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Abstract

Studies conducted in a Western context have shown that there are multiple factors coming into play to make Teachers Professional Development (TPD) a strategic and powerful tool for improving teacher instructions. However, there have been few studies in Indonesia to also confirm the existing literature. Common influential factors identified by Opfer and Pedder (2011a) that influence TPD are learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions.

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the nature of teacher professional development (TPD) in an Indonesian context by investigating the three factors identified by Opfer and Pedder (2011a) that influence TPD — learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions. Three research questions were posed to guide data collection in the study: 1) What are the features of TPD learning activities in which teachers participate and what are teachers’ perceptions about their TPD learning activities?; 2) What teacher characteristics influence their learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?; and 3) At the school level, what influences support, or impede, teacher learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?.

The methodology involved conducting case studies in three schools in three different regions in South Sulawesi province in Indonesia. This study employed a holistic multiple case study design in which questionnaires and interviews were used to collect data about teachers’ experiences and perceptions toward their professional learning. A case study for each school was constructed as well as a cross-case analysis to compare findings from the three case study schools.
This study provided several key findings about the nature of TPD in the three case study schools. First, consistent with the existing literature, learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions were present and influential for teacher professional learning in each of the case study school. Second, the influences of these three factors varied in emphasis across the three case study schools. That is, one factor had a stronger influence on teacher professional learning than others and each school in regard to TPD operated similar to a complex system. Third, another influence on TPD in the three case study schools, which added to the factors identified by Opfer and Pedder (2011a), was the socio-political context of Indonesian education system. In Indonesian context, the bureaucratic control and authoritarian structure has long been entrenched in Indonesia’s education system which also significantly influences the practice of TPD.

The main implication of this study is that although the TPD in each school was influenced by the learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions, these did not occur equally in the schools. Whilst they vary in emphasis, it is the combination of different influences that make each school a complex TPD system and this needs further research to understand the dynamics and interrelationships of factors influencing TPD.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

Teacher professional development (TPD) has become a major part of most educational reforms around the globe. In Indonesia, after decades of concentrated efforts on quantity measures such as increased access, enrolment, and extension of education, the current educational initiatives and policies in Indonesia are geared toward improving the quality of education through improvement of teachers’ quality (Raihani & Sumintono, 2010; World Bank, 2010). In this respect, TPD is essential because “if we want schools to produce more powerful learning on the part of students, we have to offer more powerful learning opportunities to teachers” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, pp. 1013-1014). Indeed, research on TPD suggests that teacher learning improves teachers’ knowledge, instructional practices and efficacy (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; Ingvarson, Meiers, & Beavis, 2005; Parise & Spillane, 2010; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007), has significant impacts on students’ learning and achievement (Bruce, Esmonde, Ross, Dookie, & Beatty, 2010; Fishman, Marx, Best, & Tal, 2003; McCutchen et al., 2002) and is employed as a lever for educational improvement at both the school and system-wide levels (Doecke et al., 2008). The general agreement from these findings is that TPD is crucial in any educational reform, be it for teachers, schools, systems and more importantly, students.

The question now becomes how to make TPD a powerful learning opportunity for teachers. Researchers have made several recommendations. For example, a group of researchers has argued the need to focus the content of TPD programs on students’ learning and teachers’ instructional problems as opposed to emphasising skill development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Desimone et al., 2002; Knapp,
Another group has argued for reforming the types or forms of TPD. They argue for more active, constructive and reflective forms of TPD to replace passive, one-shot and authoritative types of TPD activities (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Ingvarson et al., 2005; S. M. Wilson & Berne, 1999). Others call for more TPD that is conducted in a collaborative and collegial environment (learning communities) to replace TPD activities that only offer individual development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Knapp, 2003; Putnam & Borko, 2000; S. M. Wilson & Berne, 1999). These recommendations are certainly invaluable references which TPD providers can use when constructing TPD learning programs. However, it cannot be assumed that all these recommendations will work successfully in every context.

Research on TPD shows that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to develop a universally applicable set of TPD principles that works in every context (Guskey, 1994). Opfer and Pedder (2010), reviewing the literature on TPD, found inconsistent results in many studies on TPD. They argued that many TPD practices that are successful in one study do not yield similar success in others. In other words, ideas for successful TPD often do not replicate. Let us illustrate this with the issue of workshop training as one form of TPD learning activities. Workshop training has been widely criticised on the basis that it focuses primarily on expanding an individual repertoire of well-defined content and pedagogic knowledge and skills (Hawley & Valli, 1999). This focus is currently viewed as insufficient or incompatible with the current spirit of educational reform that emphasises collective learning (Knapp, 2003). Thus, many researchers propose alternative, reformed models of TPD such as actions research or lesson study to replace workshop training. However, Kelchtermans (2004), for example, argued that “exchanging the traditional workshop format for other activities
does not guarantee that the desired learning takes place” (p. 231). Kelchtermans further concluded that TPD has contextual characteristics that make it difficult to develop a solid overarching research-based theory that can be used to construct TPD practices that work in each and every context.

What follows from Kelchtermans’ argument is that successful TPD is not dependent solely on its content, structure and processes but is also shaped and conditioned by the arrangements, circumstances and conditions of the system or context in which it is implemented (Bolam & McMahon, 2004; Day & Sachs, 2004). This means that contextual differences have significant influence on TPD. Bolam and McMahon (2004) pointed out that

[T]PD policies and practices are necessarily rooted in the particular context of a single educational system and, indeed, are often the product of unique and dynamically changing sets of circumstances – political, economic, social, cultural, historical, professional and technical – in that system. (p. 35)

If teacher professional development is the product of a particular context, then TPD in an education system as large and diverse as Indonesia’s is a distinctive practice. There are various factors to be considered in developing TPD. They include the large numbers of teachers, the diversity teachers’ lives and work, and the nations’ historical, socio-economic and political influences. Therefore, it is very important to identify those factors that influence TPD, and to ascertain whether the current ideas regarding TPD are applicable in the Indonesian context.

1.2 Research Purpose and Questions

In the context of Western educational change, there are growing calls to conceptualise TPD as a complex system (Davis & Sumara, 1997, 2006; Gravani, 2007; Hoban, 2002; Opfer & Pedder, 2011a; Webster-Wright, 2009). Conceptualising TPD as a complex system implies that the system involves many interconnected components,
elements, parts or aspects (these words will be used interchangeably throughout the thesis) and that these components interact and combine in different ways depending on the situation, and further, that they are reciprocal and are always nested (Opfer & Pedder, 2011a). Whilst acknowledging this complexity, in this study I adopt Opfer and Pedder’s (2011b) position that delimits the numerous factors influencing TPD to three key influences:

[I]f we are to understand the potential of professional development to improve teaching and learning – and fulfil its promise as a mechanism for school improvement – then we must attend to three aspects of teacher professional learning: the characteristics of the individual teacher, the characteristics of professional development activities in which they participate, and the supports for professional learning provided by the school. (p. 6)

Thus, the purpose of the current study was to develop an understanding of the nature of TPD in an Indonesian context by researching three aspects/factors of TPD: learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions that influence teacher learning and change.

This study is framed by the following research questions:

1. What are the features of TPD learning activities in which teachers participate and what are teachers’ perceptions about their TPD learning activities?
2. What teacher characteristics influence their learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?
3. At the school level, what influences support, or impede, teacher learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?

1.3 The Contribution of this Study

This study is potentially significant in several ways. In general, the study provides insights into what factors influence TPD and the nature of their influences. The insights resulting from this study add to the discourse of multidimensionality of TPD.
That is, TPD is facilitated or restricted by the confluence of multiple factors and it is incomplete, partial or bias to understand, and thus to improve, TPD based on individual factor. In particular, most of the studies reported in the research literature on TPD have been conducted in Western, Anglo-Saxon contexts, and very little research about TPD has been conducted in the Indonesian context. As such, a context-based description and illustration of TPD practices in an education system as large and diverse as Indonesia’s will provide an important contribution to the ongoing discussion (in theory and practice) on what kinds of TPD ideas and practices may or may not work (or to what extent if they work) in a particular context.

1.4 Perspectives Informing the Inquiry

1.4.1 My Personal Perspective

As an officer at a governmental agency for educational quality assurance called Lembaga Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan (LPMP), I have first-hand experience with many of the government’s programs for educational quality improvement in general and for TPD in particular. The main duty of the agency for which I work is to ensure that the implementation of education at the provincial level is in accordance with national education standards and policies. The agency does this through monitoring and evaluation, providing technical assistance and delivering TPD programs for in-service teachers. As a program coordinator, I am responsible for the implementation and supervision of educational programs that are enacted by the central government. These are the programs that teachers are expected to implement and thereby produce better student outcomes.

To successfully implement a particular educational quality program that is initiated by the government, teachers are provided with a series of TPD learning activities. The TPD activities are not only meant to introduce what the program entails
but most importantly they aim to provide teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills to successfully implement the program. The premise is that if teachers are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to perform the program, then the expected outcomes will be achieved. Generally, the TPD learning activities are in the form of in-service training days, workshops and seminars in teachers’ schools or at the training facilities in my organisation.

In a typical in-service training held through my institution, teacher participants come from various backgrounds (regions, schools, career status and qualifications). Participants receive intensive lectures on specified educational topics (teaching methods, curriculum or assessment) from 08:00 to 17.00 during the day, with a second session in the evening from 19:30 to 21:30. Training instructors are also required to follow specified teaching methodologies to ensure that the same outcomes are acquired by all participants. In our terms, everything (content, processes and outcomes) must follow Petunjuk Teknis (Juknis, Technical Guidance). In most cases, the Juknis is established by my central office. The duration of this in-service training ranges from a one-day workshop to a 15-day in-service training program. To conclude the training session, a summative test and a questionnaire are administered to participants to evaluate teachers’ attainments against the training objectives and to gauge the effectiveness of the training process. A follow-up activity is conducted in the participants’ schools or classes to see how the teachers implement what they have learned. The activities vary from one program to another, but not all programs offer such follow-up.

When a program has a follow-up activity and I have had the chance to monitor and evaluate its implementation in schools, I have always found one disturbing fact. That is, most teachers do not enact what they are expected to do upon returning to their
classes from the training program, regardless of the efforts to standardise the delivery of training sessions. In my role, I have wondered about teachers’ experiences of the TPD training programs: What accounts for teachers’ failure to implement the expected outcomes? Do teachers really learn? If not, does it have something to do with the nature or characteristics of learning activities (contents, process and duration)? Does it have something to do with the characteristics of the teachers that results in their not learning what they are intended to learn? If they do learn, why they do not enact the learned knowledge and skills they have gained?

In conversations with teachers, I found that teachers often attribute “what and how they do things” in accordance with their school conditions. For example, in a training workshop for integrating information and communication technology (ICT) into the teaching and learning process, a group of teachers from remote areas reported (actually complained) to me that they liked and agreed with the idea of integrating ICT into the classroom, but asserted that it would just not work in their workplaces/schools where electricity had not been installed. In another case, teachers associated their lack of participation in TPD programs with a number of factors such as poor management and leadership by their principals, tight teaching schedules, or insufficient financial support from schools. I also heard stories about teachers who felt “lonely” when they tried to use new approaches they had learned in TPD programs. The loneliness was due either to their fellow teachers not appreciating or supporting the initiative, or to their schools not providing them with the necessary resources to put the approach into action. I observed that not many teachers succeeded in their lonely efforts to try an innovation in their schools/classes. What I learned from these teachers’ experiences is that the successful implementation of TPD in terms of its applicability or transferability into teachers’ schools/classrooms is to some degree dependent on the conditions in the
teachers’ schools. The issue of teachers’ low participation in TPD activities, and their inability to transfer knowledge from TPD activities into their schools and classrooms, suggests the need to consider school conditions.

Reflecting on my practices, I found that my perspective on TPD used to be atomistic (Webster-Wright, 2009). I used to think of TPD programs or learning activities as independent of teachers and school conditions. I assumed that once research-proven ideas or information were selected, qualified trainers chosen, and necessary learning resources provided, teacher learning and change would follow. All teachers would learn regardless of their personalities, status and circumstances. Also, knowledge would transfer to schools/classrooms despite the conditions in those schools/classrooms. My belief was deeply driven by a cause and effect principle similar to what Kazemi and Hubbard (2008) referred to as unidirectional conceptualisation: I assumed that once teachers participated in TPD learning activities, they would apply the ideas that were presented in TPD activities in their classrooms. However, as I considered all of the above experiences, the need becomes clear to consider other factors that may influence TPD practices. Hence, I embarked on the study of TPD in the Indonesian context to find out what influences shape teacher learning and change.

1.4.2 Theories and Concepts Framing the Inquiry

From my experiences and subsequent reading of literature, I found that there are four ideas that are closely related to the phenomenon examined in this study. The first idea is about teacher professional development. This idea is informed by the mounting research and discussion of TPD as a lever for education in general and as a mechanism for teacher quality improvement in particular. The second idea theme is about the characteristics of teachers. This theme relates to the discussion of teacher characteristics such as age, years of teaching experience, and educational qualifications, and how these
characteristics influence teacher learning and change. The third idea is about school-level influences. This idea explicates how schools become the immediate context for TPD and what factors at the school-level influence teacher learning and change. The fourth idea is about the complexity of educational practices, including TPD practices. With this in mind, it becomes necessary to draw on numerous or different pools of theories and concepts to generate meaning.

1.5 Definition of Terms

Definitions of key terms are essential to avoid ambiguity and semantic diversion. Evans (2002) commented on the importance of definitions by asserting that “[n]ot only would definitions … increase construct validity, they would also generally add clarity and reduce confusion by establishing shared meanings between those wanting to communicate ideas on the subject and those with whom they communicate” (p. 129). Therefore, the definitions for key terms used in this study are developed within and from the purpose, concepts and perspectives informing this study. Key terms and definitions in use for this study are as follows:

1. **Teacher professional development (TPD):** a learning activity, process or system established to help teacher learning and change.

2. **TPD learning activities:** the types, forms, or models of professional development activities either enacted by teachers or provided by other parties.

3. **Teacher characteristics:** the teachers’ cognitive, affective and emotional (e.g. prior knowledge, beliefs, and self-efficacy) attributes that may come into play to shape and influence their learning and change.

4. **School conditions:** the structures, resources, beliefs/norms and culture that exist at the school level that may influence teacher learning and change.
1.6 Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis is presented in nine chapters. This chapter, Chapter 1, provides an overview and rationale for the study, presents the research purpose and questions and consideration of the contribution of the study, and introduces the researcher’s perspective and theories and concepts informing and guiding the inquiry. Chapter 2 provides the contextual and historical background of the phenomenon under investigation. Chapter 3 reviews literature relevant to the thesis. Chapter 4 discusses and justifies the research methods employed in the study. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 present an individual case study for each school. Chapter 8 presents a cross-case analysis of the three cases. Chapter 9 concludes the thesis with discussion, implications of the study, limitations of the study and suggestions for further study and conclusions.
Chapter 2  Context of the Study

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a background for the study by locating the phenomenon under investigation within its moment; a moment that is shaped by social, economic and political circumstances in the country of Indonesia. The first part of the chapter traces the history of the national education system in Indonesia. The second part presents a description of the biographies of Indonesian teachers that includes teachers’ lives and work and pathways into the teaching profession. The characteristics of teachers’ professional development in Indonesia are discussed in the third section. The chapter concludes with the implication of these contextual background for this study.

2.2 Indonesia’s Education System

Indonesia’s education system is affected by a dynamic socioeconomic and geopolitical situation. In the history of Indonesia, “national education was an integrated part of the system of Indonesians’ struggle for freedom” (Tilaar, 1995, p. 26). Tilaar also noted that with hundreds of ethnic groups and multiple religions and beliefs around the country, education has been long regarded as a strategic instrument to promote and maintain the nation’s cohesiveness and integration. Also, as the fourth world’s most populous country, education is intimately linked to the nation’s economic development and competitiveness (Lee, 1995). In other words, the national education system reflects the character and goals of Indonesia as a nation. The history of Indonesia’s education system can be divided into five periods: 1) Dutch colonisation (c. 1840s–1942); 2) Japanese occupation (1942–1945); 3) Old order (1945–1965); 4) New order (1966–1998); and 5) Reformation (1998–present) (Bjork, 2005; Lee, 1995; Putrawan & Akbar, 2009; Sumintono, 2006; Tilaar, 1995).
The dates for each period are based on the number of years of a particular ruler in power. Each period imprinted particular influences on current educational practices. The goals of the contemporary education system, the function of schools, the role of teachers and government educational practices, for example, are all rooted in the past. Therefore, to have a better understanding of the current state of education in Indonesia, it is necessary to examine the development of the system with particular attention to key changes or influences.

2.2.1 Dutch Colonisation (c. 1840s–1942)

Prior to Dutch colonisation (i.e. prior to the 1840s), education was informally administered by families and communities. Indonesian youngsters gained their education either by informal apprenticeships (observing and participating) at their homes, in their communities or at places of worship (Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam) (Clark et al., 1998; Lee, 1995). Formal schools for Europeans, Eurasians (European-Indonesians), and the descendants of local Indonesian chiefs and princesses were introduced in the early years of Dutch colonisation. However, formal education for indigenous or native Indonesians was not available until the Dutch government established a three-year public elementary school system in 1849 (Djajadiningrat, 1942; van der Veur, 1969).

During the period of Dutch colonisation, the education system was based on social strata and nationality. The Dutch government’s discrimination on the basis of nationality and socio-economic status impacted on the administration of education during the Dutch colonial period. A dual education system was in operation during this time. Djajadiningrat (1942) termed these dual education systems as oriental education and occidental education. The oriental education system was composed of schools in which the local language was the medium of instruction. These were schools for the
masses (e.g. the native population) and were then divided into two groups: schools for children from higher social strata (the first class) and schools for children of lower social strata (the second class). In this system, schools only taught up to an intermediate level of elementary school (year 6). The occidental education system, on the other hand, was composed of schools in which instruction was given in the Dutch language. These schools were designed for descendants of European/Eurasian (European-Indonesian), “eastern foreigners” (some Arabs and Indians but mostly Chinese) and “special Indonesians” (local chiefs and princesses). Graduates from occidental schools could progress to secondary and university education.

Clark et al. (1998) highlighted that the education system during the period of Dutch colonisation reflected the power structure of this colonial society. Clark et al. described the Dutch colonial education system:

At the apex were the Dutch schools, identical in curricula and staffing to those in Holland and fully funded by the colonial government. At the bottom were village primary schools, furnishing a meager fare of subjects in local dialects and funded mainly by native princes. (p. 12)

The schools that used local languages were designed for the masses who would work in the native world, becoming farmers, fishermen or craftsmen. Meanwhile, the schools that used the Dutch language were intended for the smaller group of European/Eurasian and natives who would make careers in the “Western sector” and government agencies, as lawyers, doctors or engineers (Embree, Simon, & Mumford, 1934; van der Veur, 1969). In short, education in this period was designed for the benefit of the colonial regime – “to train native[s] so that they would be efficient workers for Western exploitation” (Embree et al., 1934, p. 97).

Apart from being discriminatory, elitist and exploitative, the education system under the Dutch colonial government was managed in a centralised manner (Tilaar,
The Dutch colonial government established an agency called the *Departement van Onderwijs en Eeredienst* (Department of Education and Public Worship) that, along with its representative offices in provinces, governed all educational matters from its office in Batavia (former name for Jakarta).

The formal schools in the Dutch education system were not the only options available to Indonesian children. There were also a large number of independent schools that operated throughout the archipelago without Dutch colonial government support. These schools included the most famous *Taman Siswa* (Garden of Pupils) schools which were founded by the well-known nationalist movement Ki Hadjar Dewantara, and *Pesantren* (Islamic boarding schools) that were founded by Islamic scholars. The development of the schools outside the Dutch system was instigated by three main factors: limited access to Dutch schools; a desire for more employment for natives; and an aspiration for a form of education that accommodated national ideas and culture (van der Veur, 1969). Tilaar (1995) pointed out that these schools became the historical ground for private and Islamic schools designated as a subsystem within the Indonesian national education system after Indonesia’s independence.

It was during the period of Dutch colonial rule that formal education was introduced to Indonesians. This formal education, although discriminatory, elitist, exploitative and centralised, opened up opportunities for many native Indonesians to have an education, even if only in a very basic sense. In 1942, the Dutch army surrendered to the Japanese military. This event ended an almost 350-year period of Dutch colonial rule and Dutch control over the education system in Indonesia.

### 2.2.2 Japanese Occupation (1942–1945)
During World War II, another foreign imperialist power dictated the form and focus of education in Indonesia. When the Japanese military replaced the Dutch as Indonesia’s rulers in 1942, they introduced a variety of significant changes to Indonesia’s education system. They overhauled the Dutch education system and created a new system that could be beneficial to their war effort.

Soon after the outbreak of Pacific phase of World War II, the Japanese military in Southeast Asia forced the surrender of the Dutch army in West Java on 9 March 1942. The Japanese sought Indonesian cooperation in their war efforts with its propaganda about creating a “Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere”. Thomas (1966) argued that this propaganda basically meant that the Japanese military aggression to Asian countries, including Indonesia, was intended to free East Asians from Western colonialism and to develop an area of mutual prosperity for East Asians. The propaganda also portrayed Japan as the more experienced older brother who would lead its younger-brother nations in the pursuit of this mutually beneficial future. It was no surprise, then, that all government systems underwent a complete overhaul during the Japanese occupation to support this objective.

