you know because he sits at your table, practically seems to be running up the hill, jumping from boulder to boulder. You think to yourself that he might be being a bit reckless.

**Stage 2**
About five minutes later, as you look up the trail, you see Adrian slip and fall backwards bumping down as short rock face, maybe five feet in height. The fall doesn’t seem that dangerous and you think to yourself ”He’s going to pop up. He's going to be fine.” A minute or so later, as you continue towards the boy, you see that he is not getting up. You hustle up the mountain and see him lying there. He’s conscious but in obvious pain. There seems to be a good deal of blood on his face, and he is beginning to cry

**Stage 3**
You send Jamal and Dan back down the trail as you recall seeing the head of outdoor education program about 15 minutes back where he was stationed at a fork in the trail.

---

**Scenario 10: Locker Room Bullying**

**Stage 1**
It is 4:45 and you are on locker room coverage. As you circulate through the locker room, in the corner where the Third Form lockers are you find Julian a Third Former and two other Third Formers and Julian has clearly been crying. You ask if there is something the matter and he says “No nothing’s wrong. I just bumped my knee.”

**Stage 2**
When Julian starts to leave and is away from the other boys, you talk with him again, saying, “Julian, you really look upset. Are you sure there is nothing wrong?” His response is, “No. Nothing’s wrong. I can handle it.” And he moves quickly to the door.

**Stage 3**
Before dinner while waiting in the dining hall, you see Skip one of the other Third Formers with Julian in the locker room. You know Skip from the new student orientation. Since there are no other students nearby, you ask him what was going on that afternoon. He says that Julian had told him that Ed, a Fifth Former who also lives in Julian’s dorm, had been mean to him. You ask him to be more specific but he says that’s all he heard.

**Stage 4**
You see Julian’s adviser at dinner and ask him if there have been any issues between Julian and Ed, and he says none that he knows of. The adviser also adds that Julian can be a bit of an “itch” sometimes.
Scenario 11: Parents Arguing in Conference
Stage 1
It is the afternoon of Country Fair and you have been having parent teacher conferences, which have all gone fine. The next parents you are speaking with are JD’s. JD is a new 7th grader from Boca Raton, Florida who has been very cooperative in class and you find him likable and easy to work with. However, you are a little concerned about his difficulty with finding main ideas in reading selections which has led to his earning a couple of low quiz scores. The boy is earning a B in class but you have been scaffolding the work and meeting him for extra help. JD has ADHD, which is noted in the file, and you have been trying to follow the items noted in the IEP in class.

Stage 2
His parents, Judy and Steve, come in to the room. Both have very serious expressions on, and Judy is carrying a notebook and pen that she opens and prepares to take notes as soon as she sits down. When you bring up the issue of JD’s difficulty identifying main ideas, Judy maintains that it is related to his ADHD while Steve is adamant that it is more about JD’s not caring enough and his rushing through his work. Their discussion seems to become acrimonious, and Judy says in response to a statement by Steve, “That’s just stupid” to which Steve replies, “And your just making excuses for him, again.” They start to talk about difficulties he is having in other classes and seem similarly divided as to its roots. They are clearly very annoyed with each other.

Stage 3
You interject, saying “If I could just explain the steps I am taking right now.” and then you explain that you plan to have him put check marks in his texts where he thinks he has encountered a main idea. The parents accept this re-direct, but there is clearly a great deal of tension in the room. You learn later that they told Emily, JD’s advisor, that they were not sure if Eaglebrook is the right place for JD.

Scenario 12: Room Change
Stage 1
It is the beginning of the second term in December, and Leon, a Sixth Form advisee, has just been involved in a room change. He was moved from a single, which he liked and his parents have said that they felt the single helped him do better academically, into a double with Jaime, a fairly quiet and cooperative student from Mexico, whose English is still a bit weak. Although Leon and Jaime are friendly, they are not close and neither was terribly happy about the move. Your housemaster, Peter, has talked with both sets of parents, and although both sets of parents expressed some concerns, they seemed OK with it. However, you receive an email from Scott, Leon’s father, whom you met at Country Fair and feel you have a good relationship with, that says that he is concerned because of the room change. He feels that Leon is unhappy, and in particular, he says that Leon is upset that Jaime always has his “Mexican buddies” (the father’s words) in the room.
Stage 2
You email Scott back and arrange for a phone conversation. From observations and from what you have heard other faculty in the dorm say, Jaime does regularly seem to have friends over and they do seem to get a little boisterous. However, Leon has never expressed any problems with this to you or other dorm faculty.