In education, the Japanese military authorities instigated numerous fundamental changes. First, they abolished the complex Dutch colonial education system and introduced a standardised and simplified school system as a substitute (Lee, 1995). This system was comprised of the following stages: six-year primary, three-year lower secondary, three-year upper secondary and university. All children were eligible to be admitted to these schools regardless of their socioeconomic status. Second, and of particular importance, the Japanese eliminated the Dutch language as the medium of instruction and stipulated that *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian language), as the national language, was to be used in schools and in official communication (Clark et al., 1998;
Tilaar, 1995). Third, the Japanese instituted a decentralised administrative system. Unlike the Dutch colonial government whose educational policies emanated from a central office in Jakarta, the education system was now no longer governed from a single centre or a central office. Instead, educational matters were managed from the military headquarters in designated regions (e.g. the 25th Army controlled Sumatra, the 16th Army controlled Java etc.) (Thomas, 1966).

The focus of education, however, was mainly oriented toward supporting the Japanese military’s need to win World War II. During the Japanese occupation, school lessons and activities consisted primarily of strenuous physical drills, military training and indoctrination into Japanese culture (Bjork, 2005; Thomas, 1966). The Japanese military authorities replaced most academic-type schools with vocational ones. They banned private schools that did not have affiliation with organisations recognised by the Japanese authorities. They also banned the teaching of Dutch and other European languages and made the Japanese language a compulsory subject in primary and secondary education (Lee, 1995). All these policies were enacted to support the war effort.

When World War II ended in August 1945, the Japanese forces returned to their homeland but they had substantially changed the Indonesian education system. The ‘6-3-3’ schooling system that the Japanese authorities introduced for primary and secondary education, remains in the present system. Vocational schools also gained prominence during the period of Japanese occupation. However, due to the war, many of the educational ideas initiated by the Japanese authorities were not fully implemented. When Indonesia gained its independence in 1945, the education system that survived was fragmented and unfocused (Bjork, 2005).
2.2.3 The Old Order (1945–1965)

The war began to go badly for the Japanese in Asia at the beginning of 1945. Foreseeing that it might not win the war, the Japanese military authority “allowed” Indonesian nationalists to plan for the Independence of Indonesia. The Japanese military surrendered to the Allies on 15 August 1945. Two days after the Japanese surrender, on 17 August 1945, Sukarno and Mohammad Hatta proclaimed the independence of the Republic of Indonesia, with Sukarno as the president and Hatta as the vice-president.

Sukarno ruled the country for a twenty-year period which has been labelled the *Order Lama* (Old Order). According to Lee (1995), the Old Order was a period during which Indonesian educators and political leaders set the future form and direction of the Indonesian national education system.

The new government of the Republic of Indonesia’s first educational concern was access to schooling. The new republican government was concerned that schools were accessible only to certain social classes and, thus, proposed an egalitarian education system. The aspiration for an egalitarian education system manifested in *Undang-undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia 1945* (the Constitution of the Republic Indonesia, henceforth referred as the Constitution). Article 31, Point 1 of the Constitution declared that “[e]very citizen is entitled to education”. Following this constitutional directive, a single model of schooling was to be provided to all Indonesians regardless of their wealth or status.

The public school system during the period of the Old Order comprised primary schools (six years of schooling), lower and upper general and vocational secondary schools (three years each) and a small number of tertiary institutions. Students who previously had no access to education populated these schools in large numbers. After over three centuries of education only for the elite, the government under Sukarno made
education available to all Indonesian children regardless of their parents’ position or status.

In the period of the Old Order, the fundamental basis of the Indonesian national education was established. Education under both the Dutch and the Japanese was grounded on the ideology of the occupying power, not on Indonesia’s ideology. Therefore, Sukarno declared the national creed of *Pancasila* (the five principles of national identity of Indonesia) as the ideology underlying the Indonesia national education system (Tilaar, 1995). The Five Principles are: a belief in the One and Only God; a just and civilised humanity; the unity of Indonesia; democratic life led by wisdom of thoughts in deliberation amongst representatives of the people; and social justice for all people of Indonesia.

Upon independence from Japan, the government under Sukarno oriented the Indonesian education system toward nationalistic goals. Lee (1995) noted that "[s]chools were urged to instil the spirit of nationalism especially through daily singing of [the] national anthem and raising of the Republican flag” (p. 32). Lee also argued that the use of *Bahasa Indonesia* both as a compulsory language of instruction and as a subject in all levels of education significantly instilled in students a nationalistic spirit. At the time, for parents, sending children to schools was one way to participate in the nation building process. All in all, the architects of Indonesia’s first national education system regarded education as a strategic mechanism for promoting nationalism and national integration (Clark et al., 1998; Lee, 1995).

Religious and private schools were deeply rooted in Indonesian society. They had existed long before independence but they were often banned, restricted or subjected to very strict requirements by both the Dutch and Japanese occupying powers (Lee, 1995). In line with the new spirit of freedom, the Sukarno government made
special arrangements for religious and private schools and decided to separate religious schools from secular schools. This separation marked the creation of two major education streams in Indonesia: a secular system under the Ministry of Education and a religious one under the Ministry of Religious Affairs. The government also allowed private organisations to open and run private schools and provided them with technical and financial assistance.

Socio-political unrest and outbreaks of separatism characterised the Sukarno years. Initially, Sukarno addressed this instability by implementing a decentralised authority structure. However, as the situation worsened, he enacted more authoritarian policies and regulations. As a result, power became increasingly concentrated in the President which “led politicians to augment the authority accorded to central authorities and to reinforce top-down authority framework –trends that continued until the end of the [20th] century” (Bjork, 2005, p. 46). This instability had important implications for the national education system that was being formed. The most prevalent and obvious one was the excessive exploitation of the education system as a vehicle for the nation’s integration (Bjork, 2005).

Exercising a new freedom, the government under Sukarno had the power to create an education system that embodied Indonesian character and aspirations. The government successfully laid the foundations of the Indonesian national educational system, for example, by making education a citizens’ legal right and establishing the tenets of Pancasila as the guiding principles of education. Unfortunately, the political turmoil in the period of the Old Order often hindered educational advancement and innovation.
2.2.4 The New Order (1966–1998)

The political turmoil of the last years of the Old Order regime brought Suharto to power in 1966. To cope with the political unrest inherited from the previous regime, the focus of Suharto’s government was on creating stability and uniting the fragmented populace so that the government could peacefully continue building the nation. However, instead of opting for democratic solutions to resolve political conflicts, he adopted an autocratic approach to ruling the country. With this autocratic leadership, Suharto ruled the country for 32 years. In the history of Indonesia, the term *Orde Baru* (New Order) was originally a name attached to Suharto’s regime to distinguish it from the regime of his immediate predecessor. Below, some the distinctive influences and changes that characterised the Indonesian education system during the period of the New Order are discussed.

The government of Suharto expanded the national education system established by the previous regime. The government added kindergartens of one to two years to the six-year primary level and the two general and vocational secondary levels. Of particular significance, vocational and technical education was intensified and diversified due to a new policy of aligning the outcomes of education to the demand for skilled manpower to build and develop the nation (Tilaar, 1995). At the tertiary level, the expanded educational qualifications ranged from a one-year qualification (diploma) to a four-year postgraduate/doctorate degree in universities, faculties, colleges or academies. In addition, non-formal and informal education which were not recognised in the previous education system were integrated into the national education system under Suharto. In this period all types of learning – whether delivered through guidance, instruction, or practice (apprenticeships) – belonged under the jurisdiction of the national education system. Special education for disabled children was, for the first
time, recognised and included within the system. The levels, types and pathways of education for citizens were substantially expanded during this period.

Under President Suharto, the government made massive progress towards its goal of universalising basic education for all Indonesian children. During the 25 years of Indonesia’s first period of *Pembangunan Jangka Panjang I* (PJP 1, 1969/70–1994/95, Long Term Development), the participation rate in primary education had climbed to 100% (Tilaar, 1995). This achievement was made possible by a sudden increase in oil prices in the 1970s which enriched the government. A major proportion of these oil revenues were applied to a massive primary school construction program known as *Instruksi Presiden* (INPRES, Presidential Instruction). Under INPRES, thousands of primary schools were built, formal school fees were abolished and a six-year primary education became compulsory (World Bank, 1992). When the sixth *Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun* (REPELITA, Five-Year Development Plan) was launched in 1994, basic compulsory education had been extended to nine years.

Although the government under Suharto successfully expanded and extended the education system, there were a number of factors that made these achievements less impressive. Among those factors were: an over-emphasis on national unity and loyalty to the state; bureaucratic control by the central government; and an excessive emphasis on quantitative growth (Beeby, 1979; Bjork, 2005; Liddle, 1999; Nielsen, 1998; Tilaar, 1995; White, 1997). Each of these factors bears elaboration.

During the period of the New Order regime, schools were made to serve at least two important functions in relation to the economic development goals of Suharto’s government. First, they served to produce the necessary skilled manpower needed to support the nation’s economic development. Secondly, schools functioned as a mechanism to safeguard national unity to support economic development. To a large
extent, the latter function undermined the goal of education. Leigh (1999), who investigated schooling practices in Indonesia, noted that “[n]ational unity is breathed in on a daily basis as a paramount principle” (p. 47). Teachers were required to deliver subjects based on a common official national history and shared ideology. Students were obliged to assimilate actions and thoughts that were considered acceptable and legitimate, according to what the state authorities determined as the national good. According to Bjork (2005), the New Order regime arranged schools as “a means of developing a body of citizens that would support the nation, rather than as an opportunity for individuals to acquire skills and knowledge that would reap them rewards” (p.52). In most cases, the Suharto government’s emphasis on national unity and loyalty to the state overshadowed the goal of education. That is, the government forced the education system to function as an instrument to produce a body of obedient, loyal servants of the state rather than as an instrument to provide pupils with the necessary knowledge and skills that would help them to become active, productive and innovative citizens.

The government’s great emphasis on national security and loyalty to the state also exerted a powerful influence on the actions of educators. Teachers, for example, were conditioned to pay more attention to the demands of the state than to the demands of the students, parents or local community (Bjork, 2005). In many other countries, teacher salaries were tied to their classroom performance, but teachers in Indonesia during this period were paid according to the level of their loyalty and obedience to the state.

The second factor that undermined the development of education during the period of New Order was the central government’s bureaucratic control. The central government control of education was prevalent and pervasive during this period. In
general, the Ministry of Education (MoE) was the central government agency responsible for education throughout the archipelago. The MoE, along with its bureaux, departments and bodies, organised and administered every aspect of education from its central offices in Jakarta. Every single decision, from the major to the minor, had to be made in Jakarta (Nielsen, 1998). This excessive bureaucratic centralisation “has tended to sap the initiative of teachers, pupils and supervisors and make them look to Jakarta for a lead” (Beeby, 1979, p. 231). For example, teachers did not have opportunities to “improvise” their teaching materials and methodologies unless those changes had been stipulated or determined by central authorities. Bjork (2005) argued that “[b]y specifying in detail contents as well as pedagogy, the Ministry [of Education] limited the autonomy of instructors” (p. 53). Local educational authorities such as district educational administrators and principals found it difficult to introduce new ideas other than ones already approved or permitted by the central office. All educational actors at the local level were obliged to respect the authority of the central government (Bjork, 2005). The bureaucratic control of the central government was so pervasive that local educational employees (administrators, principals, and teachers) had to tailor their words and behaviour to fit the directives of central authorities.

Adding to over-emphasis on national unity and loyalty to the state, and on the bureaucratic control of central government, was an excessive emphasis on quantitative growth. As mentioned earlier, the numbers of students, teachers and schools all grew dramatically during the period of the New Order. However, in many cases these quantitative measures eclipsed the importance of quality measures in education. As an illustration, students were merely assessed for how many questions they could correctly answer than on how creatively or critically they could solve problems (Leigh, 1999; White, 1997). Teachers and schools were awarded or punished, according to the number
of graduates they could produce regardless of their quality. According to Tilaar (1995), graduates of the school system during the New Order were not sufficiently skilled to fill positions created as a result of the economic boom. Tilaar further noted that there were about 840,000 unemployed graduates in 1971, but by 1990 this number had tripled to almost 2.5 million. These unemployed graduates ranged from primary- to tertiary-level students, with a significant proportion being secondary and tertiary students.

Indonesia’s education system developed at an accelerating rate under Suharto’s regime. A constant increase in the numbers of schools, teachers and students generated a wealth of statistics that impressed outside observers. Such positive impressions, however, were dissipated by a closer look into the educational experiences and practices in schools or classrooms. Schools became places where free minds were transformed into “a common individual unconscious possession” (Leigh, 1999, p. 36, emphasis added). Teachers were rewarded for their obedience and loyalty rather than for their excellent performance in the classroom (Bjork, 2005). Students were assessed for what they could correctly recall (e.g. dates of particular historical events) rather than for how they could creatively or critically solve problems (Leigh, 1999; White, 1997). With the spirit of reformation in Indonesia in the post-Suharto era, it is hoped that shortcomings of the education system during the period of the New Order will be resolved.

2.2.5 Reformation (1998–present)

In 1998, the economic crisis, coupled with worsening social conditions as a result of riots by anti-Suharto protesters marked the fall of Suharto’s authoritarian and centralised regime. The term Era Reformasi (Reformation) was coined to refer to the post-Suharto era. The reformation era provides momentum for the Indonesian people and the elected government to once again reform and improve the nation. In education,
two primary changes have occurred during this period so far: improvement of educational provision and services, and decentralisation of education.

The improvement of educational provision and services has become one of the priorities of the government in the reformation era. Despite the massive educational expansion under the Suharto government, the issues of access, equity and quality in education are still the nation’s biggest concerns. A number of strategic initiatives have been taken to tackle these issues. For example, the amended Constitution (UUG 1945) now mandates that governments (central, provincial and local) must allocate 20% of their budgets for education to support the provision of national education – a national education that provides free compulsory basic education. Another initiative is the enactment of Undang-undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional (UU Sisdiknas) 20/2003 (National Education System Law No. 20 Year 2003). This law covers all aspects of the Indonesian education system, including its functions and aims; the rights and obligations of learners, parents, community and government; the pathways, types and levels of education; the curriculum; the medium of instruction; national education standards; educational facilities and equipment; evaluation, accreditation and certification; and supervision.

According to UU Sisdiknas 20/2003, there are now three different pathways for Indonesians to gain educational qualifications: formal, non-formal and informal schooling. The schooling system comprises primary, secondary and higher education levels and can take the forms of general, special, religious, vocational or professional education. Formal and non-formal schools are established and operated either by the government or private organisations while informal education is run by the community. The operation of schools is under the management and supervision of several ministries. Formal/non-formal, general, special, vocational, public/private and non-Muslim schools
are mostly under the control of the Ministry of Education (MoE) while formal public and private Islamic schools fall under the responsibility of Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA). A small number of vocational institutions are also administered and managed by other ministries such as the Ministry of Industry, the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Health with the coordination of MoE. Indonesians can choose among these different pathways, levels and types of education (Figure 2.1).

While every citizen has a legal right to have an education, not all children can be part of the formal schooling system for a number of reasons such as ethnicity, religion/beliefs, poverty and geographical location. In order to extend education to all children, non-formal/informal schooling is made available as an alternative pathway for those whose circumstances prevent their access to formal schools. For example, children who work in local farming or industry and are unable attend morning classes in a formal school can attend non-formal/informal schools which are held in the afternoons or on weekends. In other cases, people who are over the ages for formal school (e.g. illiterate adults) may access non-formal/informal schools.

_UU Sisdiknas 20/2003_ further explicates that non-formal and informal schools and institutions have substitutive, complementary and enrichment functions to formal schools and can also be administered like formal schools. Therefore, students from non-formal and informal schools and institutions can be accredited and certified in the same way as formal school graduates through an assessment process by government bodies. For example, students completing courses from _Paket A_ (Package A), which is equivalent to primary school, can sit for an exit examination comparable to the primary school exit examination. It is important to note that in Indonesia’s education system students must pass an exit examination to complete each level of education except for participants of kindergarten and early education. Completion certificates are required to
progress to upper levels (e.g. from primary or Package A to junior secondary or Package B).
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**Figure 2.1  Pathways, levels and types of education**

Following the legal stipulation of 20% of educational budget allocation and enhancement of national education systems, the government introduced the eight
Standar Nasional Pendidikan (SNP, 8 National Education Standards). The introduction of these standards was the government’s strategy to improve the provisions and services of education, and it was especially salient in a populous, geographically large and socioeconomically diverse country such as Indonesia. As of 2006/2007, for example, there were over 300,000 schools from primary to secondary operating across diverse geographical and socioeconomic areas (e.g. urban, semi-urban, rural, remote or isolated) throughout the Indonesian archipelago. There are huge disparities within and across these areas in terms of school enrolments, school facilities and equipment, teacher quality and student performance and outcomes (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/BAPPENAS, 2010; Surayana, 2011; UNESCO, 2011). The SNP provides national education service standards for the operation of education at school levels across the Indonesian archipelago. The SNP includes:

1. **Standards for graduate competency**: the criteria for the qualifications of graduates.

2. **Standards for teaching content**: the criteria for the scope and level of content and competency required to achieve the graduate competency standard at a particular level and type of education.

3. **Standards for instructional process**: the criteria for teaching and learning processes at a particular level and type of education to achieve graduate competency.

4. **Standards for teachers and educational personnel**: the criteria for pre-service and in-service education and eligibility for becoming teachers and educational administrators.
5. **Standard for structure and infrastructure:** the criteria for educational facilities and equipment at particular level and type of education such as classroom, library, playground, laboratory and other teaching and learning facilities.

6. **Standard for management:** the criteria for planning, implementation and supervision of educational activities at the school, local, provincial, or national level.

7. **Standard for budgeting:** the criteria for components and operational unit costs at a particular level of education for a period of a year.

8. **Standard for evaluation and assessment:** the criteria for mechanisms, procedures and instruments for evaluation and assessment of students’ learning outcomes.

Based on the above eight national standards, schools are evaluated, accredited and certified, resulting in three accreditation levels: A, B and C. The accreditation levels indicate that A-level schools meet the standards at a high level; B-level schools meet the standards at a more than satisfactory level; and C-level schools meet the standards at a satisfactory level (C). According to a report of Badan Akreditasi Nasional (BAN, National Board of School Accreditation), by 2012, there were still 64,047 schools that had not been accredited out of a total of 326,004 primary to secondary schools, and the majority of the accredited schools (261,977 schools) had earned B-level accreditation (Aulia, 2012). The BAN’s report also highlighted that three standards were found to be very weak in schools around the country: standards for graduate competency; standards for teachers and educational personnel; and standards for structure and infrastructure. The conditions of schools as reflected by their accreditation levels can be used by the central government and by particular local governments as macro and micro indicators for what needs to be done to improve national education.
The role of local governments in education is crucial in the current reformation era. In line with the spirit of reformation, the government decided to decentralise most public services, including education, to the local level. Therefore, the managerial and financial responsibilities for all levels of education (except for higher education) have now been transferred from the central government to local authorities, mostly at the municipal or district levels and to schools. The introduction of *Managemen Berbasis Sekolah* (MBS, School-Based Management) is a good example of the devolution of authority and responsibility to the local level. MBS gives schools autonomy to manage and empower their local potential to improve their quality (Raihani, 2007). In 2006, the government introduced a new curriculum which was known as *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (KTSP, School-Based Curriculum). KTSP is another educational innovation resulting from the decentralisation of education. Through KTSP, schools have the authority to develop individualised curriculums that suit their needs, potentials, resources and characteristics.

From the pre-independence era to the current Reformation era, a great many educational changes have been introduced to develop and improve the Indonesian education system. Regardless of the kind of changes initiated, teachers always play an important role in their implementation. The thesis now turns to a description of Indonesia’s teachers.

### 2.3 Indonesia’s Teachers

As the Indonesian education system evolves over time, so do teachers. The teaching profession has experienced numerous changes in response to the dynamics of the socioeconomic and geopolitical situation in Indonesia. Traditionally, teaching was a socioeconomically prestigious career and a vocation of choice. However, there was also a time when teaching was seen as a second-class, last-choice profession. Now, as the
result of educational reform, careers in teaching are once again among the most pursued careers for thousands of job seekers in Indonesia. The lives and work of Indonesia’s teachers cannot be understood without a substantial consideration of the factors shaping their biographies. The subsequent parts of this chapter are therefore devoted to a succinct description of the Indonesian teachers’ lives and work, followed by a description of pathways into teaching from the colonial period to the reformation era.

2.3.1 Teachers’ Lives and Work

Teaching was regarded as a desirable and highly respected career in the colonial era. People were recruited to be teachers not only on the basis of their intelligence but also with regard to their socioeconomic status (Djadiningrat, 1942). The colonial government paid modest salaries to teachers and praised the teaching profession through direct appointment (Embree et al., 1934). In a similar vein, the Japanese military administration recognised that teachers enjoyed a strong standing in the community and thus were seen as important figures who deserved prestige and privileges (Lee, 1995; Thomas, 1966).

In the history of Indonesia’s struggle for independence, teachers also assumed the roles of revolutionary fighters that posed a real threat to colonial power (Lee, 1995; Thomas, 1966). Teachers fought against the colonisers by instilling the spirit of Indonesian freedom and nationalism in the youth. The Dutch government, for example, imposed a two-year suspension to teachers who were found to have promoted nationalist Indonesian ideas in their classes. During the period of Dutch colonial rule, teachers also needed to meet various political requirements before they earned their teaching licensure due to the Dutch government’s fear of Indonesian independence (Lee, 1995).
From Indonesia’s Independence in 1945 until the early 1970s, in both the Old Order and the New Order, teachers had an important role in developing the nation. In these periods, teachers were not merely transmitters of skills and knowledge relevant to the country’s development needs; they were also the “messengers” of the rulers and conveyed ideas about a shared story of national struggle, Indonesian morality and ideology, and the national creed of *Pancasila* to maintain social-political security and stability (Lee, 1995; Sumintono, 2006). During the periods of the Old Order and New Order, teachers were given the title of *Pahlawan Tanpa Tanda Jasa*, which means unsung heroes. This title conveyed an adoration for the teaching profession and signified the important role of teachers in the nation’s development.

In the reformation era, the government of Indonesia issued *Undang-undang Guru dan Dosen Teacher 14/2005* (UUGD, Teacher and Lecturer Law No. 14 Year 2005) which has had a significant impact on the Indonesian teaching workforce across the system from early childhood education to higher education. The law completely reformulated the roles and responsibilities for teachers/lecturers and proposed strategies to improve teacher quality and welfare. The UUGD included the following fundamental reforms:

- the core principle that teaching is a “profession”
- the requirement that all teachers must meet a minimum qualification of a four-year degree (bachelor’s degree or diploma 4) before being certified, and that all teachers should be formally certified after the four-year degree has been gained
- the edict that teachers who can fulfil the academic requirements and adequately perform their specified competencies are considered “professional” and are therefore entitled for a professional allowance
- the reform of pre-service teacher education institutions
- a mandatory 24-hour contact time (18 hours) workload per week required to gain and maintain certification
- a “special” area allowance to be paid to teachers in defined areas such as remote locations, border regions and natural or social disaster areas
- improved processes of in-school induction and probation
- a comprehensive system of teacher appraisal and public service salary increases
- a more systematic program of continuing professional development
- the merit-based appointment of principals and supervisors based on mastery of the four core competencies (pedagogic, personal, social and professional) for educators.

(Adapted from Chu Chang et al., 2014).

UUGD initiated a fundamental transformation of teachers’ positions and functions in the education system. According to UUGD, teachers are now regarded as professionals or professional educators compared to teaching staff in the former system. Articles 4 and 6 of UUGD explain that the positioning teachers as professionals is meant to enhance their dignity and roles as learning agents who function to carry out the aims of the national educational system and realise national education goals. With this new way of portraying and perceiving teachers’ positions and functions, teachers are now expected to perform their duties like professionals (e.g. competent, responsible, committed etc.) rather than as mechanics or technicians of education as they were perceived in the previous era (Thair & Treagust, 2003).

To sufficiently understand why the UUGD was an essential reform to the Indonesian teaching workforce, it is important to understand the status of teachers before the enactment of this law. Prior to the enactment of the UUGD, the Ministry of Education had identified a number of shortcomings in the education system related to teachers, namely: ill-defined teaching standards; inefficiency and inequality of the
teacher management system; and low quality of teachers (Chu Chang et al., 2014). Chu Chang et al. further explicated that the low quality of teachers was caused by a combination of factors including teachers’ minimal educational qualifications, low salaries, limited pedagogical and subject matter competency and questionable commitment to teaching. These factors will be further elaborated in the following discussion.

With the rapid expansion of the education system in the 1970s and 1980s, when the INPRES program built tens of thousands of new primary schools, the great increase in number of students meant that hundreds of thousands of new teachers had to be trained and hired. During this rapid system expansion, several crash programmes were initiated for producing teachers. For example, anyone with a lower or junior secondary education could be awarded a teaching certificate after completing a one-year teacher training program. By 2004, one year before the enactment of the UGGD, it was reported that 95% of all primary teachers, 45% of all junior secondary teachers and 29% of all senior secondary teachers held less than a four-year university degree (World Bank, 2010). In other words, the existing teaching force mainly consisted of teachers from the rapid expansion period.

While the number of teachers increased, the salaries of teachers declined in real terms since the period of system rapid expansion. By 2004, incomes for teachers were lower relative to other occupations that required a similar educational level (Chu Chang et al., 2014). Teachers’ salaries in Indonesia were also low compared to those in other middle-income countries in the region. For example, in 2004–2005, the top annual salary for junior secondary teachers in Indonesia was less than US $4,500, while their Malaysian counterparts’ earned around US $31,000 (World Bank, 2010).
The low salaries for teachers in Indonesia made the teaching profession less attractive for high achievers. The teaching profession came to be seen as a second-class, last-choice profession in the decades before UUGD. Due to their low salaries, many teachers needed to find part-time jobs which were often considered low status occupations, such as farmers, drivers, or street vendors (Jalal et al., 2009). According to Chu Chang et al. (2014), the most salient feature of UUGD is its attempt to “professionalise” teaching by granting a professional allowance which doubles teachers’ salaries upon certification. The intention was that this would eventually attract more of the best and brightest candidates into the profession.

Adding to teachers’ low salaries as a contributing factor to low teacher quality is teachers’ limited pedagogical and subject matter competency. Studies on Indonesia’s teachers have commonly highlighted their out-dated pedagogical skills, chalk-and-talk teaching strategies, rote-learning methods or teacher-centred teaching methodologies. These studies have found that teachers had limited content and pedagogical knowledge and skills (Leigh, 1999; UNESCO, 2006; White, 1997). In 2007, the World Bank completed a video study of teacher classroom performance in a sample of grade 8 mathematics classes in Indonesia to relate classroom teaching-learning behaviour with student achievement on the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). The study revealed some of the weaknesses in the pedagogical practices of Indonesian teachers such as extensive use of rote-learning methods, spending insufficient lesson time on new content and not placing enough emphasis on reasoning and problem solving (World Bank, 2010).

In addition to teachers’ poor content and pedagogical knowledge and skills, teachers’ low commitment to teaching was also seen as a factor contributing to Indonesia’s low teacher quality (Chu Chang et al., 2014). High rates of absenteeism,
tardiness, and lack of preparation were amongst the indicators for teachers’ low commitment to teaching (Jalal et al., 2009). As mentioned earlier, one of the most frequently reported causes of this issue was the fact that many teachers held second jobs to supplement their low incomes from teaching (Bjork, 2005; Lee, 1995; World Bank, 2010). Bjork argued that in many cases, teachers’ secondary employment caused them to see their teaching obligations as secondary. Jalal et al. (2009) concluded that teacher certification along with a professional allowance as mandated by UUGD, which doubles teachers’ incomes, would make teachers more knowledgeable and skillful as well as more committed to their instructional tasks – in other words, it would enable them to be professional teachers.

Another important undertaking during the reformation era that has changed teachers’ lives and work is the decentralisation of education. Before the reformation era, the central government made all the decisions regarding teacher employment and management (e.g. recruitment, retention, or promotion). Now, due to decentralisation, local governments and institutions (districts/municipalities and schools) regulate, administer and manage the arrangements for teacher employment. As a result, there are various categories of teachers in Indonesia: (1) civil servant teachers; (2) contract teachers; and (3) school-hired teachers. These types of teachers exist in every type and level of education as shown in Table 2.1 It is important to note that these categories, to a large extent, determine teachers’ socioeconomic status. Of the three categories, the civil servant teachers are the most prestigious. Civil servant teachers receive a higher level of pay than contract or school-hired teachers and enjoy more professional support and development (e.g. scholarships, grants and TPD opportunities).
Table 2.1. Types of Teacher and Their Employment Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Category</th>
<th>Hired by</th>
<th>Paid by</th>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Servant Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Local gov.</td>
<td>Central gov.</td>
<td>Hiring quota set centrally, but selected locally. Small number of teachers are assigned to private schools. Enjoy professional allowance, special incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>Local gov.</td>
<td>Central gov.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Central gov.</td>
<td>Central gov.</td>
<td>Salary is generally 50% less that of civil servant teachers. To be converted to civil servant teachers. Entitled to functional and professional allowances paid by central government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>Local gov.</td>
<td>Local gov.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-Hired Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Schools, Central</td>
<td>Low salary/honorarium (10-30% of civil servant teachers). Entitled to functional and professional allowances paid by central government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Schools, Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from World Bank, 2010)

2.3.2 Teacher Pathways

The system of teacher preparation and development has played a vital role in shaping the character of the Indonesian teacher workforce. Table 2.2 presents a summary of the evolution of pathways to teaching over the last 60 years. The pathways to teaching have evolved from a four-year teacher training post-primary course in 1945 to a one-to-five-year teacher post-secondary course presently.

In the early years after independence in 1945, anyone with at least six years of basic education could enrol in a teacher training school and become qualified as a primary teacher. At that time, there were two types of teacher training schools: Sekolah Guru B (SGB, Lower Secondary Teacher Training Schools) and Sekolah Guru A (SGA, Higher Secondary Teacher Training School). SGB lasted for four years which was equivalent to completing three years of junior high school plus a one-year teacher training program while SGA lasted for six years which was equivalent to six years of
secondary school or an extra two years for SGB graduates. The graduates of both SGA and SGB received a qualification to teach at primary schools.

Table 2.2. The Evolution of Teacher Education Programs/Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Programs/Institutions</th>
<th>Teaching Authority</th>
<th>Years of Preparation</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945 - 1960s</td>
<td>SGB</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary + 4 yrs</td>
<td>Transformed into SPG in early 1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGA</td>
<td>Primary and Junior sec. until late 1950s</td>
<td>Primary + 6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 – 1980s</td>
<td>SPG/SGO</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary + 6 yrs</td>
<td>Closed in 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 - 1960s</td>
<td>PGSLP/PGSMTP</td>
<td>Junior sec.</td>
<td>Junior sec. + 1 yrs</td>
<td>Transformed into SPG in early 1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 - 1960s</td>
<td>Kursus B-I</td>
<td>Junior sec.</td>
<td>Senior sec. + 2 yrs</td>
<td>Diffused into IKIP/FKIP since 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 - 1960s</td>
<td>Kursus B-II</td>
<td>Senior sec.</td>
<td>B-I + 2 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 – 1960s</td>
<td>PTPG</td>
<td>Junior and Senior sec.</td>
<td>Senior sec. + 5 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - now</td>
<td>LPTK (FKIP/IKIP/STKIP)</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Senior sec. + 1 – 5 yrs</td>
<td>From Diploma 1 to Bach./Undergrad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Cunningham, 1957; Jalal et al., 2009; Tilaar, 1995)

During the period of 1945–1960s, the government initiated various teacher training institutions for teachers at secondary level. There were *Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Lanjutan Pertama* (PGSLP, Teacher Training Schools for Junior Secondary School) later called *Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Menengah Tingkat Pertama* (PGSMTP), *Kursus B-I* (Subject Course For Junior Secondary School Teachers) and *Kursus B-II* (Subject Course For Senior Secondary School Teachers). PGSLP/PGSMTP was a one-year post-junior secondary teacher training program while Kursus B-I was a two-year teacher post-senior secondary training program. Both PGSLP/PGSMTP and Kursus B-I produced teachers for junior secondary. Kursus B-II lasted for four years after post-senior secondary or two years following Kursus B-I. Kursus B-II was established to produce senior secondary teachers. These initial teacher training institutions were subsequently transformed to improve the quality of teachers.
The government of Indonesia instituted a new arrangement of teacher training in the early 1960s. SGB, SGA and PGSLP/PGSMTP were transformed into Sekolah Pendidikan Guru (SPG, Teacher Education School). SPG was established to continue SGB’s and SGA’s function of preparing primary school teachers until the late 1980s. To prepare secondary school teachers, the government established teacher training in four big cities called Perguruan Tinggi Pendidikan Guru (PTPG) in the mid-1950s. The establishment of PTPG later became the basis for establishing teacher education and training for secondary teachers at tertiary level. Thus, in 1963 teacher education and training for secondary teachers became based in faculties of education called Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (FKIP, Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Studies) in some existing universities, or through new teacher training institutes called Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (IKIP, Institute of Teacher Training and Educational Studies) in several big cities. These cities were: Padang, Bandung, Malang, Surabaya, Semarang, Manado, Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Makassar and Medan. By then, all PTPGs had been converted to IKIP and Kursus B-I and Kursus B-II were diffused into IKIP or FKIP.

In 1989, the government enacted Undang-undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional 2/1989 (UU Sisdiknas, Law No. 2 Year 1989 on National Education System). The law brought two primary changes to teacher preparation. First, the law mandated increased qualifications for teachers at all levels of schooling. Second, the law also required that teacher education and training be conducted at the tertiary level. For example, it was mandated that primary school teachers needed to have Diploma 2 (D2, two-year-post-secondary diploma), Junior secondary school teachers needed have at least Diploma 3 (D3, three year-post-secondary diploma) and senior secondary school teachers needed to have Diploma 4 (D4, four-year-post-secondary diploma) or Sarjana 1
(S1, bachelor/undergraduate degree) certificate. Therefore, teacher education and training for all types and levels of education have been conducted at the tertiary level since 1990. In the current climate, Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan (LPTK, Teacher Training Institutions) is the generic term that refers to teacher education and training agencies in Indonesia. There are several forms of LPTK, including FKIP within a university, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP, Higher Education for Teacher Training and Educational Studies) and IKIP. As of 2013, there were 415 LPTK in Indonesia offering around 900 educational courses in both public and private institutions (Afriadi, 2013).

Over the last 60 years, teacher education and training in Indonesia has changed from a four-year teacher training school at post-primary level to a four-year teacher education and training at the tertiary level. Given the length of this time period, it is not surprising to see that a large proportion of the current in-service teachers were educated in “a period of trial and error [of] appropriate format for teacher education” (Jalal et al., 2009, p. 18). In other words, a large number of current teachers gained qualifications during the earlier rapid expansion period and they need sufficient and powerful learning opportunities to bring them up to date with the knowledge and skills required in the current education system.

2.4 Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia

Even the finest teacher education and training system cannot provide teachers with knowledge and skills for a lifetime of teaching (Hendriks, Luyten, Scheerens, Sleegers, & Steen, 2010). Once student teachers become in-service teachers, they need regular learning opportunities to develop their instructional practices. Therefore, the provision of learning opportunities for in-service teachers is fundamental to any education system. In Indonesia, in-service training is a general term used to refer to any
learning opportunities for in-service teachers. However, in this thesis, the term ‘teacher professional development’ (TPD) will be used instead. The reasons for using TPD are discussed in Chapter Three. The term TPD is used exclusively unless there is a necessity to retain the original terms such as in a quotation or illustration. With these clarifications in mind, this sub-section discusses the history, characteristics and goals of TPD in Indonesia.

TPD has long been regarded as a mechanism to develop teacher quality. The first TPD programs started in the early 1970s when the Indonesian government launched an intensive three-week training workshop for teachers. Teachers and school supervisors (later labelled as ‘national instructors” after completing the training workshop) from all 27 Indonesian provinces at the time were selected and trained in national workshops in the Indonesia capital city, Jakarta. Upon return to their districts and schools, this cadre of national instructors had the responsibility to cascade their newly gained knowledge through a series of learning activities in order to reach as many local teachers as possible (Adey, Hewitt, Hewitt, & Landau, 2004). As of 1976, this series of national workshops had produced 1,200 national instructors in 120 provincial teams and had trained 90,000 teachers (Soedijarto et al., 1980). Given the large number of teachers in the population, according to Thair and Treagust (2003), the cascade model was adopted as a low-cost strategy to multiply training – that is, to reach as many teachers as possible over a relatively short timeframe. Since the 1970s, TPD programs have typically been conducted according to this cascade model.

TPD programs in Indonesia are not only large in number but also large in coverage. In most cases, TPD programs are run nationally. The *Pemantapan Kerja Guru* (PKG, Improving the Work of Teachers) program during the 1980s, for example, was a government-initiated in-service teacher training program which directly targeted
thousands of teachers in junior and secondary schools throughout the archipelago. The overarching aim of PKG was to transform teachers’ traditional instructional practices (chalk-and-talk teaching and teacher-centred approaches) into active learning and student-centred learning. The PKG was popular for its ‘in-on’ system. It was scheduled over a 16-week period divided into two in-service cycles of two weeks each and two on-service cycles of six weeks each (Thair & Treagust, 2003). Thair and Treagust explained that the PKG in-service cycle started with a two-week in-service training session held at a provincial centre and the on-service cycle began when teachers returned to their classes. The PKG programs were run twice a year in each province and different groups of teachers attended the program every year in order to disseminate the PKG learning content across the country.

In the early 1980s, due to the popularity of PKG among teachers, many non-PKG teacher participants wanted to join the PKG. Also, due to requests from principals and teachers for faster dissemination of the PKG methodology and materials, the PKG was then developed into Sanggar Pemantapan Kerja Guru (SPKG) or centres for disseminating PKG’s methodologies and materials. Thair and Treagust (2003) reported that by the end of the 1980s the SPKG had provided a greater number of in-service/on-service inductions than the original PKG program. They noted that by 1988 there were only 26 PKG teams (one for each province) compared to more than 200 SPKG teams (one for each district). According Adey et al. (2004), the PKG project was among the largest TPD programs anywhere in the world during the 1980s.

In 1993, the MoE introduced a new TPD program to replace the PKG and SPKG projects. They were the Kelompok Kerja Guru (KKG, Primary School Working Group) and Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran (MGMP, Subject Teacher Working Group for Secondary School Teachers). The MoE envisioned KKG and MGMP as local
networking forums for in-service training and self-improvement activities conducted by local teachers. KKG and MGMP adopted the concept of teacher networking that recognises the idea that teachers can help each other to improve competencies based on their own expertise. The common activities of these teacher working groups range from curriculum and instructional material development and test item design to more advanced activities such as lesson study and classroom action research. Both KKGs and MGMPs are cluster-based, and are made up of teachers from neighbouring schools. More recently, MGMP has been extended to include subject teachers at the same school. The fact that thousands of KKGs and MGMPs still exist may indicate their particular importance for the government and for teachers.

KKG and MGMP have waxed and waned in importance over the years since they were introduced. Chu Chang et al. (2014) explained that their existence and ability to facilitate learning opportunities depends on the support of the central and local governments or the interests of teachers. Many are still active but a large number have become inactive. Some of the key features of the remaining active teacher working groups are:

- sizes of approximately 6–10 schools for a KKG and 10–12 schools for an MGMP
- fortnightly meetings
- focused meetings that last for approximately four hours
- organisational structures comprising at least a chair, a secretary and a treasurer.

A report from the World Bank (2010) highlighted that these teacher working groups have played a critical role in preparing and delivering professional learning activities for Indonesian teachers over the last 30 years. The report also estimates that there could be around 20,000 KKG and 15,000 MGMP across the nation, and with more than three million teachers, these teacher working groups make up one of the largest
teacher networks in the world. Jalal et al. (2009) added that teacher working groups are often the only form of in-service training available for teachers in their districts. Also, they may be the only places where government’s agenda for improving national education are disseminated.

One particular thing about TPD programs in Indonesia is that they are utilised as a mechanism to support the national education agenda and reform. The national workshops in the above example were primarily designed to support the implementation of a new curriculum at the time, known as Curriculum 75 (introduced between 1976 and 1978) (Thair & Treagust, 2003). As the national curriculum has been regularly revised (10 times since independence in 1945), TPD has also been frequently formulated and reformulated to support the implementation of the new curriculum. In fact, teachers have more TPD opportunities every time the curriculum is changed. The Primary Education Quality Improvement Project (PEQIP) which was supported by the World Bank and launched in 1992, was another example of a national educational improvement program that included a very extensive TPD component, upgrading qualifications of around one million in-service teachers (Nielsen, 1998).

In the current climate of educational reform, the Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Profesi Guru (PLPG, Education and Training for Teaching Profession) program which consists of a 90-hour in-service training program, is a TPD program designed to support teacher certification. As mentioned earlier, teacher certification is a strategic government initiative to improve national education by mandating that teachers meet specified competencies (pedagogic, personal, social and personal) and PLPG is designed to facilitate teachers learning and acquiring those competencies. The PLPG is undertaken by selected teacher training institutions and takes the form of lectures and workshops. Since its initiation in 2007, about one million teachers have passed through
the certification process and more than half of them gained their certification through the PLPG’s in-service training (Akuntono, 2011). With 3.3 million teachers in Indonesia, a number that continues to grow, many more TPD programs are needed to support teacher learning.

Providing TPD opportunities for Indonesia’s large teaching workforce requires huge financial resources. In most cases, particularly for those training courses that are categorised as nationwide and large scale, TPD opportunities are made available by funding from development agencies or donors such as the World Bank, UNESCO, USAID, AusAID or the Asian Development Bank. While this external funding is undoubtedly invaluable for developing countries like Indonesia, it also brings with it some issues. In the first place, most of the funded projects come with fresh ideas or innovations to be implemented by teachers which are sometimes not appropriate or applicable to teachers’ immediate needs and contexts (Thair & Treagust, 2003). Secondly, there is also a problem with program sustainability. The promoted changes usually fade out as the funding is phased out (Bjork, 2005). Lastly, as these agencies came with specified targets and goals, the agencies’ top priorities are commonly geared toward the attainment of quantitative targets and expansion which may deviate from the quality measures and goals of the education system (Nielsen, 1998).

Institutionally, Indonesia has a number of government agencies to support the professional development of its teaching workforce. As mentioned earlier, the 1970s were a period of rapid educational expansion with hundreds of thousands of teachers recruited who had minimal initial preparation. At the same time, the government had no TPD system in place to support the professional development of the existing teachers. Therefore, the government established Pusat Pengembangan Pendidikan Guru (PPPG, Centres for Teacher Professional Development) in the mid-1970s. These PPPGs were
initially introduced to supplement and support the existing national TPD programs such as PKG and SPKG. Over time, PPPGs were also designed to train specific subject-area teachers (mathematics, science, social studies, language, technology and vocational subjects). At the same time, the government also initiated teacher training centres at regional and provincial levels called *Balai Pendidikan Guru* (BPG, Teacher Training Agencies) to expand TPD opportunities.