Stage 3
When you call Scott, you start by asking him to explain what his concerns are. In addition to Scott’s feeling that the single is better for Leon academically, he also says that he doesn’t like that they are always in Leon and Jaime’s room speaking Spanish and he also says that Jaime’s friends tend to get into trouble and he worries that they will be a “bad influence” on Leon.

Scenario 13: Processing Issues
Stage 1
JD is a new student in your Fifth From history class. In class, he seems engaged by discussions most of the time, although he sometimes seems to become reticent or drift off a bit when discussions have been going on for a while. He also seems to have difficulty answering questions about more abstract ideas. While he is earnest, polite and, when in class, hardworking, he has had difficulty fully completing assignments and this has affected his grade. He often hands in work that is partially done and sometimes expresses surprise when you tell him that the assignment is incomplete. Also, he sometimes fails to answer all parts of assessment questions.

Stage 2
You have had JD come to your apartment of a couple of times for extra help. He has always seemed willing to come, and you have found the sessions productive. When he works with you and you walk him through the assignments, he does a good job on all parts of them.

You have regularly entered his incomplete assignments in feedback, and communicated at least weekly with the advisor. However, although JD has been attending library study hall for the past two weeks, there doesn’t seem much change in the quality of his work when he is working on his own.

Stage 3
In preparation for a phone call you have arranged with JD’s parents because they could not make it to Country Fair, you went to TED to see if there was anything there. You did see a statement that said that mom felt that JD had undiagnosed “processing issues” but there were no specific recommendations about what you should do.

Scenario 14: Pre-Vacation Conflict
Stage 1
It is two weeks until Thanksgiving break, and you are on duty on the second floor of Kravis House. While the dorm has gone pretty well this term, you do have a couple of ninth grade boys, Jose and Nathan, who tend to get a bit rambunctious and physical but it all seems good natured. In fact, on more than one occasion, you have engaged in a good-natured wrestling match with both of them yourself, and there had never been any trouble. You also feel that you have a very good relationship with them. It has been a busy day and you are just getting back to the dorm after sports, and you know that Fred and Susan, who live at the other end of the hall, are away until after dinner. As you come onto the floor, you see Jose and Nathan squaring up for what appears to be a “slap fight.” This is something you’ve seen before, and although it seems a bit rough to you, they are both smiling and appear to be in good moods.

**Stage 2**
As you walk by you say, “Lets try to keep a lid on this.” and you walk down the hall to your apartment, sit down on your couch, and start to work through the 20 emails that have come in during the afternoon while you were at sports. After you’ve been working for about 15 minutes, there is loud knocking at the door. It is Emile, an energetic Third Former, who says that there’s a “big fight” going on in the common room and as you look down the hall you can see the boys aggressively grappling with each other. It looks serious.

**Stage 3**
By the time you get to them in the common room, Leonard, a Sixth Former who has a reputation for being responsible, is actively trying to break up the fight between Jose and Nathan, with little success, and there are several other boys watching.

**Scenario 15: Stolen Headphones**

**Stage 1**
At 7:00 on Sunday night, Chris, a Fourth Former who is your advisee, comes to you and says that his expensive headphones have been stolen. He says he is sure that he left them on his desk Saturday night but just noticed they are not there any more. He says he suspects Sam, a Sixth Former, who has been having some difficulty throughout the fall mostly as a result of being disrespectful of teachers, has taken the headphones. Chris’s roommate says he thought he saw Sam with the headphones earlier in the day. You have seen Chris and Sam together on more than one occasion, and they generally seem on friendly terms. The other faculty member on duty is Jeff, who is a fifth year faculty member.