Along with the evolution of the education system, PPPGs and BPGs have now transformed into *Pusat Pengembangan dan Pemberdayaan Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan* (P4TK, Centres for Professional Development and Empowerment of Teachers and Educational Personnel) and *Lembaga Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan* (LPMP, Institutes for Educational Quality Assurance) respectively. Currently, there are 12 P4TKs at the national level. At the provincial level, there are 33 LPMPs that, in addition to their main role of quality assurance, have a role in providing TPD opportunities.

Teacher professional development has gained in importance as a mechanism to improve teachers’ instructional practices since the 1970s. A cascade model of teacher training has commonly been adopted to accommodate the large number of Indonesian teachers in the workforce. For the same reason, TPD programs are typically run on a nationwide scale. With limited financial resources, the Indonesian government has generally tried to provide TPD opportunities by utilising external funding. Also, to better support the provision of TPD, the government has established agencies at both the national and provincial levels to provide TPD assistance and services.

### 2.5 Implications for the Study

The Indonesian education system has undergone remarkable developments across several historical periods. To some extent, these periods have exerted influences
that have shaped the national education system up to the present time. The schooling structure, administration and management of education, teacher education as well as teacher professional development have all evolved in line with the dynamics of Indonesia’s socioeconomic and political situation during the last 70 years following independence. With regard to teacher professional development as the focus of the current study, there are several key issues that impact on current TPD practices and they need to be considered in this study.

First, TPD programs generally target a large number of teachers and are conducted on a nationwide scale. Also, given the large number of Indonesian teachers, a cascade model of TPD is mostly adopted so that a particular TPD program can reach as many teachers as possible over a relatively short period. With this type of implementation, a high level of uniformity in the content and processes of TPD should not be a surprise.

Second, the majority of teachers in the current system come from the period of “maintaining national security and stability”. This was a period in which all government officers’ performances, including teachers, were assessed according to their level of obedience and loyalty to the regime. These old behaviours and attitudes, unfortunately, are still evident among teachers and may affect TPD practices in the current system.

Third, the condition of schools is very diverse. The professional, social and economic conditions in schools affect teachers’ TPD practices. Teachers in schools with A-level accreditation, for example, are more likely to get more government grants and assistance and thus may have more TPD opportunities than those in schools with C-level accreditation. Lastly, the fact that standards for teachers and educational personnel are low underlines the crucial importance of TPD as a mechanism to develop teacher quality.
The context of this study suggests that attention must be paid to the significant historical, social, cultural and institutional influences affecting the practice of TPD in Indonesia. In other words, the macro context (e.g. the goals of national education, national standards and the government’s TPD-related policies) and micro contexts (e.g. types of schools, school facilities or students) can have a significant influence on the kind of TPD that is suitable and effective for teachers.
Chapter 3 Review of Literature

3.1 Introduction

This review of the literature serves to inform the study about what has been discussed and studied in the field of TPD. The first section of this review presents a discussion of teacher professional development, particularly in regard to terms used in the study and the nature of TPD. This first section provides background information on the way that TPD has been conceptually interpreted and practically conducted over time. The second section focuses on the three aspects of TPD upon which the study’s theoretical framework is based, namely: 1) the types or forms of learning activities in TPD; 2) teacher characteristics; and 3) school-level influences. Following this is the discussion of the theoretical framework guiding the investigation of the study. The last section presents a summary of key themes derived from the literature review.

3.2 Teacher Professional Development (TPD)

3.2.1 Terms Used and their Definitions

In the literature, there is a variety of terms and definitions related to notions of teacher learning and change, ranging from the general, overarching terms to more specific ones. Among the commonly used terms are teacher training, in-service education and training (INSET), in-service learning, staff development, continuing professional development (CPD), staff development, professional development, continuing education, professional learning and life-long learning. The ideas or meanings of these terms often overlap. According to Burke (2000), “when educators think of professional development, they usually think of in-service days” (p. 29). Therefore, these terms are sometimes used loosely and interchangeably (see for examples, Bolam & McMahon, 2004; Burke, 2000; Craft, 2000; Day, 1999). In this
thesis, the term teacher professional development (TPD) is employed for several reasons that are elucidated in the later parts of this sub-section.

Historically, TPD has been an evolving concept in teacher learning and change (Bredeson, 2002; Knapp, 2003). I argue that the notion of teacher learning and change, and a number of associated terms, are open to multiple interpretations and each interpretation is associated with particular perspectives or theories on TPD. These theoretical orientations can be classified into four different perspectives. The first perspective is put forward by scholars who view TPD as activities, events, or opportunities. Fenstermacher and Berliner (1983) defined staff development as “the provision of activities designed to advance the knowledge, skills and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to change in their thinking and classroom behaviour” (p. 4, emphasis added). In similar vein, Bolam (2000) proposed that:

> CPD embraces those education, training and job-embedded support activities engaged in by teachers, following their initial certification, and head-teachers. Such activities are aimed primarily at adding to their professional knowledge, improving their professional skills and helping them to clarify their professional values so that they can educate their students more effectively. (p. 267, emphasis added)

The focus of this perspective of TPD is on formulating the types of learning activities that can effectively and efficiently deliver the expected knowledge and skills for teachers. This perspective is concerned with the quest for “what” types, forms and models of TPD work best to improve teachers’ instructional practices. According to this perspective, there are “empirically effective” types of TPD and thus some particular TPD forms are simply better than others in improving teachers’ professional knowledge and skills. Thus, in the current discussion of TPD, the supporters of this perspective call for replacing the so-called “traditional” TPD activities such as workshops, seminars and in-service training with “reform” ones such as action research, collaborative learning and peer networks.
The second perspective regards TPD as a process by which teacher quality can be enhanced (Evans, 2002; Kelchtermans, 2004; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989). Evans, for example, views TPD, or ‘teacher development’ to use her term, as “the process whereby teachers’ professionality and/or professionalism may be considered to be enhanced” (p. 131, emphasis in original). According to this perspective, the concern is about uncovering the processes that work best for developing teachers’ knowledge and skills. Therefore, the proponents of this perspective are likely to concentrate their attention on “how” TPD can best be implemented so that teacher quality is enhanced or improved. There are some competing ideas within this perspective. The first is the idea that TPD is a process of transmitting knowledge to teachers. Teacher learning in TPD follows a transmission process: knowledge is generated by researchers, imparted by teacher educators and, as a result, enacted as newly gained knowledge by teachers in classrooms. Second, TPD is considered to be a constructive process in which “the teacher is seen as one who mediates ideas and constructs meaning and knowledge and acts upon them” (Richardson, 1996, p. 266). Lastly, TPD is “a process of increasing participation in the practice of teaching and through this participation, a process of becoming knowledgeable in and about teaching” (Adler, 2000, p. 37). Thus, the ongoing discussion about TPD within this perspective focuses on whether to send teachers on courses, let them plan and pursue their own learning, or present them with the problems and challenges that arise in their own practices.

The third perspective combines the previous two perspectives and conceives of TPD as comprising both activities and processes. Guskey (2000) defined TPD “as those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills and attitudes of educators so that they might, in return, improve learning of students” (p. 16,
emphasis added). In an overarching and commonly cited definition, Day (1999) explained:

Professional development consists of all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school and which contribute, through these, to the quality of education in the classroom. It is the process by which, alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching; and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills and emotional intelligence essential to good professional thinking, planning and practice with children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives. (p. 4, emphasis added)

This perspective combines the “what” and “how” of TPD. Theoretically, the activities and processes of TPD are dependent on one another and, in most cases, a particular TPD activity informs the process that it entails and vice versa. For example, action research as a TPD activity involves a constructive process whereby teachers examine their practices and construct new understandings or knowledge in order to improve them. This third perspective is evident among the scholars who propose a set of “effective” features of TPD (e.g. Ball & Cohen, 1999; Burney & Elmore, 1999; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Desimone et al., 2002; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Knapp, 2003).

The last perspective views TPD as a complex system rather than an activity or a process, or both (Davis & Sumara, 2007; Hoban, 2002; Knight, 2002; Morrison, 2008; Opfer & Pedder, 2011a). Opfer and Pedder (2011a), for example, see “teacher learning as a complex system representing recursive interactions between systems and elements that coalesce in ways that are unpredictable but also highly patterned” (p. 379, emphasis added). With the same orientation, Hoban (2002) coined the term “professional learning system” to advocate a theoretical framework in teacher learning “based on a
combination of … conditions for teacher learning that need to complement each other to support educational change as a complex system” (p. 68, emphasis added).

The orientation for this thesis aligns with the latter perspective that sees TPD as a complex system. Despite their shared orientation, the proponents of TPD as a complex system offer no consensual definitions of TPD, which seems unsurprising for a perspective that embraces uniqueness and diversity. Davis and Sumara (2006) explicated the difficulty of defining a complex system:

It is not always possible (or useful) to determine with certainty which components are part of the system (i.e., ‘inside’) and which belong to the setting (i.e., ‘outside’)…the physical or boundaries of a complex/open system are always contingent on the criteria used to define or distinguish the system from its backdrop. (p. 15)

Thus, a definition is always a conceptual boundary for “those wanting to communicate ideas on the subject [e.g. TPD] and those with whom they communicate” (Evans, 2002, p. 129) and, as a result, the use of a term can be different from one study to another. Nevertheless, Evans further argued that a definition is essential at least at a study level because “it allows conceptual parameters, dimensions, constituents and features to be identified, which, in turn, facilitates recognition of what does and does not constitute and, therefore, represent, the concept(s) being studied” (p. 127). Thus, in this study, teacher professional development is conceptually defined as a learning system in which actors and factors (agents) interact to help teacher learning and change.

The term “teacher professional development” and the definition used in this thesis have some implications. First, etymologically, a system is a group of agents that work together (interact) as a unit for a particular purpose. Agents can be factors or actors that are parts of the system and whose properties contribute to the system as a whole. Interaction indicates a mutual, reciprocal relationship among the agents; they have an effect on each other. Second, the word “teacher” is attached to the term to
specify the reference of the system and it refers to in-service teachers who have completed their initial training or preparation. The term “development” is chosen over “learning” because development carries a broader meaning that can embody the multiple dimensions, effects and purposes of teacher learning and change. Besides, learning itself is the essence of TPD as Bredeson (2002) argued that “[p]rofessional development is first and foremost about learning” (p. 663). In this definition, “learning” and “change” are seen to be the two sides of the same coin. Actors and factors in TPD not only affect the conditions for teacher learning, but, equally important, they also interact to shape the changes that teachers undergo. Yet this does not necessarily mean that the relationship between learning and change takes place in a linear, cause-effect manner. Rather, learning and change are related in mutual, reciprocal interactions between and among agents.

The term TPD is used exclusively in this thesis instead of the other aforementioned terms unless there is a necessity to retain the original terms used by authors or researchers in a quotation or illustration. The variety of perspectives informing TPD not only generates different uses of terms and definitions, but also creates different TPD practices. These different TPD practices will be discussed in the next sub-section which provides an overview of the changing nature of TPD practices.

3.2.2 The Practices of Teacher Professional Development

The practices of TPD have changed over time. Reviewing its evolution helps us to understand the context of different TPD practices. This section presents a review of theories or perspectives informing TPD practices over time.

It has been argued that practices in TPD are initially based on a deficit or authoritarian perspective (Barton, 2000; Knight, 2002; McDonald, 2011). TPD driven by this view assumes that teachers do not have the knowledge they need to teach well
TPD, thus, is seen as a set of activities or opportunities for teachers to “stock up on” their knowledge or to “fill in the gap” between what they know and what they need to know to be able to successfully perform tasks in their classrooms. Viewing TPD as opportunities to stock up on knowledge reflects the idea that having more knowledge about teaching will lead to effective or improved teaching.

According to Barton (1992), traditional TPD rests on an authoritarian model. That is, people with authority (experts) deliver a package of knowledge and skills to teachers in a linear, causal process, and once the package of knowledge is transmitted/disseminated by the experts and acquired by teachers, improved teaching practices result. Teacher learning thus follows a transmission process: knowledge is generated by researchers, imparted by teacher educators and, then enacted as newly gained knowledge by teachers in the classroom. This traditional model of TPD views teacher learning as a matter of mastering a set of discrete facts and skills, and deems teachers as passive consumers of knowledge who acquire facts through a memorisation and imitation. In such a model, “teachers are knowledge users, not generators” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, p. 257).

According to a traditional view of TPD, the knowledge needed by teachers is generated by outsiders. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) termed this type of knowledge as knowledge-for-practice. Knowledge-for-practice is formal knowledge generated by university-based scholars and researchers for teachers to use in order to be effective. This knowledge includes content or subject matter knowledge, educational theories, knowledge about learners and teaching, and learning strategies. Taken together, they constitute what is widely referred by educators as “the knowledge base” for teaching. According to Shulman (1998) in his critical examination of Dewey’s “The Relation of
Theory to Practice in Education”, Dewey believed that this knowledge derives from scientific experimentation by scholars (a laboratory approach) that is “portable, cosmopolitan, and broadly transferable” (Shulman, 1998, p. 512). As such, it is assumed that this type of knowledge “can be neatly packaged into courses, materials, workshops, and training programs” (Hargreaves, 1995, p. 13). To deliver this type of knowledge to teachers, TPD or learning activities mostly take the form of lectures followed by question-and-answer sessions in discrete activities such as workshops, local and national conferences or college/university courses (Little, 1993).

The purpose of TPD within this model is either for “maintenance” – to align teachers’ practice with educational policies, standards or requirements (Day & Sachs, 2004) or for “extension” – to introduce new knowledge or skills into teachers’ repertoires (Grundy & Robison, 2004). Models of TPD in which the purpose is maintenance or extension focus on the acquisition or mastery of the knowledge and skills that teachers are required to have according to legislation or teacher standardisation/certification bodies. TPD programs or opportunities are initiated and controlled by authorities who seek to ensure teachers’ replication of specific practices in the classroom (Fraser, Kennedy, Reid, & McKinney, 2007; Smylie & Conyers, 1991). The maintenance purpose endorses the transmission view of TPD: “to equip teacher[s] with the requisite skills to implement…reforms as decided by others (usually government)” (Kennedy, 2005, p. 247). Beatrice. Avalos (2004) found that this is mostly the case in developing counties that try to enact or introduce educational reform agendas (i.e., decentralisation, school-based management, new curriculums or teacher certification). Avalos suggested that in many instances the focus was to “teach the reform”. In such reforms, various initiatives by governments are enacted to have
teachers participate in formal and mandated TPD programs such as skills training, upgrading qualifications or refresher courses.

In the Indonesian context, Thair and Treagust’s (2003) review of TPD for science teachers provided a good example of TPD practice based on a traditional model of TPD. They highlighted that during the implementation phase of a new curriculum (between 1976 and 1979), known as Curriculum 75 which adopted a student-centred approach, the government initiated a series of national workshop programs to equip teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills to use the new curriculum in their schools or classrooms. Thair and Treagust explained:

Science teachers from around the nation were assembled in a central location for several weeks of intensive workshop activities involving demonstrations of effective science teaching methodology, preparation of lesson plans and materials conforming to the instructional objectives of the curriculum, and micro-teaching sessions…for further disseminating this information, a ‘cascade’ model was adopted where these teachers were then expected to return to their schools and conduct further professional development programs at regional centres for local teachers. (p. 203)

Van Der Werf, Creemers, De Jong, and Klaver (2000) who evaluated the Primary Education Quality Improvement Project (PEQIP) initiated by the Indonesian government to improve the overall quality of primary education, found a similar TPD practice. The TPD component of this project focused on training tutors and subject-matter specialists to use new ways of student grouping, teaching methods and using teaching-learning aids (science kits, globes, or overhead projectors). The tutors and subject-matter specialists were then responsible for transferring their newly acquired knowledge and skills to other teachers. At the same time, principals, supervisors and education administrators/managers at the subdistrict, district and provincial levels were trained in how to support the implementation of the prescribed knowledge and skills in schools and classrooms.
Another approach to TPD that arose as an alternative to traditional TPD practice is often labelled as competency or inquiry-based TPD (Hawley & Valli, 1999) or constructivist TPD (Pitsoe & Maila, 2012). These forms of TPD posit that teachers are capable of investigating and constructing knowledge central to teaching (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Smylie & Conyers, 1991). Learning activities in these forms of TPD encourage teachers to question their teaching, students’ learning and classroom practices in such activities as classroom action research, classroom observation and reflective journals. In this competency-based TPD, TPD is seen as a process of teachers generating and applying knowledge in and from practice (Ball & Cohen, 1999). Therefore, teachers’ new knowledge or practice derives from their inquiry into their own day-to-day instructional practices—practice is the site of inquiry. The result of this inquiry is what many educational researchers refer to as practical knowledge or personal practical knowledge (Carter, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 1987).

This conception of practical knowledge is closely akin to what Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) termed as knowledge-in-practice. Knowledge-in-practice is based on the assumption that the most fundamental knowledge teachers need in order to teach well is “embedded in the exemplary practice of experienced teachers” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, p. 263). According to Cochran-Smith and Lytle, teachers learn this type of knowledge through experience and considered and deliberative reflection about their teaching experience. The concept of knowledge-in-practice breaks with the image of the formal, base knowledge creation which assumes that: 1) there is a body of knowledge generally applicable across school and classroom contexts created by educational experts/researchers; and 2) this knowledge is ready to be implemented by teachers to solve their problems. Instead, from the perspective of knowledge-in-use, it is believed
that professional teachers create an understanding of incidents and problems in their
day-to-day tasks, and that they make sense of these incidents and problems by
connecting them to their prior knowledge and experiences. On the basis of their daily
practice, teachers acquire practical knowledge that can be used to improve their
teaching or to solve their problems. What teachers need to improve their teaching, then,
are opportunities to make explicit, and to articulate, the tacit knowledge embedded in
their practices.

The view of practical knowledge or knowledge-in-practice is based on a strong
belief in teachers as active learners. Teachers are not passive recipients or consumers of
knowledge or practice, but “the teacher is seen as one who mediates ideas and construct
meaning and knowledge and acts upon them” (Richardson, 1996, p. 266). The notion of
teachers as inquirers resonates with the concept of teachers as researchers or reflective
practitioners (Hardy, 2012; Richardson, 1996; Schön, 1995). This idea suggests that the
work of teachers is like the work of researchers. Teachers pose questions in their efforts
to design particular units of instruction, experiment with different types of activities,
collect records, evidence and artefacts of teaching and learning and analysis and
interpret findings (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Richardson, 1996). Teachers are both
knowledge generators and knowledge users and the best way for teachers to learn what
they need to teach is not through imitation or replication but through inquiry in and
reflection on their instructional practices (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Smylie &

In some sense, competency or inquiry-based TPD is somewhat similar to
traditional TPD. First, both approaches imply that teacher learning involves acquiring or
constructing what is already known in order to teach well (Cochran-Smith & Lytle,
1999; Richardson, 1996). Yet, there is still a critical difference between the two. A
traditional TPD model highlights that teachers learn about teaching from what is known
by virtue of outside experts or researchers who formulate the formal, base knowledge.
On the other hand, a competency/inquiry-based TPD model emphasises that teachers
learn about teaching from what is already known by teachers themselves, although the
knowledge of teaching is tacitly known by the teachers. Second, both models share the
assumption that teacher learning is something that takes place primarily inside
individual teachers, either in passive or active ways.

Competency/inquiry-based TPD places its emphasis on teachers’ daily tasks or
problems as the basis for “improvement” (Day & Sachs, 2004). That is, according to
this view, TPD is aimed at improving students’ learning by transforming the knowledge
and skills of teachers. In the Australian context, Doecke et al. (2008), who conducted a
twelve-month mapping project into practices of teacher professional learning found that
professional learning is an integral part of teachers’ professional lives, not an “add on”,
and thus, it should be explicitly embedded within teachers’ work. Burns and
Rochsantiningsih (2006), in their investigation of teachers’ action research in Indonesia,
found that although action research employed as TPD activity is new in Indonesia,
teachers regard it as a powerful form of TPD that helps them to enhance their
instructional practices. One of their participants highlighted the benefits of action
research: “I feel good with AR [action research]. In particular because everything was
from my side: the problems were rooted in my classroom with which I was quite
familiar, and the solutions which I proposed were something I could handle” (Teacher

In another context, “looking at student work” becomes a vehicle for
professional development for teachers in the USA (Little, 2004). Looking at student
work is one of the TPD pedagogies used to locate and support teacher learning from and
in their practice (Ball & Cohen, 1999). Little (2004) explicated that looking at student work involves a set of practices that joins three particular purposes:

The first purpose is to deepen teacher knowledge and strengthen teachers’ instructional practice in specific subject domains. A second set of purposes focuses on collective capacity for improvement in teaching and learning at the school level; it joins school reform goals with an emphasis on professional community. Finally, a third set of purposes aligns directly with the growing accountability movement, employing reviews of student work in the service of standards implementation and external accountability. (p. 98)

Adding to the traditional and competency/inquiry TPD model discussed above is TPD practice that is based on the situative perspective. The TPD model or approach based on this perspective posits that teacher learning, along with learned knowledge, is always situated in a context or setting (Borko, 2004; Greeno, 1998; Putnam & Borko, 2000; R. D. Sawyer, 2002; R. K. Sawyer & Greeno, 2009; A. L. Wilson, 1993). According to Putnam and Borko (2000), the physical and social contexts in which learning takes place are integral to the learning and affect both what is learned and how learning occurs. They further described learning as being distributed across the individual, other persons and various artefacts or tools. Along the same lines, Wilson (1993) argued:

Learning is an everyday event that is social in nature because it occurs with other people; it is ‘tool dependent’ because the setting provides mechanisms (computer, maps, measuring cups) that aid, and more important, structure the cognitive process; and finally, it is the interaction with the setting itself in relation to its social and tool dependent nature that determines the learning. (p. 73)

Whereas traditional and competency/inquiry-based TPD focus on the individuals, the situative TPD model focuses on systems of activity in which individuals interact with each other and with other subsystems in the environment (Greeno, 1998). The situative model of TPD places a strong emphasis both on teachers’ daily tasks or problems as the site of inquiry as in the competency/inquiry based TPD model and on
knowledge of outsiders as in the traditional TPD model. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) referred this knowledge as knowledge-
of-practice. It is knowledge that “is generated when teachers treat their own classrooms and schools as sites for intentional investigation [and] at the same time that they treat the knowledge and theory produced by others as generative material for interrogation and interpretation” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, p. 250). Because of the emphasis on the interaction, learning activities in a situative TPD model mostly take the form of collaborative, interactional learning in such contexts as study groups, group/collaborative action research, and teacher networks.