**Stage 2**
Jeff goes to Sam and asks him if he has taken the headphones and Sam says no, but he maintains that Chris has leant them his headphones before. Jeff tells Sam that he needs to search his room just to be sure that he has not taken them. Sam tells him to “Go ahead.” When Ben does so, he so he discovers the headphones next to the wall behind some boxes underneath Sam’s bed. When they are discovered, Sam maintains he has no idea
how they got there. When Chris is interviewed again he says that he has lent the headphones to Sam before but not recently.

**Stage 3**
Eventually Sam admits to the Director of Residential life that that he had “borrowed” the headphones from Chris’s room but was planning to give them back. When asked why he lied about having them, he says that he had forgotten that he had borrowed them.

A formal Incident Response meeting is called in the assistant headmaster’s office, and this is the first such meeting you have ever been involved in. The director of residential life, the assistant headmaster, Ben, your housemaster, Jeff and Bill, Sam’s advisor, are in the room when you arrive. After reviewing the facts, Bill suggests that he thinks that several weeks of campus restriction, probation, and a call to parents is appropriate. This situation seems extremely serious.

**Scenario 16: Sent to Office (2nd written response)**

**Stage 1**
In your Sixth Form Biology class, Jimmy, a returning Sixth Former, has been “pushing the limits” in class in a variety of ways by being late to class, talking with his neighbors when you are presenting, and asking irrelevant questions. You’ve put him on feedback a couple of times for this and told him that continued poor behavior would “affect his grade.” Finally, one Thursday morning after a Home Night, you ask him for an assignment that he did not hand in the day before. He says, apparently dismissively, “Are you kidding? It was Home Night.” To this you reply “Alright, I’ve had enough, I think you need to talk to Mr. Cyr-Mutty about this. You need to go to his office right now.” He replies “Fine! This is a worthless class anyway.” and leaves, leaving his book bag in the room.

**Stage 2**
You go to Paul’s office after class, and Jimmy is there sitting on the couch. Paul says that Jimmy hasn’t been able to really explain why he was sent from class.

**Stage 3**
After Jimmy leaves, Paul asks if you have talked with Mark, Jimmy’s advisor, and you say you have not, but you’ve written him a couple of times, and he hasn’t done anything. You go on to say that Jimmy is ruining your class and someone needs to do something. After listening to you for a few minutes as you recount Jimmy’s misbehaviors, Paul says “Ed, I think that the more you try to deal with this on your own, the better.”
Appendix 7: Written Scenario Protocol

Written Scenario Protocol

Introduction
This open response questionnaire is intended to both provide you and me with an indication of what your thought process is like in regards to events that you might encounter in your work at school, and to help me understand better if our use of scenario learning is helpful to you in your work. Although this questionnaire is not anonymous, it is not intended as a type of evaluation, and you will not be judged professionally on the quality of your response.

You will have ten minutes to read and respond to each prompt, and please do not worry about grammar etc. I am only interested in the content.

In order to see the next stage of the scenario, you'll need to submit your response to the preceding stage, and you will not be able to go back and alter responses once they have been submitted.

There is no specific length for this although 5-to-7 sentences seems about right.

I will answer general questions before we begin but after that I'd like for everyone to work independently.

Thanks for your help with this project.

Paul

Stage One
It is Sunday morning of the first weekend of school, the new students returned a few hours ago from a somewhat soggy camp out, and the dorm is largely quiet. You are sitting in the common room, preparing for the next day's classes, when Bill, a returning Sixth Former, comes up to you and says that he just walked by a Third Former's room and the boy, whose name he doesn't know, is crying.

An “open comment” box follows stage.

Stage Two
You go to the boy’s room and see that the Third Former is Nick, an African American student from Brooklyn. He is alone in the room, lying face down on the bed, clearly sobbing. You do not really know Nick at all except by name.

Stage followed by an “open comment” box.

Stage Three
You pull a desk chair over to his bed and ask him if there is anything you can do. He replies very quickly, “I hate it here and I want to go home.”

Stage followed by an “open comment” box.

Closing
That's it. Thank you for your help. I will have you complete a similar questionnaire in November.

If you have any thoughts about this questionnaire, please feel free to share them with me.