As mentioned previously, situative model of TPD focuses on the interaction of individuals with other people and with their physical and social contexts, with the term interactive being a close synonym of situative (Greeno, Collins, & Resnick, 1996). Research into TPD affirms that learning occurs as people participate in shared endeavours with others, or through social interaction with others (Birman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000; Borko, 2004; Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Putnam & Borko, 2000). Learners, according to this model, are positioned as active agents. They are seen, not as the “solo constructors” of competency/inquiry based TPD, but rather as participants or constituents wanting to engage in socially and culturally organised activities or practices in which they are members (Greeno et al., 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In this arrangement, learning happens both at the group or community level in which individuals undertake cooperative activities, and at the individual level for those who participate in cooperative activities.

The purpose of TPD within a situative perspective is directly connected to teachers’ “growth” through the development of greater levels of expertise (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Day & Sachs, 2004). According to this view, teachers are “active
learners shaping their professional growth through reflective participation in professional development programs and in practice” (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002, p. 948). In his 10-year case study examining the situated nature of two teachers’ development, R. D. Sawyer (2002) found that the powerful context of professional learning for the two case teachers existed both within their classrooms and through their collaborative interactions. According to R. D. Sawyer, the intersection of these two contexts created a transformative synergy for their growth or development. R. D. Sawyer further explicated that teachers’ classrooms become a space for teachers to develop grounded knowledge and subjective theories about their learning, and this grounded knowledge, in turn, becomes a meaningful lens for teachers when they collaborate with their peers. In another case study, Suratno (2012) investigated the experience of a private school in Jakarta, Indonesia in implementing its school improvement initiative through the use of lesson study as a form of professional learning. Suratno reported that the lesson study practices of the principal and the teachers in the school were “shaped not only by the intentional practice knowledge of participants, but also by circumstances and conditions which are external to them” (p. 637). In other words, what teachers come to know is inseparable from the activities (the lesson study) and context (the school) in which the knowledge develops.

It should be noted that differing TPD practices, along with the perspectives informing them, are not mutually exclusive and in many instances exist simultaneously. This is particularly true if TPD is conceived as the “product” of unique and dynamically changing sets of circumstances – political, economic, social, cultural, historical, professional and technical – of one particular system (Bolam & McMahon, 2004; Hardy, 2012). Kelchtermans (2004) strongly argued for the contextual character of TPD contending that TPD must be understood both in its ‘spatial’ and ‘temporal’ dimensions.
The spatial dimension refers to the social, organisational and cultural circumstances in which teachers work (schools) and the macro-political context of a particular educational system. In its temporal meaning, context includes to the teacher’s life history. Kelctermans explicated:

Teacher learning at a certain moment in time can only be properly understood against the background of earlier experiences on the one hand and in terms of the teacher’s expectations about the future on the other. Past, future and present together constitute the inevitable ‘situatedness in time’, that characterizes teachers’ work. (p. 224)

To this point, the chapter has discussed the definitions and the changing nature of TPD practice over time, along with underlying perspectives. Conceptual and empirical studies have shown very clearly that TPD is a highly complex and multidimensional phenomenon – a number of factors and actors (agents) influence TPD. Discussion now turns to those agents or aspects that have been said to affect TPD as a system (Borko, 2004; Opfer & Pedder, 2011b). In this study, it is conceptually argued that, among other things, there are three factors/actors that come into play to shape TPD: 1) TPD learning activities; 2) teachers; and 3) schools. The following sections discuss these in turn.

### 3.3 TPD Learning Activities

A variety of learning activities have been utilised across different contexts with reference to TPD. In the literature, the terms, forms, types, approaches, models and methods are used to represent the variety of TPD learning activities. In this study, these terms are used interchangeably to mean TPD learning activities.

Shallow, fragmented, piecemeal and poor focus are terms commonly used to describe the “old” or “traditional” models of TPD. As Hawley and Valli (1999) argued:

In the old paradigm, in-service workshops emphasise private individual activity; are brief, often one-shot sessions; offer unrelated topics; rely on an external ‘expert’ presenter; expect passive teacher-listeners;
emphasise skill development; are rhetorical; and expect quick visible results. (p.134)

Learning activities in these traditional models of TPD take the form of discrete activities such as workshops, conferences, college/university courses, or in-service days designed for transmitting specific ideas to teachers (Little, 1993). These types of learning activities are widely reported to have little impact on teachers or the impacts are superficial and short-lived. Little (1993) argued that this model of TPD is no longer adequate to meet, and is incompatible with, the complex demands of current reform and the equally complex demands of teaching.

In contrast with the traditional TPD is a “reform” TPD which is seen to be more active, practice-based and social-interactive. Hawley and Valli (1999) argued:

[T]he new paradigm staff development is a shared, public process; promotes sustained interaction; emphasise substantive, school-related issues; relies on internal expertise; expects teachers to be active participants; emphasise the why as well as the how of teaching; articulates a theoretical research base; and anticipates that lasting change will be a slow process. (p. 134)

This newer image of TPD is believed to bring about more powerful impacts for teacher learning and change as well as student learning and outcomes. The result of this paradigm shift, in general, is that traditional forms of TPD learning activities (for example, workshops or in-service days) are considered less effective than reform types of professional development such as action research or study groups.

However, providing or designing effective TPD is not simply a matter of replacing the “old” with the “new”. Kelchtermans (2004) discussed this issue in detail, for example, and argued that “exchanging the traditional workshop format for other activities does not guarantee that the desired learning takes place” (p. 341). Similarly, Birman et al. (2000) strongly advocated that forms or types of learning activities in TPD do not matter because both the traditional and reform types of learning activities can be
effective as long as they have characteristics of effective TPD. The essential differences between the different perspectives of TPD do not reside in the forms used to facilitate learning but in the assumptions made when these forms are used (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999).

Conceptual and empirical research has shown that teachers learn from a vast range of activities that may increase their knowledge and skills as well as develop their personal, social, and emotional characters as teachers. These learning activities can range from “formal, structured topic-specific seminars given on in-service days, to everyday, informal ‘hallway’ discussions with other teachers about instruction techniques, embedded in teachers’ everyday work lives” (Desimone, 2009, p. 182). Desimone’s description of the myriad of learning activities for teacher learning makes obvious the inadequacy of designating learning activities in two opposing poles – formal, planned/structured, mandated learning activities on one hand, and informal, incidental, self-initiated or voluntary on the other. What is needed is not a complete rejection of traditional workshops and a wholesale move towards reflective study groups, but a balance or an optimal mix (Birman et al., 2000; Hill, 2009; Hoban, 2002).

Forms of TPD learning activities in the literature seem never-ending. Craft (2000), for example, listed a wide range of TPD learning activities which are linked to the contemporary views of TPD, such as:

- action research
- self-directed study
- using distance-learning materials
- on-the-job coaching, mentoring or tutoring
- school-based and off-site courses
- job shadowing and rotation
peer networks
- membership of a working party or task group
- learning partnerships
- school cluster projects
- personal reflection
- experiential ‘assignments’
- collaborative learning
- information technology-mediated learning (e.g. e-mail discussion groups, or self-study using multi-media resources).

The forms of TPD learning activities are also often put into categories. Villegas-Reimers (2003) grouped the forms of TPD learning activities into two broad categories as shown in Table 3.1. The first category involves forms that require and imply particular organisational or inter-institutional partnerships. The second category involves those that can be implemented on a smaller scale (i.e. a group, a classroom, or a school).
Table 3.1  Forms of TPD Learning Activities Based on Villegas-Reimers’ (2003) Categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Partnership Models</th>
<th>Small Group or Individual Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development schools</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-school partnerships</td>
<td>Students’ performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools’ networks</td>
<td>Workshops, seminars, courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ network</td>
<td>Case-based study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td>Self-directed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inter-institutional collaborations</td>
<td>Co-operative/collageal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of excellent practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ participation in new roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills-development mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project-based model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generational/cascade model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching/mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burke (2000) listed the many forms or types of TPD learning activities as shown in Table 3.2. According to Burke, these forms of TPD of learning activities can be customised to meet individual teachers’ or group of teachers’ needs and concerns and emphasises the need for teachers to choose their own forms of TPD for better results – improved teaching practices and student learning.
Table 3.2 Forms of TPD Learning Activities Based on Burke’s (2000) Categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inactive Activities</th>
<th>Investigative Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service days</td>
<td>Study Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-School Workshops</td>
<td>Book Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>Individual Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Visits</td>
<td>Group Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Grade Level Meetings</td>
<td>Educational Journals and Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video of Best Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet Searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chat Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Programs</td>
<td>Reflective Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning Courses</td>
<td>Log Entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Renewal</td>
<td>Videotaped Lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Institutes</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Board for Professionals</td>
<td>Peer Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Standards</td>
<td>Professional Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An OECD report (2005) highlighted that these different forms of TPD learning activities exist across OECD countries. The OECD report suggests that each activity has its own role and each one can benefit its users, be they the teachers, schools or systems.

S. M. Wilson and Berne (1999) concisely described the diversity of learning activities that teachers can experience:

Practicing teachers participate in mandatory part-day or day-long workshops sponsored by their school district. They pursue individual learning opportunities: enrolling in master's courses, signing up for summer and weekend workshops, joining professional organizations. Some learning, no doubt, goes on in the interstices of the workday, in conversations with colleagues, passing glimpses of another teacher's classroom on the way to the photocopying machine, tips swapped in the coffee lounge, not to mention the daily experience of the class-room. (p. 174)

The forms or types of TPD learning activities are varied and continue to evolve over time. TPD providers, schools or teachers themselves can choose which of these forms or types are suitable and appropriate for their needs and circumstances.
3.4 Teacher Characteristics Influencing TPD

Teachers are the central actors in TPD, either as subjects or objects. In this regard, what teachers bring into TPD matters. A number of teacher characteristics have been extensively reported to affect teacher learning and change in TPD. For the sake of this study, however, teacher characteristics are limited to: years of teaching experience, beliefs and prior knowledge and teachers’ economic status.

Teachers experience many stages throughout their careers. Understanding where teachers are in their careers is important for supporting their learning and change. Thus, many scholars have argued that TPD needs to be aligned to stages of teachers’ career development (Day, 1997; Kelchtermans & Vandenberghhe, 1994; Maskit, 2011; Richter, Kunter, Klusmann, Lüdtke, & Baumert, 2011). Day suggested that “professional development must take account of where teachers are in their lives and careers, that the kinds, levels and intensities of professional development opportunities available must relate to these, and that resources should be targeted accordingly” (p. 42).

To show the influence of teachers’ years of teaching experience on TPD, a number of teacher career stage models have been developed to describe the stereotypical development of teacher characteristics in terms of discrete stages. Huberman’s (1995) model of teacher career stage (see Figure 3.1), for example, characterises the teacher career cycle as a set of five consecutive stages which are closely connected to teachers’ years of teaching experience. This model suggests that among other things, teachers make use of different forms of learning opportunities or activities across their careers. Choy, Chen, and Burgarin (2006) found that beginning teachers (three years of experience or less) participate more frequently in mentoring or peer observation while teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience are involved in more in collaborative and observational visits to other schools. These
stages, however, “should not be viewed as fixed, but rather as a dynamic working explanation as new data are fed back into the process” (Fessler, 1995, p. 190).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching</th>
<th>Themes/Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>Career entry: Survival and discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 18</td>
<td>Experimentation / Diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 30</td>
<td>Serenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>Disengagement (&quot;serene&quot; or &quot;bitter&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock-taking / Integrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1  Huberman’s (1995) model of teacher career stage

According to Kennedy (1991), pre-service teachers have over 3000 days of experience observing teachers as children or young adult learners, and Kennedy argued that these experiences as students form pre-service teachers’ views about learning and teaching. In the case of in-service teachers, the accumulation of teachers’ experiences becomes more influential and intense. For example, in a recent study to investigate teachers’ uptake of different learning opportunities from the beginning to the end of their teaching careers, Richter et al. (2011) reported statistical analysis that indicated a significant year-of-experience-related change in the uptake of in-service training and content of TPD activities. Their findings further suggest there is a distinct learning pattern across a typical teaching career. For example, teachers who are at the beginning of their careers are likely to favour collaborative learning and learning from or drawing
on the expertise of more experienced teachers than teachers in the middle or at the end of their teaching careers. Conversely, self-directed learning, such as reading professional literature, is more often preferred by older teachers compared early in their careers. From these findings, it can be inferred that to some extent teacher learning is informed and influenced by individual teachers’ years of experiences, particularly experiences that are relevant to learning and teaching.

Other characteristics that are closely related to teachers’ experiences are their beliefs and knowledge. Teachers hold beliefs and knowledge about their students, the subjects they teach and their roles. Although these beliefs and knowledge are often implicit or tacit, they have been widely acknowledged to influence teachers’ thoughts and actions (practices). The beliefs and knowledge of teachers are perhaps the characteristics that get the most attention and investigation in reference to teacher learning and change (Boulton-Lewis, Wilss, & Mutch, 1996; Hughes, 2005; Kagan, 1992; Luft & Roehrig, 2007; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Peterman, 1991; van Driel, Beijaard, & Verloop, 2001). Nespor (1987) described beliefs as propositions about the existence or non-existence of entities as well as ideal or alternative realities. For example, some teachers may believe teaching is simply a matter of drilling; other teachers may believe that students who fail a test do so simply because they are lazy. Other teachers may believe that there is an ideal teaching model that is an alternative to the sorts of models he or she is familiar with, though he or she has never experienced that model. Pajares (1992) suggested that these propositions “are the incontrovertible, personal truths everyone holds” (p. 309). Nespor (1987) also suggested that beliefs have strong affective and evaluative functions that become “important regulators of the amount of energy teachers will put into activities and how they will expend energy on an activity” (p. 320). The affective and evaluative nature of beliefs
probably becomes the most common basis for theorists and researchers when formulating their interpretation of the influence of teachers’ beliefs on teaching. To name but a few possibilities, beliefs can function as filters, determinants, predictors, directors, or indicators of teachers’ perceptions, judgements and behaviour.

Knowledge, on the other hand, is a mental representation of objects and events. What teachers know about their subjects (‘what’ knowledge) and how to teach the subjects (‘how’ knowledge) are instances of teacher knowledge. Teacher knowledge (Michaloski, 2009), or teacher personal/practical/professional knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1987, 1996; Connelly, Clandinin, & Ming Fang, 1997), which is distinguished from the knowledge base of teaching, “is highly determined and ‘colored’ by...[teachers’] individual experiences, personal history (including learning processes), personality variables, subject matter knowledge and so on” (Verloop, Van Driel, & Meijer, 2001). As such, this personal knowledge plays a prominent role in teachers’ perceptions, thinking and actions. It filters, guides and determines teachers’ practices (Borko & Putnam, 1995; Pajares, 1992; Verloop et al., 2001). Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) argued that teacher change is closely related to the growth of teacher knowledge.

The last teacher characteristic influencing teacher learning and change is teachers’ economic status. Sufficient financial resources are essential for ongoing, regular TPD. However, in some circumstances, particularly in developing countries, the financial situation of most teachers does not allow for sustained, intensive TPD (Christie, Harley, & Penny, 2004; Lambert, 2004; Villegas-Reimers, 2003). Villegas-Reimers (2003) argued that “differences in the amount of time allotted to professional development are related to differences in salary and the hiring practices in those countries” (p. 126). In a similar trend, Lambert (2004) found that poor salaries among teachers in African regions is the biggest problem for the education sector in general.
and for teachers’ commitment and motivation to their job and development in particular. In such cases, teachers often cannot participate in TPD opportunities because they do not have time or feel exhausted from doing their second or even third jobs; or because they cannot afford the costs incurred (e.g. registration/tuition fee, travel costs etc).

To this juncture, the two factors or aspects of TPD (learning activities and teacher characteristics) as influential factors to powerful TPD have been discussed. This chapter now turns to the third aspect, school conditions.

3.5 **School-Level Influences**

It has been a common view that the conditions of the schools in which teachers are situated influence teacher learning and change (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Jurasaitė-Harbison & Rex, 2010; OECD, 2009; Schwille, Dembele, & Schubert, 2007; Timperley, 2008). Schwille et al. (2007) argued that “the school and classroom, is increasingly recognized as the most appropriate, indeed the only entirely suitable context for teachers’ professional development” (p. 103). According to Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002), the school context (or school setting as it is referred in the current study) affects every dimension of TPD: access to TPD opportunities; restrictions or support for particular types of participation; encouragement or discouragement to experiment with newly learned knowledge/skills; and restrictions or support for the long-term application of new ideas (Figure 3.2). In other words, conducive school settings for TPD are schools that provide fruitful condition for teachers accessing and participating in TPD as well as experimenting and applying TPD ideas into teachers’ practices. Among the school-level influences for creating fruitful condition for TPD: principals; norm of collaboration and collegiality; and norm of continuous improvement.
Principals are key actors in the school setting. As such, their roles are crucial for teacher learning and change (Bredeson & Johansson, 2000; Geijsel, Sleegers, Stoel, & Kruger, 2009; Gumus, 2013; Havlik, 2007; Leithwood, Leonard, & Sharratt, 1998; Timperley, 2008). Bredeson and Johansson (2000), investigating the role of principals in teacher professional development, identified four areas and roles where principals have a substantial impact on teacher learning and change. Firstly, principals act as instructional leaders and learners. As instructional leaders and learners, principals become: 1) stewards of learning who value teacher learning and commit themselves to it in their daily work; 2) models of life-long learning by participating actively in TPD in their schools; 3) experts who possess professional expertise in teaching, learning and schooling; and 4) instructional leaders who utilise a variety of strategies and activities to encourage and celebrate learning. Secondly, principals create a supportive environment in which teachers continue to grow and improve their instructional practices when they act as communicators, supporters and managers of TPD. Principals’ direct involvement in the design, delivery and content of TPD is the third area where principals exert significant influences on teacher learning. The last area where principals exercise influence on TPD is in the assessment of TPD outcomes through regular supervision and evaluation of their teachers’ TPD experiences, collaborative planning of teachers’ TPD plans and systematic collection and analysis of TPD data in their schools. Leithwood, et al. (1998) concluded that as top managers in schools, principals set the...
general tone in schools and shape the organisational conditions of teachers’ learning in
the workplace in particular.

There has been a growing recognition that teacher learning is not only individual
but also collective or social (Caffarella & Barnett, 1994; Hansman, 2001; Putnam &
Borko, 2000). Putnam and Borko (2000) argued that “interactions with the people in
one’s environment are major determinants of both what is learned and how learning
takes place” (p. 5). The reasoning behind this argument is that ideas or new information
is to a large extent inherently the product of people’s interactions and arises from their
working together (collaboration). Therefore, for example, literature suggests that
teachers are more likely to professionally grow and learn in a school environment that:
promotes professional interaction between principals and their teachers and teachers
with their colleagues; values collaborative learning; and provides administrative and
collegial support (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2010;
Rosenholtz, et al., 1986). Collegiality, in fact, is the most mentioned school-level
influence in the literature that makes workplace conditions conducive to teacher
learning and change. Collegiality refers to “school situations [that] foster teachers’
recourse to others’ knowledge and experience, and to shared work and discussion”
(Little, 1982, p. 339). With respect to the increasing attention to workplace learning,
collegiality is often considered a necessary condition for successful TPD in schools
(Clement & Vandenbergh, 2000; Manouchehri, 2001; M. Park & So, 2014). M. Park
and So (2014), for example, investigated the experiences of three Korean secondary
teachers in a school-initiated teacher learning project and found that learning through
and with colleagues was a key component of teacher learning and growth because it
provided exposure to diverse ideas, enabled both critical self and collaborative
reflection which helped teachers to enact an inquiring stance toward their teaching
practice. Therefore, it is generally argued that schools in which collaboration and collegiality are valued and practised by school members (teachers, principals and administrators), or schools with norm of collaboration and collegiality, provide more conducive environments for teacher learning. Norm in this respect refers to shared expectations that are valued and practiced by all participants of schools (OECD, 2005).

In addition, the norm of collaboration and collegiality, school members need to value and practice a norm of continuous improvement to support teacher learning and change (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Little, 1982; Silins & Mulford, 2002). A norm of continuous improvement refers to an expectation of analysis, evaluation and experimentation in the business of teaching and learning shared by people who are responsible for teaching and learning at schools (Little, 1982). Silins and Mulford (2002) argued that in line with a collaborative environment, schools need to promote collective learning for continual improvement. In other words, schools should “value differences, support critical reflection and encourage members to question, challenge and debate teaching and learning issues” (Silins & Mulford, 2002, p. 441). In such schools, experimentation, risk-taking and failure are acceptable and supported as a part of the process of teacher learning and initiating change for improvements in teacher practice (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Rosenholtz, et al., 1986; Silins & Mulford, 2002).

3.6 Theoretical Framework

Complexity theory is the theoretical framework of this study. While complexity theory originated in other fields, such as physics, biology, mathematics and economics, complexity theory has been increasingly employed in the social sciences, including education (Davis & Sumara, 2006; Haggis, 2008; Hoban, 2002; Lemke & Sabelli, 2008; Mason, 2008; Morrison, 2008; Pitsoe & Maila, 2012; Reigeluth, 2004; Tosey, 2002;
Zellermayer & Margolin, 2005). Complexity theory is a way of thinking and acting that perceives and conceives of organisms or living systems as consisting of multiple elements or agents that interact in many different ways, and further holds that the organisation of these systems cannot be understood in simple mechanistic or linear ways (Alhadeff-Jones, 2008; Davis & Sumara, 2006; Morrison, 2008; Tosey, 2002; Waldrop, 1992).

From a mechanistic point of view, “studying the parts is the key to understand the whole...[based on the assumption] that the more we know about the working pieces, the more we will learn about the whole” (Wheatley, 2009, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii). In contrast, complexity theory is concerned about wholes rather than parts and the relationships between constituent parts (Mason, 2008; Wheatley, 2009). Wheatley suggested that “[w]hen we view systems from this perspective, we enter an entirely new landscape of connections of phenomena that cannot be reduced to simple cause and effect, or explained by studying the parts as isolated contributors” (Wheatley, 2009, p. 10). Put differently, complexity theory rejects the mechanistic notion of seeing living systems as constant, independent and predictable. Instead, complexity theory suggests an alternative way of understanding phenomena in an organic, non-linear and holistic way (Santonus, 1998 cited in Morrison, 2008; Plsek & Greenhalgh, 2001; Urry, 2005).

According to Mainzer (2007), “[t]he principles of complex systems suggest that the physical, social and mental world is nonlinear, [and] complex” (p. 417, emphasis added). The systems are complex because “a great many independent agents are interacting with each other in a great many ways” (Waldrop, 1992, p. 11). They are nonlinear because the properties or behaviours of complex systems are due to “the interrelationships that exist among a combination of elements and groups of elements” (Hoban, 2002, p. 23). Thus, a study of complex systems is orientated towards
investigating the emergence of collective behaviours, properties or patterns as a result of the dynamic interaction of multiple elements (Davis & Sumara, 2006; Horn, 2008; Urry, 2005). As Hoban (2002) argued:

The key to studying complex interaction is to focus on the interrelationships between multiple elements and to reflect upon patterns that emerge to gain a ‘big picture’ of the change process ... [for this reason] complexity theory is the most appropriate [theory] to help us understand the dynamic of educational change because it highlights the multidimensional nature of change as well as acknowledging that non-linear interaction can result in a sense of order or balance... [in other words] educational change can be better understood and hence managed by thinking about it as a complex system. (p. 25, emphasis added)

There are at least two primary reasons for conceptualising TPD as a complex system. First, casting TPD as a complex system implies that numerous factors come into play in TPD. As described earlier, TPD is multidimensional in nature. Therefore, when teachers participate in a TPD program, their learning and change cannot be attributed to a single factor. Teacher learning and change are made possible by other agents being already in place. For example, teacher learning and change occur when, among others, a learning activity is available; the teachers have a need and/or motivation for learning; their beliefs, knowledge and experience are compatible with the knowledge or skills to be learned; and supports are provided by principals or administrators (Ball, 1996; Bransford & Schwartz, 1999; Caffarella & Barnett, 1994; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Richter, Kunter, Klusmann, Lüdtke, & Baumert, 2011).

The second reason for conceptualising TPD as a complex system relates to the process of TPD. A number of scholars argue that TPD researchers and practitioners commit an epistemological flaw when they approach TPD in a linear, causal and deterministic way (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Gravani, 2007; Hoban, 2002; Kaasila & Lauriala, 2010; Opfer & Pedder, 2011a; Pitsoe & Maila, 2012; Webster-Wright, 2009). Guskey (1986, 2002), for example, proposed the following model of TPD which,
according to (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002), represents teacher learning and change as a linear process:

![Diagram of Guskey's (1986, 2002) model of TPD process]

*Figure 3.3  Guskey’s (1986, 2002) model of TPD process*

This model assumes that: 1) an activity or reality occurs in a sequential process; 2) one part of an entity causes or affects another part in a linear way; and 3) because of this linear, cause-effect relationship, the outcome of an activity is pre-determined and known. This view holds that a known input will repeatedly produce a similar effect (Jayasinghe, 2011). Thus, it is a common belief in the field of TPD that once teachers attend “effective” TPD, the desired learning and change will follow. Unfortunately, the relationships between agents (factors and actors) that interrelate in TPD is highly complex, which means that the outcomes of TPD are mostly unpredictable (Gravani, 2007; Knight, 2002). TPD is more than just a process or a compilation of an activity (by an agent) and a process; it is a nonlinear system in which “the effect is disproportionate to the cause” (Larsen-Freeman, 1997, p. 143).

While acknowledging the multidimensionality of TPD, this study adopts Opfer and Pedder’s (2011b) position that delimits the numerous factors influencing TPD to three key influences: learning activities, teacher characteristics and school-level influences. Borrowing the lens of complexity theory, this study focuses on how teacher learning emerges from the intersection of these three influential agents. Figure 3.4 provides a theoretical representation of TPD as a complex system. Yet, Figure 3.4 presents only a simplified image of a much more complex set of processes and structures. First, there are multiple elements or agents (small circles) operating as one
system (big circle). Second, as the two-way arrows suggest, the process at play in a system is not a linear process but rather one element or agent can feed back or influence (or can be influenced by) other elements. Third, the arrows outside the big circle indicate that there are other systems, elements or agents operating outside the main system under study here. It is important to note that the boundary in Figure 3.4 should be viewed as a conceptual boundary delimited for the purposes of the study.

Figure 3.4 TPD as a complex system

3.7 Summary of Key Findings of the Literature Review

TPD is an evolving conception of teacher learning and change that is informed by a variety of perspectives. These various perspectives can be grouped into at least four different perspectives that view TPD as: 1) activities, events, or opportunities for advancing teacher knowledge and skills; 2) processes for enhancing teachers’ professionalism either through transmission, construction of knowledge or participation in practice; 3) both activities and processes for developing the professional knowledge,
skills and attitudes of teachers; and 4) a complex systems in which systems and agents coalesce or interact to shape teacher learning and change.

To some extent, the perspectives informing TPD have also affected the practices of TPD. Traditionally, TPD is seen as an opportunity for educators to transmit the formal or base knowledge of teaching deemed important for teachers to have in order to be effective. The purpose of TPD is either to align teachers’ levels of knowledge and skill with the prescribed requirements or standards, or to introduce knowledge and skills to support deficiencies. Coming from a different viewpoint, competency, inquiry-based or constructivist TPD arises as an alternative to the traditional practice of TPD. Competency based TPD is a process of teachers generating and applying knowledge in and from practice and, through this process, constructing practical, personal, professional knowledge that they can use to improve their practice or solve problems in teaching and learning. TPD is geared toward transforming and changing the knowledge and skill of teachers. Adding to traditional and competency based approaches to TPD is TPD practice that is based on the situative view. TPD according to a situative view is a social enterprise in which teachers generate local knowledge of practice through collective systematic inquiries within their local and broader communities (i.e., students, principals, district administrators, or academics/researchers). The purpose of TPD, then, is directly connected to teachers’ growth through the development of greater levels of expertise.

The literature on TPD describes a number of factors and actors come into play to shape teacher learning and change. Three of them are under scrutiny for the current study, namely: TPD learning activities; teachers; and schools. Forms of TPD learning activities vary from formal, planned/structured, or mandated learning activities to informal, incidental, self-initiated or voluntary ones. Each of these has its own place to
benefit its users. Teachers as the ultimate users of TPD bring some characteristics (e.g. years of teaching experience, educational qualification, economic status and beliefs and prior knowledge) that affect their learning and change. At the school level, there exists some actors/factors such as principals and norms of practices in schools that influence teachers’ access to and participation in TPD as well as teachers’ experimentation and application of what they learn in TPD in their schools or classrooms.

When viewing TPD as a complex system, influential factors/actors to TPD such as the three aspects under investigation in the current study are no longer appropriate seen an individual, independent influences. It is also problematic to see process of TPD as a strictly linear-causal process. As such, investigating TPD “cannot be reduced to simple cause and effect, or explained by studying the parts as isolated contributors” (Wheatley, 2009, p. 10). Instead, as the current study aims, research on TPD should focus on the dynamic relationship and interaction among those influential factors/actors.
Chapter 4 Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an account of components that build up the methodology and overall strategy for this research as well as a rationale and justification for choosing these components. There are five sections in this chapter. The first section discusses my ontological and epistemological positions that influence the methodology. The second section explores the research paradigm, the choice for qualitative research and the chosen research design. The third section focuses on decisions and actions taken in the research process including the pilot study. This section also provides details of methods for data collection and procedures for selecting participants. The fourth section describes the data analysis and interpretation process. The final section considers the ethical issues involved in the research process.

4.2 My Ontological and Epistemological Underpinnings

My ontological position has been largely shaped by my history as a teacher, teacher educator and educational administrator. As a result of these experiences, I strongly believe that teachers are learning professionals: teachers learn from the moment they commence their pre-service education and they continue to do so throughout their teaching careers. They learn in and from many different opportunities and contexts (e.g. universities, communities of practice, schools or classes). As teachers traverse these numerous and varied situations, not only do they learn different things about teaching but, at the same time, they also develop learning trajectories that are quite likely to be different between teachers and to change over time. Teachers differ from one another in many ways. For example, like other learners, they do not learn in the same fashion or pace, due to personal, workplace, socio-economic and other factors.
Because of these personal and situational differences, I believe that the results of their learning in terms of changed instructional practices are also very likely to be different. Therefore, in my belief, teacher learning and changed instructional practice constitute multiple realities and meanings that are also subject to multiple interpretations.

Throughout my educational life and experiences, I have always believed that teacher learning is indispensable for improving teachers’ instructional practices. As such, seeking to understand the “truth” of teacher learning is of significance and interest to educational researchers. I believe that every endeavour to understand teacher learning is worthwhile and will help to shed light on numerous issues in the field. Of particular interest to my research are issues of multiplicity and the interactivity of factors influencing and shaping teacher learning and changed practices.

I believe that my efforts to gain a better understanding of teachers’ life experiences, in this case their learning and change, are best facilitated by immersing myself into the “real” situations of teachers’ lives. By immersion I mean engaging myself as a conversation/dialogue partner with teachers rather than as a distant, independent observer. As an educator, I hold my own beliefs and theories about teacher learning but these are open to change through “saying, doing and relating” to other people and situations. This principle also applies to teachers and to all social actors. Thus, I believe that the relationship between researchers and their respondents should be built on a reflexive principle of dialogical interaction between people.

Beyond these personal values, there are also certain principles and rules that guide researchers’ actions and beliefs. Such principles and rules constitute a research paradigm. It is to the description of this paradigm, and my submission to this paradigm, that this thesis now turns. Following the discussion about the research paradigm is the discussion of the choice of qualitative research and the research design for this study.
4.3 The Study: Research Paradigm, Qualitative Research and Research Design

My ontological and epistemological values, as described above, inform the methodological decision for this research. I believe that the suitable methodology for accomplishing the purpose of this research should be qualitative in approach, based on the axioms of relativist (multiple constructed realities), interpretivist (knower and known interact and shape one another) and naturalistic methods (in the natural world) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003b). The following sub-sections are a succinct review of each of these notions.

4.3.1 Research paradigm

This study is situated within the realm of a constructivist-interpretive paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a). This paradigm is built on three basic interconnected philosophical tenets: a relativist ontology, a subjectivist epistemology and a naturalistic methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Relativists assume the existence of multiple, socially constructed realities. These realities are constructed by individuals to make sense or meaning of their experiences and practices. More often than not, these constructions are shared among the individuals within particular contexts (e.g. classes, schools, communities) and, thus, “are always interactive in nature” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 86). In this study, teachers devise diverse meanings for their learning experiences and practices. Teachers, as human and social beings, are parts of the communities (e.g. schools) that frame their experiences and within which they have social relationships or interactions with other members of their communities (e.g. principals, fellow teachers, students). According to this view, the practice of teacher learning is a social reality that is constructed by teachers within a context and in relation to other members of their communities.
Since a relativist ontology rejects the notion of objective reality, a relativist epistemology holds that “reality consists of a series of mental constructions, objectivity does not make sense; only interactivity can lead to a construction or its subsequent reconstruction” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 85). Denzin and Lincoln (2003a) argued that so-called objective observations can never happen, and that what actually exists is “only observations socially situated in the worlds of – and between – the observer and the observed” (p. 21). That is, the interaction between the inquirer and the inquired creates the data upon which the enquirer bases his or her interpretation of the meaning of particular social lived experiences and events. In short, the values of inquirers and all other stakeholders (e.g. research respondents, sponsors, consultants) involved in investigations hold considerable influence in the construction of realities.

The notion of subjectivity is consistent with the position and orientation of my study. I do believe that a wide range personal ideas, beliefs and theories come into play in my research. These include my own preconception, and ideas from my supervisors, peers, authors whose articles I have read, teachers and principals. Data and its interpretation involve communication and negotiation among these parties. Therefore, “the reality…is not a given reality, but is constructed by different ‘actors’” (Flick, 2006, p. 66).

Having assumed a realist ontology and a subjectivist epistemology, it is obvious that qualitative research must be carried out in natural settings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a) or under real-world conditions (Yin, 2011). In so doing, qualitative researchers employ research procedures and methods that “expose the constructions of a variety of concerned parties and provide the opportunity for revised or entirely new constructions to emerge” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 87). The choice of research procedures and
methods of data collection and analysis are explained in detail in sub-Section 4.4.2 of this chapter.

In summary, researchers working within a constructivist-interpretive paradigm attempt to understand socially constructed meanings by addressing the processes of interaction between participants, relying on the participants’ views (e.g. experiences, beliefs, values) of the phenomenon being studied and by focusing on the contextual settings or backgrounds of the participants (Creswell, 2003). To help achieve this purpose, qualitative researchers collect a variety of empirical material and employ a wide range of interpretive methods (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a).

4.3.2 Qualitative Research

The current study considers that the three aspects of TPD being investigated are socially constructed realities – meanings that teachers and principals involve in the current study give to each of these aspects. In this regard, qualitative research deems to be an appropriate for the current study. Qualitative research, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2003a) is a research activity in which “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). Qualitative research does not have distinct theories of its own. Rather, qualitative research is an umbrella term encompassing various approaches that are concerned with subjective and individual meaning-making, social experiences and their production and situational (physical, psychological, social and cultural contexts) characters informing inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a, 2003b; Flick, 2006; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Nor does qualitative research have specific or exclusive methods and strategies. Therefore, in doing qualitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (2003a) explicated:
Qualitative researchers use semiotics, narrative, content, discourse, archival and phonemic analysis, even statistics, tables, graphs, and numbers. They also draw upon and utilize the approaches, methods, and techniques of ethnethodology, phenomenology, hermeneutics, feminism, rhizomatics, deconstructionism, ethnography, interviews, psychoanalysis, cultural studies, survey research, and participant observation, among other. (p.7)

4.3.3 Holistic Multiple-Case Study Design

One of the research designs that falls into the realm of qualitative research is case study. Case study is a research strategy or approach where researchers investigate a contemporary phenomenon in its real-life context, as a bounded system (a case) or as multiple bounded systems (cases). Case study employs mixed methods to explore the case and report “rich descriptions” of the case that arises from participants’ perspectives (Creswell, 2007; Stark & Torrance, 2005; Yin, 2003). Stark and Torrance (2005) argued that case study focuses on three things: the social construction of the case; the site or physical location of the case; and the nature of the case as realised in social action. Hence, they elaborated:

[A] case study seeks to engage with and report the complexity of social activity in order to represent the meanings that individual actors bring to those settings and manufacture in them;...assumes that ‘social reality’ is created through social interaction, albeit situated in particular contexts;...and use[s] multiple methods and data sources to explore it and interrogate it ... [in order to] achieve ‘rich description’. (p. 33)

Among the options available for case study research methods, the present study chose a holistic multiple-case study design (Yin, 2003) with mixed methods of data collection as discussed below.

It is essential at the outset to clarify what a case is in a case study. A case refers to the object or unit of analysis of study about which researchers collect information and can include a wide range of “things” such as individuals, times, places, organisations, events, programs and so on (de Vaus, 2001; Stake, 2003). In this study, for example, the
three schools (multiple bounded systems) in terms of the practices of TPD (a contemporary phenomenon) are viewed as cases. That is, TPD was investigated and explored through more than one single case in the same study (a multiple-case design).

It is also important in a case study to distinguish between a case as a whole and a case that consists of various levels or components (de Vaus, 2001; Stake, 2003). Yin (2003) used the terms “holistic” and “embedded” to make this distinction. For example, TPD in one school as a case may include learning activities, teacher educators, teachers as learners or principals as the units. Analysis can be concentrated on more than one sub-unit of the case (embedded design). TPD can also be practised at the holistic level and the focus of investigation can be on the global nature of TPD in one school. That is, analysis is focused on the “macro-level properties” of the case(s) (holistic design). According to Yin (2003), one of the conditions that lends itself to a holistic design occurs is “when the relevant theory underlying the case study is itself a holistic nature” (p. 45). This condition applies for the current study that deploys complexity theory as its lens to understand the phenomenon under study and thus, a holistic design as elaborated by Yin (2003) was adopted.

A case may consist of various units and different methods of data collection may be required for these different units (de Vaus, 2001). In the current study, a survey or questionnaire of teachers seemed appropriate to enable the collection of data about teachers’ demographic details, learning activities and perceptions about the impact of the learning activities on their instructional practices. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain information on participants’ experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge about their learning and changes to practices. Documents pertinent to the case were used to gain information about the contextual conditions of the case(s).
In brief, a holistic multiple-case study design was selected to enable the study to capture the lived experiences of participants on the particular issues of their learning and their instructional practices within the particular situation of the case schools through the use of multiple methods of data collection and analysis. This design facilitated the endeavour to gain a “rich and thick description” of TPD that recognises the complexity, interactivity and uniqueness of social reality/activity. A representation of this holistic multiple-case study design of the current study is presented in overview in Figure 4.1.

As shown in Figure 4.1, the current study began with an initial set of processes consisting of formulating research purpose and questions, selecting cases, designing data collection instruments and conducting pilot study. Following the initial process was the execution of individual cases which included collecting and analysing data and writing individual cases’ reports. Data gathered in the individual cases were then used to generate a cross-case analysis and report. Finally, discussions and conclusions were drawn from both the results of individual cases and cross-case.
4.4 Research in Action

This study was originally instigated by my personal and professional interest in understanding how the provision of TPD, the field that I have been working in for the last eight years, affects or helps improve teachers’ instructional practices. This led me to set out the purpose of this study as developing a better understanding of the complex nature of TPD by examining three aspects of TPD: learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions. To achieve this purpose, the following questions were formulated:

1. What are the features of TPD learning activities in which teachers participate and what are teachers’ perceptions about their TPD learning activities?
2. What teacher characteristics influence their learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?
3. At the school level, what influences support, or impede, teacher learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?

The sources of data and the methods for data collection and analysis in attempt to answer the above research questions are discussed in the following sub-sections.

4.4.1 Research Sites and Participants

The involvement of the schools in this study was secured through a series of personal contacts. All schools were initially approached through informal contacts with “school coordinators”. These school coordinators were teacher acquaintances whom the researcher had met on various occasions (e.g. university classmates, fellow teachers in training programs) and later in the study they were recruited as research assistants for administering and organising questionnaires in the participating schools. Through these informal contacts, the possibility of recruiting the schools was explored. Once the possibility was confirmed, letters of invitation, along with copies of the ethics approval
from the University of Wollongong Human Ethics Committee, information sheets and consent forms (see Appendixes 1 to 6b) were sent to the school principals. To follow up the invitations, courtesy calls to principals were made to encourage participation as well as to clarify the purpose and whole process of the study. Eventually, approvals were granted and four schools were keen to voluntarily participate in this study (one for a pilot study and three for the main study).

These four schools became the primary sites for this study. The four schools, called for the purpose of this study, Mac, Pioneer, Map and Pilot schools, are situated in three different regions across the province of Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia. Mac School is located in an urban, south part of kota (city) Makassar, the capital city of the province of Sulawesi Selatan. Pioneer School and Pilot School are located in semi-urban parts of kota Parepare which is situated in the southwest coast of Sulawesi Selatan and is about 155 kilometres north of kota Makassar. Map school is located in a subdistrict of kabupaten (district) Wajo. Kabupaten Wajo is situated in the northern inland part of Sulawesi Selatan and is about 240 kilometres from kota Makassar. Pilot School was chosen for the pilot study (see Section 4.6 for details of the pilot study) while the other three schools: Mac, Pioneer and Map, were selected for the main study. For clarity, this sub-section is concerned with the main study unless the pilot study is specifically mentioned.