Paul
### Appendix 8: Scenario Response Scoring Rubric

**Scenario Response Scoring Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Applicable to scenario: (yes/no)</th>
<th>Not at all (0 pt.)</th>
<th>Somewhat (1 or 2 times) (1 pt.)</th>
<th>Significantly (2 pt.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perspectives (building relationships, ELL, MSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assesses perspectives, developmental needs and backgrounds of participants and self with regard situation and how it might affect actions and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boundaries establishing boundaries, role modeling, self management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assesses need to maintain proper/constructive social/emotional boundaries and model appropriate behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plans (Administering consequences, Organization and planning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assesses need to formulate a plan and/or consequences that balance requirements of situation with other demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resources: (team approach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assesses available human and physical resources as well as types of communication needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assesses the view of the school and its culture of an issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assesses how urgent an action a response to the situation is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of “applicable”: ____________________________

Total score of subject: ____________________________

Potential Rubric Range: 0 to 12

Range will vary based on scenario. Not very scenario will necessarily call for consideration of all the factors from the rubric, thus every “range” will vary based in the rubric. Ultimately this would mean that inter-observer agreement on the total for scenario would be ideal.
Appendix 9: Focus Group Protocol

Focus Group Protocol

Participants: ___________________________    Date: ___________________________

Introducer: ___________________________    Location: ___________________________

Introduction
Thank you for taking the time to meet with me. We appreciate your help with this research project and hope that what we develop out of it will prove useful to you and to the other new faculty who will follow you in the future.

The goal of this group discussion is for us to learn more about whether the scenario discussions you have participated in over the last few months were useful to you. We are trying to determine if the discussion of scenarios is a technique that we should continue using, and if so, which aspects of it are most and least useful. There are no right or wrong answers, and your input is extremely valuable in helping us to develop the most useful tools possible for helping new faculty to learn about the important aspects of their jobs.

In the final write up of this study, no teachers will be identified by name. Pseudonyms will be used, and as much as is possible, all personally identifying information will be removed.

With your permission, I would like to record this focus group. The recording will then be transcribed, and we will share that transcription with all of you so you can help insure that it is accurate.

Focus Group questions more closely and exclusively focused on the issue of self-efficacy, not whether or not they felt that using the scenarios made them more effective as professionals.

I will make sure to have questions in the focus group protocol that address whether the scenarios addressed issues that closely mirrored what they felt were actual (real world) challenging experiences or if there were ones that did not.

Questions
1) How confident were you that you would do a good job teaching in this context?
   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   a) Did you feel adequately prepared to be a teacher when you first started working here?
   b) Has your level of confidence in yourself changed?
   c) Do you feel that discussing the scenarios helped you develop confidence in your abilities to meet challenges? Please provide examples and explain.

2) What were the biggest challenges you have faced so far in becoming the teacher, coach and adviser you want to be?
   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   a) What experiences or information that you gained before you came to Eaglebrook were most valuable to you in handling these challenging moments?
   b) What experiences or lessons that were part of your new faculty induction helped you most in handling these situations? Please provide two examples and explain.
3) In what ways, if any, were the scenario discussions helpful to you in working through those challenging moments?
   
   3a) If they were helpful, in what ways were they helpful? Please provide an example and explain.

   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   
   i) Were there specific questions asked during the scenarios that helped the most?
   ii) What features of the scenarios themselves would you change to make the sessions more helpful or useful?
   iii) What features of the scenario discussions would you change to make the sessions more helpful or useful?

   3b) If they were not helpful, can you explain why you thought they were not helpful?

   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   
   i) Were there some other activities you thought would have been a better use of your time? What are those? How do you think they would have been helpful?
   ii) Are there features of the scenarios themselves or the discussions that could change to make the sessions more helpful or useful? Please provide examples and explain.

4) Were there particular scenarios that you found especially helpful? If so, which ones?

   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   
   a) What do you feel you learned from that/those scenario(s)?
   b) Were you able to apply specific knowledge learned from this scenario in a future situation or was there something else that made it valuable? Please provide examples and explain.
   c) Were there specific scenarios and discussions that were not particularly useful or helpful? If so, which ones? Please provide examples and explain.

5) Please explain or describe any type of general approach you have for the way you handle challenging moments in your work?