Research participants were drawn from Mac, Pioneer and Map schools. These three schools are secondary public schools. As public schools, they are managed at three different governance levels: the central level, the regional (provincial) level and at the district (municipal or regency) level. As such, responsibility for the provision of TPD for teachers/principals is handled at all three government levels. Teachers recruited for this study were subject teachers who were teaching different subjects and levels or
stages (year 7 to year 9). Research participants included the principals from these three schools. It is important to note here that in the Indonesian education system, a principal is a teacher who is awarded an additional responsibility as a lead/principal in a school (Kemdiknas, 2010). This means that principals still maintain their main function and status as teachers while they are also in charge of school administration and management as principals.

The schools were purposively chosen as they were thought to be suited to the purpose the study. Each school was selected on the belief that it could provide an “instance in action” (Adelman, Jenkins, & Kemmis, 1976) of the phenomenon under investigation. That is, teachers, principals and schools had experienced some TPD activities or programs from which data can be generated for the current study. It is important to note that the decision to choose schools from different types of areas was not meant to ensure representativeness of each area, but rather to illuminate the variety of the schools in Sulawesi Selatan.

4.4.2 Methods of Data Collection

Multiple methods of data collection were employed in this study. Qualitative researchers recognise that social phenomena or issues are complex, situated in particular contexts and histories, and involve problematic relationships (Stake, 2003; Stark & Torrance, 2005) and thus, the use of multiple sources of data allows for collecting wider views of the complex nature of the phenomenon. Additionally, according to Yin (2003) and Stake (2003), the use of multiple sources of data helps to clarify meaning or to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation. Methods of data collection employed in this study included a survey questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and the examination of documents.
4.4.2.1 Questionnaire

The use of survey in the current study was not exclusively geared toward collecting measurement or numerical data, although the questionnaire enabled the collection such of data. The primary purpose for using survey was to get general descriptions of the issue within each case (school) so as to enable analysis across cases (schools). Nonetheless, the survey enabled research participants to establish a level of familiarity of the research topic prior to interviews. Also, the survey allowed the researcher to: 1) develop interview questions; 2) identify any new emerging ideas and issues that can be further elaborated in the interview; and 3) identify prospective interview participants.

One of the ways to develop a survey instrument for a research study, as suggested by (Creswell, 2008), is to locate existing questionnaires that suit one’s research purpose. This mode of instrument development seemed justifiable within the time frame of this research project. In the literature, numerous studies that use questionnaires to study TPD have been conducted (see for examples: Boyle, While, & Boyle, 2004; Desimone et al., 2002; Doecke et al., 2008; Ingvarson et al., 2005; McRae, Ainsworth, Groves, Rowland, & Zbar, 2001; OECD, 2009). Thus, after comparing and contrasting prospective questionnaires, I opted for a teacher questionnaire from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) administered by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2009).

TALIS is an international survey on TPD and its teacher questionnaire (Appendix 8) has been used in 24 countries and translated into 17 different languages (OECD, 2009). Hence, the transferability of this questionnaire (its content and constructs) to the context of this study is less problematic. More importantly, with respect to the first research question of this study, items in the TALIS questionnaire
comprehensively capture data about types and features of learning activities that teachers had participated in and teachers’ perceptions of these learning activities. After pilot testing the questionnaire (Appendix 9a and 9b), it was apparent that the piloted questionnaire, in general, worked well in terms of its transferability and functionality (collecting the intended information).

The teacher questionnaire for the current study (Appendix 10) has two parts. Part One contained items asking about the participants’ backgrounds and personal details such as: gender, status, qualifications, number of schools they had taught in, qualifications, number of hours of instructional activities in a week and length of service. In this part, participants were required to either to tick a categorised response or specify a number. Data collected from this part were mainly ordinal or categorical.

Part Two explored the learning activities (formal and informal) that responding teachers had participated in during the 18 months prior to filling out the questionnaire. It sought information on the types of learning activities and the associated degrees of impact on instruction as perceived by respondents, the number of hours spent on learning activities and the personal costs incurred. It also explored teachers’ perceptions of their needs in relation to particular learning topics or issue, and factors hindering their participation in formal learning activities. The teacher questionnaire required to either to tick a categorised response or specify a number. Data collected from this part were mainly ordinal or categorical with some “other” option/space provided, in case participants had issues or topics other than the provided ones.

The survey phase was remotely conducted from Wollongong, NSW, Australia. With the assistance of school coordinators, a total of 150 copies of the questionnaire were sent to the three participating schools (65 copies each for schools Mac and
Pioneer, 20 copies for school Map) and 128 questionnaires were completed by the participants represented a return rate of 85%.

**4.4.2.2 Semi-structured interviews**

Interviews were employed in this study to generate data for answering the research questions. Interviews are one of the most-used data collection methods in qualitative studies in general and in case study designs in particular. Interviews are prominent in qualitative study because they enable researchers to explore the experiential accounts (e.g., meanings) of social events or activities in the lives of research participants (Fontana & Frey, 2003; Miller & Glassner, 2004). Therefore, I concur with Seidman’s (2006) proposition that researchers choose interviews because there “is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 9). By employing interviews in this study, I was able to explore participants’ perspectives regarding their TPD experiences.

There is a wide range of types and uses for interviews. They can be structured/standardised, semi-structured/standardised, or unstructured/open and may also be used for descriptive, exploratory or evaluative purposes. Some important caveats for undertaking qualitative interviews informed the interview process in this inquiry. In the first place, it should be recognised that an interview is a social, interpersonal enterprise (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Fontana & Frey, 2003; Seidman, 2006; Yin, 2011). Interviews are far more than just data collection methods: “[i]nterviews enable participants –be they interviewers or interviewees – to discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live, and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view” (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 349). Secondly, what follows from the first caveat is that interviews are not a neutral tool for gathering objective data used for scientific purposes (Fontana & Frey, 2003). Fontana and Frey (2003) contended that interviews
are “active interactions between two (or more) people leading to negotiated, contextually based results” (p. 698). Lastly, data generated from interviews cannot be taken for granted as a true and accurate picture of people’s selves and lives. Nor can they be assumed to speak for themselves. Yin (2003) argued that interview data “should always be considered verbal reports only” (p. 92, emphasis in original). As such, analyses are subject to a wide variety of personal and social problems or biases such as poor memory, inaccurate articulation, language ambiguity or subjectivity and complexity of social words.

Choosing among the available options, I decided that the interviews for this study were open-ended to enable engaged, friendly conversations with research participants about their TPD experiences so that in-depth, rich experiential accounts could be generated. For this reason, semi-structured interviews were utilised in the study. A semi-structured interview is structured but remains open-ended and provides a considerable degree of flexibility (Coll & Chapman, 2000; Yin, 2003). The advantage of semi-structured interviews is twofold. First, its structured approach through the use of an interview guide, “helps to make data gathering more systematic, facilitating analysis” (Coll & Chapman, 2000, p. 5). Second, despite its relatively structured approach, a significant degree of “openness” and flexibility is retained, allowing for “friendly” and “non-threatening” questioning during the interview (Yin, 2003).

In this study, an interview protocol (Appendix 11a-12b) containing a set of topic questions pertinent to the research questions was developed prior to interviewing participants. Appendix 11a and 11b show interview protocol for teachers in English and Indonesian version respectively while Appendix 12a and 12b correspondingly present interview protocol for principals in English and Indonesian version. The interview questions were organised around topics pertinent to the research questions and “are
oriented to the scientific literature about the topic or are based on the researcher’s theoretical presuppositions” (Flick, 2006, p. 153). Thus, interview questions asked were initially developed from the literature, especially the ideas regarding TPD, teacher characteristics, teacher learning and change and features of the schools that promoted or inhibited TPD. These interview protocols did not impose a set order to the questions and specific wording. Instead, the order of the questions and the wording varied from participant to participant allowing for prompting, probing, rephrasing and summarising the emergent/interesting ideas that emerged in the questionnaire.

Initially, only one interview was scheduled with each interview participant. However, the results of the pilot study indicated that at least two interviews were needed for each participant. The first interview focused on what had happened in the teachers’ professional lives and their perspectives about their TPD, specifically in relation to the three research topics in this inquiry (learning activities, school characteristics and school-level influences). Participants’ viewpoints from the survey phase were also discussed in this phase. The aim of the first interviews was to unpack teachers’ “subjective theories” of their professional development experiences. At this stage, the interviews were transcribed and issues, problems or topics related to learning activities, school characteristics and school-level influences from individual participants were roughly content analysed.

After a few days, the second interview was conducted. In this interview, the participant’s transcription from the first interview was presented to him or her and the participant was asked to recall the interview and check if their viewpoints were correctly represented in the transcription. If not, they could reformulate, eliminate or replace sections with other statements. This process aimed at assessing the content of
the first interview (member checking) – that is, it was a communicative validation of the statements by the interviewees (Flick, 2006).

Out of 45 teachers (14, 17 and 14 teachers from Mac, Pioneer and Map Schools respectively) who indicated an interest in participating in the interviews, nine (three from each school) were selected. The teachers were chosen on various criteria. First and foremost, they needed to satisfactorily respond to all items/questions in the questionnaire, on the assumption that teachers with complete responses were more likely to provide rich information regarding the phenomenon under study. Secondly, consistent with my adherence to the notion of multiplicity of social worlds, the teachers were selected from various backgrounds related to gender, age, length of tenure/experience, and qualifications. Lastly, it was apparent from the questionnaire responses that some teachers/participants provided “critical” viewpoints, particularly in items/questions where participants could make “other” comments. Thus, teachers from this category needed to be in the interview pool to explore these comments. Principals, were only selected because they were the Principals in case schools. The following table summarises the characteristics of participants from each school by gender, age, qualification, and years of experience.
Table 4.1 Composition and Participant Characteristics by Gender, Age, Qualification, Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers Gender</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudonyms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Alan M</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>30-39 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan F</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>&gt;20 Years</td>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anton M</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>&gt;20 Years</td>
<td>50-59 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>Garrick M</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel F</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>30-39 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tini F</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td>25-29 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>Raul M</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy F</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>&gt;20 Years</td>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudolf M</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals Gender</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonyms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Mr B M</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>&gt;20 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>Mrs S F</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>Mr A M</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>&gt;20 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.3 Document analysis

Documents are another common source of information in case study research (Yin, 2003). Documents can take many forms and are mostly not produced for the purposes of the study and include letters, reports and newspapers (Flick, 2006; Yin, 2003). Regardless of their form and purpose, documents can provide useful and specific details and, most importantly, documents can “corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (Yin, 2003, p. 87). For example, documents can provide rich information related to participants’ points of view expressed in interviews, or they can give researchers ideas for asking/seeking other questions. Documents gathered were used both as primary data and as ancillary sources of information to triangulate other sources of data. Therefore, a variety of documents were collected, including:

- public/government documents related to TPD
- schools’ profiles and strategic plans
- reports on schools and teachers
- teachers’ portfolios
manuals/handbooks on TPD.

Most of the documents were collected in the interview phase.

4.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study was framed by a hermeneutic approach. Hermeneutics as an analytic approach emphasises “understanding as a situated event in terms of individuals and their situations –an inevitably prejudiced viewpoint” (Heywood & Stronach, 2005, p. 115). In this sense, data analysis is the act of interpretation or “making sense of what has been observed in a way that communicates understanding” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2003, p. 311). One of the general analytic strategies to enable such interpretation is to follow the theoretical propositions underpinning one’s study (Yin, 2003). That is, the process of making sense out of data is guided by the researcher’s theoretical framework.

The data analysis in this study adapted Yin’s (2011) five-phased cycle of qualitative data analysis. That is, data analysis consisted of procedures for preparing, organising, examining, tabulating, categorising, interpreting and combining both quantitative and qualitative data to address the research questions. Figure 4.2 illustrates the complete cycle and its five phases.
Figure 4.2  Process of qualitative data analysis

The first phase of this cycle dealt with compiling and sorting the collected data into an orderly set of records/fields/folders/files. In this phase, the analysis included transcribing the interviews and translating them into English, compiling field notes and documents and summarising the survey/questionnaire data using descriptive statistics (e.g. frequency counts, percentages and measures of central tendency). The aim of this phase was to familiarise the researcher with the collected data by [re]reading transcripts, field notes and documents, (re)listening to interviews and (re)viewing the descriptive analysis of the questionnaire data. In this phase, NVivo was utilised to help manage and organise the data.

The second phase involved an analytic process to disassemble the data into “notations”. This is generally referred to as a coding process. In this phase, the data are broken down into segments or fragments and assigned codes/labels. A combination of prefigured codes (based on the theoretical framework) and emergent codes from the data set are employed. The intention is to generate initial codes for the entire data set. They are also termed as Level 1, open or in vivo codes (Creswell, 2008; Merriam, 1998;
Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2011). Inherent in this initial coding is an examination of codes for overlap or redundancy. Throughout this process, I started to identify how the Level 1 codes may have related to each other and I tried to formulate themes/categories for a set of similar (or different) codes (Level 2 coding/analysis).

The above phase was followed by a process of (re)organising the initial codes into themes/categories – a phase that may be considered as a reassembling procedure (Yin, 2011). Yin further explained that “[d]uring the Disassembling phase … [researchers] may have become aware of potentially broader patterns in the data” (Yin, 2011, p. 190, emphasis in original). So, the purpose of disassembling phase was to construct themes or categories that captured some recurring patterns. While the disassembling phase mostly involved identification analysis (coding, recoding), analysis in the reassembling phase moved to a conceptual or constructive level, sometimes referred to as Level 3, by aggregating, comparing and synthesising codes into similar (or different) conceptual themes/categories.

The fourth phase made use of themes/categories developed in the disassembling and reassembling phase to construct meaning – that is, it aimed to make sense of the pattern. At this phase, the entire analysis is put together for interpretation in order to form some larger meaning about the phenomenon under study based on personal viewpoints, both my perspectives and my participants’. The analytic objective of this phase is “to develop a comprehensive interpretation, still encompassing specific data, but whose main themes will become the basis for understanding [the] entire study” (Yin, 2011, p. 207).

The final phase of the analysis cycle was an act of interpretation to draw conclusions and to report the study. The conclusions were rooted in and generated from the entire analysis process and study findings. To report the study findings, a thematic
approach was adopted in which themes that emerged from data analysis are presented in an extensive discussion.

The entire analytic process, however, did not occur in a sequential manner but rather it occurs in *interactive* and *iterative* steps. As indicated by the two-way arrows in Figure 4.2, the act of analysis involves a remarkable back and forth analytic process. For example, it was found that after initial interpretation, a review of themes/categories in reassembling process was required which, in turn, causes a revision of codes/labels in the preceding phases.

In summary, methods of data collection and data analysis procedures were developed to fruitfully answer the research questions of the current study. Table 4.2 shows each of the research question and its corresponding data collection methods and procedures for data analysis.
### Table 4.2 The Relationships between Research Questions, Data Collection Methods and Procedures for Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Method and Data Sought</th>
<th>Data Analysis Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | What are the features of learning activities in which teachers participate and what are teachers’ perceptions about these learning activities? | - Teacher questionnaire on their learning activities and perceptions about their learning opportunities/experiences.  
- School reports and teachers’ portfolios. | - Descriptive analysis (measures of central tendency).  
- Document analyses.  
- Corroboration of data from questionnaire and document sources.  
- Compilation of statistical and descriptive overview of the features of TPD and teachers’ perceptions. |
| 2  | What teacher characteristics influence their learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system? | - Semi-structured interviews with teachers to reveal: stories/experiences about their learning and accounts about what characteristics influence/shape their learning. | - Preliminary exploratory analysis (prefigured/emergent codes and categories).  
- Categorical aggregation analysis to establish themes.  
- Condensing codes to formulate categories and aggregating the categories to form themes.  
- Insight-based interpretation (look for patterns and direct interpretation).  
- Triangulation of data and identification of themes. |
| 3  | At the school level, what influences support, or impede, teacher learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system? | - Teacher questionnaire and semi-structure interviews with teachers and principals about: teachers’ and principals’ stories/experiences of teacher learning and change; school-level influences that promote/impede teacher learning and change; and relevant schools/principals/teachers profiles. | - Preliminary exploratory analysis (prefigured/emergent codes and categories).  
- Categorical aggregation analysis to establish themes.  
- Condensing codes to formulate categories and aggregating the categories to form themes.  
- Corroboration of the themes from questionnaire, interview and document.  
- Insight-based interpretation (look for pattern and direct interpretation).  
- Triangulation of data and identification of themes. |
4.6 Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out prior to the main study and was part of the initial structure of this inquiry. A pilot study is a worthwhile undertaking for testing and refining aspects of actual/main studies (e.g. research instruments, fieldwork procedures, or design). As Light, Singer and Willett (Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990) argued:

No design is ever so complete that it cannot be improved by a prior, small-scale exploratory study. Pilot studies are almost always worth the time and effort. *Carry out a pilot study if any facet of your design needs clarification.* (p. 213 emphasis in original)

For the current study, a pilot study was used to assess the “workability” of the research procedures and instruments.

The characteristics of pilot study participants broadly reflected the participants in the main study – for example, they came from the same region or population (the province of Sulawesi Selatan in Indonesia); they are subject teachers at secondary high schools; and they are mostly teacher civil servants. Ten teachers from the pilot study school completed the pilot version of the questionnaire (Appendix 9) in the survey phase and two teachers and the school principal were interviewed. The pilot version of the questionnaire included items that were designed to allow teachers to evaluate and review the clarity and readability of items/questions, instructions and options in the questionnaire. Interviews helped clarify these questions and items. Further, the semi-structured interview questions were piloted with these teachers and principal.

In addition to piloting the questionnaire with teachers, an expert from Indonesia was involved as a reviewer of questionnaire and interview protocols. The expert is a senior lecturer at a teacher training institution and also a respected teacher trainer who has involved in extensive teacher training programs across the nation. The expert’s role in this pilot study was to examine and scrutinize the research instruments (the
questionnaire and the interview protocol) in terms of their construction, conceptualisation and context relevance. Comments/feedback from the teachers, principal and expert were used to fine-tune the research instruments.

The results of this pilot study led to amendments to the questionnaires, interview questions and research procedures. The first amendment to the questionnaire was the omission of item number 12 which asked the number of participants’ TPD compulsory days. The expert suggested omitting this item because TPD for teachers in Indonesia is not compulsory. The second amendment to the questionnaire was delineation of one option in item number three and a change of the unit of measurement in item number 11. Item number three asked about participants’ status of employment and, originally, there were three options provided: (1) full-time; (2) part-time (50-90% of full-time hours); and (3) part-time (less than 50% of full-time hours). Teachers’ comments on item number three indicated that options two and three in this item were ambiguous or redundant because they both referred to the same status of teachers (part-time) regardless of the percentage of teaching hours. Thus, it was decided to streamline the options to “full-time” and “part-time”. Item number 11 asked participants to indicate the total amount of time spent in TPD measured in days. According to the participants, the amount of time spent in TPD was normally measured in hours so the participants were uncertain about how to convert hours to days, for example. Following this feedback, the unit of measurement for item 11 was changed to hours. The last amendment to the questionnaire was the addition of an “other” option to items 10, 16 and 17. Based on the expert review, it was suggested that an “other” option/space be added to some items because there is always a possibility that participants have specific topics, issues or problems which do not fit the options provided. Therefore, an “other” option was added to the options for items 10, 15, 16 and 18.
In piloting interview questions, several valuable things were learned. Firstly, it was found that the questions needed to be structured in ways that left the response open to the participants rather than imposing my own framework on their viewpoints. Secondly, it was also found that the flow of the interview was affected by the sequence of the questions. Proceeding from the general to the specific allowed for a smoother conversation. Thirdly, several questions did not work as they were expected to and additional questions on particular issues were added. Lastly, I found that the interviews needed to be split into at least two sessions. I learned that while interviewing, I predominantly concentrated on interview questions and often missed my participants’ points, ideas, or stories that I needed to elaborate or clarify. Thus, the first interview was to explore and generate ideas and the second interview was an opportunity for participants to review and clarify their statements or information from the first interview (member-checking).

In summary, the pilot study provided an opportunity to practise the research methods and to evaluate the process and products. Experiences and information generated from the pilot study help shape the implementation of the main study.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was granted from the University of Wollongong Human Ethics Committee prior to conducting the research. Ethical considerations are a sensitive aspect of any study including this study. The most pertinent ethical issues related to the study are briefly outlined below:

- Informed Consent: Teachers and principals may have concerns over study findings as if the findings are used to evaluate their performances. Teachers and principals may also worry if their participations interrupt the flow or schedule of teaching and learning process. For these reasons, participation information sheets (Appendix 3a –
were developed which contained sufficient and adequate information to enable teachers make an informed decision about their participation. No part of the study involved deceit, so no aspects were hidden from participants in seeking their consent (Creswell, 2007). Written consents (Appendix 5a – 6b) were obtained from all participants after letter of invitation/introduction (2a and 2b) participant information sheets were presented to teachers and principals for their perusal.

- Confidentiality: Teachers and principals may worry about information that they provide are accessed by other parties other than researcher or used other than its intended purpose. To secure research participants’ identities and information, pseudonyms were used. All personal data were de-identified in such a way that no possible identities other than that of the researcher can be drawn about the persons and organisations in which data collection took place (Hopf, 2004). In addition, all hard copies and electronic copies of data were kept in a locked filing cabinet at the University of Wollongong and any computer files (e.g., audio recorded interviews) are stored on a hard disc under password protection during and after the study.