   Follow-up questions and prompts:
   
   a) In what ways, if any, has participating in the scenario discussions has helped you develop that approach to future experiences?
   b) If so, what specifically has changed in the way you approach challenging moments in your work?

6) Do you have any suggestions from your own recent experience for other scenarios?

   a) Would you each of you like to share one?

7) Is there anything else that any of you would like to add?

Conclusion

Thanks for taking the time to meet with me. I know how busy you all are. I will get a copy of the transcript out to each of you as soon as possible for your review. After you have reviewed it, please let me know if there is something that you feel needs clarification. Are there any questions about anything that I can answer for you now?
Appendix 10: Survey Protocol
Survey Protocol-questions supplemental to focus group questions

Introduction
While I am very reluctant to give you something else to do at this time of year, I am hoping that you might take a few moments to complete this survey to give me feedback both on our use of scenarios and the meetings we have held to help you learn about your work at Eaglebrook. I truly hope you can be open and honest in your answers, and I encourage you to not spare my feelings.

Please remember that these responses will not be used by the school to evaluate you in any way. They will be used only to help me and the school learn. I am interested in making the introduction of New Faculty to the school as helpful and worthwhile as possible, and if something is not helping to achieve that goal, then I would like to know that.

The questions that have asterisks are required questions, but please don't feel you have to give any and/or lengthy responses in the comment boxes unless you feel you have something you want to share. My estimate is that the survey will take somewhere between 5 and 15 minutes to complete.

If possible I'd like to have your responses in by Monday 11/14, and I will send out a reminder later in the week if it is needed.

I truly appreciate your investment and involvement in all the elements of this project, particularly as it has meant some extra work for you.

Paul

Questions
1) How confident were you when you started this year that you would do a good job teaching in this context? (multiple choice; response options: not at all, a little, confident, very confident)

2) Do you feel that level of confidence justified? (not at all, a little, usually, very)
   2a) Why or why not? (open response)

3) Do you feel more confident now than when you started the year? (multiple choice; response options: not at all, a little, usually, very)

4) Was the week of new faculty meeting before school helpful (multiple choice; response options: not at all, a little, usually, very)
   4a) What activities or presentations helped most? (open response)
   4b) What activities or presentations helped least? (open response)
   4c) Do you have any suggestions about how to make them better? (open response)

5) Were the weekly new faculty meeting helpful? (multiple choice; response options: not at all, a little, usually, very)
   5a) What activities or presentations helped most? (open response)
   5b) What activities or presentations helped least? (open response)
   5c) Do you have any suggestions about how to make them better? (open response)
6) What were/are the biggest challenges you have faced in becoming the teacher, coach and adviser you want to be? (open response)

7) Did the scenarios address any of these challenges in a useful way? (multiple choice: not at all, a little, usually, very)

8) Have the scenario sessions been helpful to you in learning to teach at Eaglebrook? (multiple choice: not at all, a little, often, always)

9) What has been most valuable or useful about the sessions? (open response)

10) What was least valuable or useful about the sessions? (open response)

11) What would you change about how them (e.g. timing, length, number, stages, other people being involved) (open response)

12) Do you have any type of general approach for the way you handle challenging moments in your work? (multiple choice: yes, no, not sure)
   If so please explain this approach briefly: (open response)

13) Was the presentation of categories to consider (perspective, boundaries, urgency etc.) helpful? (multiple choice: not at all, a little, usually helpful, always helpful)
13a) Have you used these categories at all to guide you in your work? (multiple choice: not at all, a little, frequently, always)

14) Were there scenarios you remember specifically? Which ones? (open response)

15) Have you had any experience here or elsewhere that you think might make good learning scenarios? Please sketch them out very briefly. We can follow up about them later. (open response)

16) Did you feel you were being evaluated by me or Eaglebrook based on how you responded to the scenarios? (multiple choice: not at all, a little, frequently, very much)

17) If you have any thoughts you like to share with me on this general topic, please use this space to do so. (open response)

**Closing**

Thank You

I appreciate all your work and patience through the summer and fall in helping me with this project. Your insights and feedback will prove invaluable to me both in my work at Penn and with the New Faculty in the future.
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