- Study Effects: Great care was taken to avoid harming participants, putting them at risk or creating a burden or obstruction to their course of life (Creswell, 2003; Flick, 2006). For example, I realised that there might be an issue related to the power relationship between me and potential participants. Participants (teachers and principals) might be affected by my situation as an officer of a government agency with a level of responsibility for school supervision in terms of the implementation and achievement of national standards. To minimise such issues, an open and honest communication on any aspects of the study was carried out prior and during the study to build or to gain participants’ trust. Pointing out some possible positive and
identifiable benefits of the study to participants also helped to reduce the potential impact of this power relationship issue.

As a researcher, I realised that I needed to be cautiously aware of any possible critical issues that might arise in the conduct of my research and to plan ahead sensitively if they did occur.
Chapter 5  The Case of Mac School

5.1 Introduction

This chapter and the other two subsequent chapters (Chapter 6 and Chapter 7) present the individual findings of the data analysis from the three case studies. Each chapter is divided into five sections. Section one provides a description of the case setting. The case setting relates to the local background of the schools, principals, teachers and students. The other three sections present the findings of the individual case to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the features of TPD learning activities in which teachers participate and what are teachers’ perceptions about their TPD learning activities?

2. What teacher characteristics influence their learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?

3. At the school level, what influences support, or impede, teacher learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?

Section five in each chapter of the individual case presents the summary of findings along with a summary table.

Data generated from interviews with principals and teachers, the teacher questionnaire and the examination of documents are used to develop the descriptions of the cases and to answer the research questions. The order of case presentation reflects only the order of school visits during the research.

5.2 Case Setting

Mac Junior High School, hereafter called Mac School, is one of the first and oldest public junior high schools built in the outer south part of the city of Makassar, the capital city of Sulawesi Selatan province. Mac School gets more than 300 new students
per year. Table 5.1 shows that, in total, there are more than 900 students and 27 or more classes from year seven to nine over the three school years. The School Profile Handbook of Mac School indicates that Mac School is categorised as an A-type school which, according to Permendiknas 129a/2004 regarding Standar Pelayanan Minimal (SPM, Minimum Service Standards), is a “big” school in terms of student numbers. For instance, an A-type school must have a total of 960 to 1,080 students (maximum) with a minimum of 27 classes and a particular number of school resources and facilities such as classrooms, a library, laboratories and the size of school yard, sport fields and buildings. According to the Handbook, Mac School has met all the specified minimum standards. However, in terms of the school quality or conditions measured against Standar Nasional Pendidikan (SNP, National Educational Standards), Mac School only falls into a B-accredited school category which indicates that the school has just met the standards at a “more than satisfactory” level.

Table 5.1 Number of Students and Classes for Three Consecutive Years at Mac School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Total (Yr.7+8+9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number (Students)</td>
<td>Number (Classes)</td>
<td>Number (Students)</td>
<td>Number (Classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mac School has one principal, 62 teachers and 12 school support staff. Almost all teachers in this school have met the minimum educational qualification requirement set by the current legislation which states that secondary teachers must have a minimum of an undergraduate degree or a four-year diploma (bachelor’s degree). As can be seen from Table 5.2, 57 teachers have a bachelor’s degree and two teachers plus the principal hold master’s degrees. As a public school, the majority of teachers are civil servants
(PNS) and all but two of these PNS teachers have also been granted professional allowances.

Table 5.2  Number of School Personnel at Mac School and their Educational Qualifications (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Junior Sec.</th>
<th>Senior Sec.</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>Undergrad.</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD/Dr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fulltime-permanent teachers (PNS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fulltime-temporary teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fulltime-permanent administrators (PNS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fulltime-temporary administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to educational qualifications and employment status, Figure 5.1 indicates that about half of this teacher cohort comprises veteran teachers who have been teaching for twenty years or more.
Figure 5.1 Teachers at Mac School – years of teaching experience

Mr B is the principal of Mac School. He started his career as a civil servant teacher in 1984 with a D2 (Two-Year Diploma) and now holds a master’s degree. Since his first appointment as a teacher and prior to being appointed principal at Mac School, he was a counsellor and an information and technology (IT) teacher in two different public schools. In his previous schools, he had extensive experience as a vice principal, attending to matters such as curriculum, student affairs and school resources. Mr B is very experienced across teaching and administrative roles which can be very helpful for his new role as a principal. He commenced his position as a principal in Mac School in April 2013 and this is his first assignment as a school principal.

As mentioned in Chapter 4 Methodology, three teachers were interviewed in each school. Alan was the first teacher to be interviewed at Mac School. With an bachelor’s degree in mathematics from the first and oldest public teacher education institute in the region (IKIP Makassar), Alan embarked on his journey as a mathematics teacher in 1998 when he was appointed as a civil servant teacher (a PNS teacher) in a suburban public junior high school. After five years serving in his first school, he
moved to Mac School in 2003 and has continued to teach mathematics. He is one of the two teachers who hold a master’s degree at Mac school. In addition to his teaching responsibilities, he has also assumed a leadership role as a vice principal for student affairs and school resources.

In contrast to Alan, Anton, another teacher participant in the interviews, is a veteran teacher who has been teaching mathematics for more than 30 years. Anton held his D1 (one-year diploma) in education when he was first appointed as a PNS teacher at Mac School in 1981. Two years after Anton’s appointment as a PNS teacher, he continued his studies and completed his bachelor’s degree in education in 1987. Because he has been teaching for so long at Mac School, he is called the “father of the school” and is seen by his colleagues as someone to turn to for advice, suggestions or help.

Susan, the last teacher participant interviewed at Mac School, had always wanted to be a teacher and a language teacher in particular. To pursue her dream, she enrolled in a three-year diploma program for language teaching at IKIP Makassar. She completed her diploma in 1990 and a year after graduation was appointed as a PNS teacher and posted to her current school as an English teacher.

5.3 Features of TPD Learning Activities and Teachers’ Perceptions towards TPD

This section presents the findings from the analysis of teacher questionnaires and of the interviews with the principal and participating teachers to describe the features of TPD learning activities and teachers’ perceptions about their TPD. It is important to note here that the teacher questionnaire asked teachers about various TPD learning activities ranging from organised and structured (formal) to informal and self-
directed learning. This section starts with the findings about formal TPD, followed by the more informal forms.

Teachers at Mac School had a generally high level of TPD participation during the 18-month period prior to completing the questionnaire. Overall levels of TPD participation are measured in terms of teacher participation rates. As shown in Figure 5.2, 87.5% of teachers reported participating in some formal TPD learning activities in the previous 18 months. This may indicate that the majority of teachers at Mac School took up TPD as an essential part of teaching.

![Participation in Formal TPD](image)

**Figure 5.2** Level of participation in formal TPD learning activities of Mac School’s teachers

The high level of participation does not mean that the 12.5% of teachers who did not take part in any form of formal TPD learning activities are insignificant and can be overlooked. According to Mr B, all teachers must participate in TPD opportunities; no teacher can be left out. Mr B stated:

So, for the last six months I have only invited school supervisors once to give presentations [training] about assessment, lesson plans, and the like. And because not all my teachers were covered, I plan to conduct another training ....We will do that [the training] during the next school holidays, so every teacher who missed the previous training will be trained on that occasion. (PR/MC)
TPD has been widely adopted by school managers as a mechanism or strategy for school improvement. For TPD to be a success as a school improvement strategy, it is very important that all teachers at the school actively participate. Therefore, Mr B’s plan to provide make-up training for his teachers in the above example is a logical decision.

While levels of participation are generally high, the intensity of participation is low and differs greatly among participating teachers. The teacher questionnaire measured the intensity of participation in terms of the number of hours of TPD learning undertaken by teachers during the 18-month period prior to completing the questionnaire. Figure 5.3 shows that, on average, among the teachers who reported their participation hours, teachers had 56.22 hours of TPD participation – an average of just under five hours per month. Quantitative analysis of this variable also reveals that the difference between teachers with the lowest intensity and highest intensity of TPD participation is very wide (lowest = 2 hours, high = 144 hours). These two statistical findings indicate that TPD opportunities are unequally distributed among teachers.

![Figure 5.3](image)

*Figure 5.3* Intensity of participation in formal TPD learning activities among Mac School’s teachers
There is an indication that this unequal distribution of TPD opportunities is influenced by the practices of authorities who are responsible for TPD provision. Alan, for example, expressed his disappointment at the discriminatory practices of district authorities: “For some reason, the district only chooses [to invite] particular schools or teachers over and over again [to participate in training]” (AL/MC). Alan’s account suggested that “favouritism” practised by TPD authorities means that TPD opportunities are only available or accessible to particular schools or teachers. Thus, it may happen that some teachers are repeatedly invited to TPD programs and therefore have more hours of TPD participation than others.

Analysis of the forms or types of TPD learning activities in which teachers participated can be informative and provide further details that explain the nature and practices of TPD. As mentioned earlier, the teacher questionnaire asked teachers about their various forms/types of TPD learning activities ranging from formal to informal ones and both are included in the following analysis.

The questionnaire provided teachers with a list of several alternatives forms/types of formal TPD learning activities and asked them to indicate their participation in any of them. Figure 5.4, which excludes informal TPD activities, shows that the forms/types of learning activities most often mentioned were workshop/training and teacher networks with 80% and more than 70% of teachers, respectively, reporting to have participated in these forms/types of TPD learning activities.
Data generated from interviews with the principal and teachers confirm this finding. Each of the interview participants named workshops or training and teacher networks to be the most common forms/types of TPD learning activities that teachers engaged in and were available for teachers. Mr B, for example, described his actions to improve teachers’ competency at Mac School with special reference to workshops or training:

I get all teachers on board. If there is a training [invitation], I send them to [participate in] training. I get them involved [in the training]….Just recently, I mean the school was invited to involve in a USAID [United States Agency for International Development] project about contextual learning. I had 15 places for my teachers so I sent all [15 teachers] for a three-day workshop training [in that USAID project]. (PR/MC)

Likewise, Anton revealed his TPD participation: “A workshop training which was similar to the one conducted by USAID few months ago….I had a training for three days as one of the representatives from this school” (AN/MC). There is evidence that externally provided TPD is a common feature of teachers’ TPD at Mac School. That is, external agencies or authorities create TPD programs and then invite schools or teachers to participate. Mr B’s and Anton’s reference to the USAID program is one example.

Figure 5.4 Participation level by form/type of TPD learning activity (Formal)
the interview participants mentioned this USAID program in one way or another and this may be because the program was the most recent TPD opportunity in which teachers at Mac School participated.

Interestingly, Mr B, Alan and Susan perceived external TPD to be more effective than internal TPD. Mr B suggested: “If it is from internal, I found teachers not to be seriously involved. You know, it’s just among themselves; they have known each other…it’s not effective; it’s trivial” (PR/MC). Susan felt: “If the [TPD] activity is from the school, I feel like it’s less effective because, you know, it’s just among us” (SU/MC). Alan observed: “most teachers do not have such a strong motivation to get involved in school MGMP activities as they do not think that they will get something new or valuable when participants are only teachers from their schools, their own colleagues” (AL/MC). These educators do not believe that internal TPD has the potential to bring about valuable learning and “teachers’ acquaintance” is perceived to undermine the potential worth of internal TPD.

With particular reference to MGMP, interviewed teachers perceived TPD to be instrumental and task-focused, with little emphasis on “learning”. Susan, for example, complained about the content of MGMP:

What teachers really need is not there [not covered in MGMP]. Because MGMP heavily focuses on the making of teaching documents such as the syllabus, lesson plans or student worksheets but, in fact, we also need other materials [TPD content] such as teaching methods or approaches. (SU/MC)

With regards to the current mode or process of MGMP, Anton said:

For MGMP, I feel like, I am over it, though, I used to be active [participating]. It used to be very substantive, you know. Now the activity in MGMP is more like a ‘task distribution’ where teachers will be grouped and each will be assigned to a particular task, say each group is developing a syllabus for chosen topics to be covered for one semester. So, the objective is how to get the task done. Back in the day, MGMP
was not like that … In fact, we used to have what you call peer teaching or practice teaching. (AN/MC)

The above accounts point out some shortcomings of external TPD and further imply that the ineffectiveness of TPD can derive from the nature or feature of TPD itself (e.g. purpose, content or process).

According to the interviewed teachers, effective TPD learning activities are those that: 1) involve active participation; 2) generate practical and applicable solution or innovations; 3) provide an evaluation and follow-up assistance to the school; and 4) are continuous. According to Alan, effective TPDs would be: “[The ones] where we teachers are directly involved in creating materials, role-play or review topics…so that we get the sense of its real application…to get things that can be directly used” (AL/MC). Alan’s view in what makes for effective TPD is echoed by Susan: “Effective TPD is the one in which teachers are guided to generate creative and innovative teaching and learning strategies and activities, meaning teachers can learn how to create enjoyable classroom learning strategies for students” (SU/MC). Adding to Alan’s and Susan’s views on effective TPD, Anton said:

[TPD] must be sustainable, evaluated and followed up….What has been happening so far is that lots of [TPD] activities or programs are unsustainable; many of them are disconnected from each other. There is an indication for teachers to associate particular TPD programs with particular projects; you know, this project and that project….It is true that once a project is completed and all [TPD] activities are finished…[there is] no follow up [at school]. At school there is no monitoring or evaluation whatsoever. (AN/MC)

Adding to the above finding about effective TPD, Mr B, Alan and Susan agreed that internal TPD would be effective only if external facilitators or speakers were involved. Alan provided an explanation on this issue:

In the case of school MGMP, for example, there is one thing that is really needed there, that is a facilitator. Teachers lack motivation to participate because when we gather, we only talk about things that we
already know among us. There is no new information…only if there is a facilitator from outside that can guide us and then it [internal TPD] becomes useful. (AL/MC)

During the first interview, Alan repeatedly mentioned the importance of facilitators as someone who understands concepts, can thoroughly explain theories, or can give an actual example of the application of an idea. It looks as if teachers need authoritative figures from whom they can receive guidance on what is right and wrong, or advice on what to do and what not to do. This outward-looking orientation (external TPDs and facilitators) is possibly shaped by the enormous bureaucratic control in Indonesia’s education system.

Ingredients for effective TPD derive from multiple elements. Again, they may come from the TPD learning activity itself (e.g. being practical or sustainable) or from other elements external to TPD such as teachers (e.g. teachers need to be active learners). Putting together teachers’ perceptions of effective [and ineffective] TPD, it is apparent that effective TPD has a wide range of attributes that can emerge from either internal or external TPD.

When overall levels of teacher participation in formal and informal TPD are contrasted, the questionnaire data shows that teachers at Mac School engage more in formal TPD learning activities than informal ones. Figure 5.5 shows that 82% of teachers reported participating or undertaking informal learning activities during the 18-month period prior to completing the questionnaire. This percentage is slightly lower than the percentage of teachers who undertook formal TPD activities (87.5%, as shown in Figure 5.2) which indicates that informal learning activities are less practised than formal TPD learning activities.
That informal learning is less frequent can be further seen from the comparison of teachers’ TPD participation levels by forms/types of TPD learning activities (formal and informal). In the questionnaire, teachers were also provided with a list of examples of formal and informal TPD activities and asked to indicate their participation in any of these informal learning activities. Figure 5.6 shows the percentages of teachers’ TPD participation levels across the formal and informal activities. As can be seen from Figure 5.6, the percentage of teachers who reported undertaking the informal types of TPD learning activities such as dialogue/discussion (82%) and reading professional literature (75%) is nearly as high as the percentage of those participating in the formal of TPD learning activities such as workshops/training (80%) or teacher networks (73%).
When cross-checking teacher TPD participation across the formal and informal learning forms, it was found in the questionnaire that some teachers who reported their participation in one or more forms/types of formal learning did not report engaging any informal learning. This finding is consistent with the previous finding that indicates teachers’ preference of external TPD such as workshops or training programs over internal TPD such as informal dialogue or discussion among teachers.

In another part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked to indicate the areas of their work where they had the greatest developmental needs. Teachers were asked to choose from a four-point Likert scale, ‘No need at all’, ‘Low level of need’, ‘Moderate level of need’ and ‘High level of need’, to indicate their developmental needs for various areas of their work. As can be seen from Figure 5.7, the areas of teachers’ work most frequently considered to be the areas of the greatest development need were student assessment, content knowledge and educational standards. More than 40% of teachers rated their development needs as high in these areas. This finding is not
surprising in a context where a standard evaluation system for primary and secondary education is employed as a mechanism to control the quality of education nationwide such as Indonesia. In the Indonesian education system, this standard evaluation system is called *Ujian National* (UN, National Exam) which is conducted as a school exit exam for primary and secondary students and as such, the UN is very high-stake not only for students but also for teachers. In this regard, teachers need to have a substantial knowledge about assessment, the content to be tested in the UN, and standards for each subject. Regarding the national exam, Susan explained its effect to her instruction:

> You know, essentially the instructional objective for English teaching is to make students capable of speaking English but UN is not set for it….It is only reading that is tested [in UN], not speaking. So my concentration is on teaching the grammar that can help students to understand reading.

(SU/MC)
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**Figure 5.7 Areas of developmental needs**

Following questions about their development needs, teachers were asked whether or not they wanted more TPD than they had participated in or received during the questionnaire period. Figure 5.8 highlights that, on average, almost three-quarters of the teachers reported wanting more TPD than they had participated in or received. In other words, teachers feel that they have insufficient TPD opportunities. As Alan stated:
After some years [of not being involved in any TPD], a few months ago, I finally participated in a training. This makes me feel that I am so behind. My participation in that training also made me realise that I have wasted so much time and I need to improve my teaching. (AL/MC)

Figure 5.8 Percentage of teachers wanting more TPD at Mac School

A follow-up question in the questionnaire was asked of teachers who had wanted to do more TPD to indicate the reasons that best explained what had prevented them from participating in or receiving more TPD. Teachers were able to select as many options as they wanted that applied to their circumstances. As shown in Figure 5.9, the most commonly cited reason was that the schedule of TPD activities or programs conflicted with their teaching schedule at school (46%). Almost half of teachers reported this reason as the barrier most frequently preventing them from participating in or receiving more TPD. Anton’s experience affirms this finding: “Actually, if we are talking about [TPD] opportunities, there are more than enough. The problem now is how to manage our time” (AN/MC). When further asked whether or not the problem of time management is caused by teachers’ work schedules, Anton briefly replied: “Most probably.” (AN/MC).
Factors preventing teachers at Mac School to participate in/receive more TPD

5.4 Teacher Characteristics

This section examines teacher characteristics that influence teacher learning and change in TPD. These teacher characteristics include: educational qualification, years of teaching experience and beliefs about teacher roles. Findings from questionnaire data are presented first, followed by interview data.

The questionnaire data demonstrates that teachers with higher educational qualifications and more years of teaching experience generally have more hours or higher intensity of formal TPD participation. As shown in Table 5.3, teachers with a master’s degree or higher had an average of 96 hours of formal TPD participation, while those with a bachelor’s degree or lower had only an average of 45 hours. When it comes to years of teaching experience, Table 5.3 also shows that teachers with 6–10 years or more of teaching experience had at least twice as many hours of formal TPD participation (a total of 60 hours at least) as those with 3–5 or less years of experience (minimum of two hours and maximum of 28 hours). These findings suggest that teachers who are expected to benefit more from TPD such as less qualified and less
experienced teachers are most likely to get the least. This may be caused by the nature of teacher TPD involvement or participation which is underpinned by the hierarchical system of social organisation in Indonesia. In this system, teachers enjoy more and more facilities as they move up the pyramid. In other words, teachers who have superior positions or status (e.g. qualifications, seniority) get more privileges (including more TPD) than their lower counterparts.

Table 5.3 Average Hours of Teachers’ TPD Participation Based on Level of Educational Qualification and Years of Teaching Experience at Mac School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Characteristics</th>
<th>Teachers with Bachelor degree or lower</th>
<th>Teachers with Master degree or higher</th>
<th>Teachers with 1-2 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 3-5 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 6-10 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 11-15 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 16-20 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 20+ years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means (Hours)</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While questionnaire data shows the influence of years of teaching experience affecting teachers’ intensity of TPD participation, there is evidence from interview data that years of teaching experience influences teachers’ orientation towards forms/types of TPD learning activities. When asked about his TPD experiences, Anton, the veteran teacher, described his favourite TPD:

A workshop training which is similar to the one conducted by USAID a few months ago, I like it….You know, in a typical training participants are directly asked to make or work on something, but this was different. Participants were asked to understand the underlying concepts [of contextual learning], the reasons why. (AN/MC)

Anton seemed more inclined to theoretical or conceptual-based learning activities. In contrast, based on Alan’s and Susan’s account of effective TPD, they prefer TPD learning activities that are more practical: “things that can be directly used” (AL/MC) or “create enjoyable learning strategies to be used in the class” (SU/MC).
In addition to teachers’ intensity of TPD participation and TPD orientation, years of teaching experience also affects teachers’ motivation toward their development or TPD. Though he did not specifically use the phrase “years of teaching experience”, Anton, the veteran teacher, pointed out: “I know, some friends like me [veterans/seniors] are still keen on developing themselves but you know, our ages usually hold us back...our spirit or motivation for it is getting fainter” (AN/MC). This account implies that teachers’ motivation toward their professional growth changes as move along their career stages. Above all, the most important implication for this finding about the effect of teachers’ years of experience is that one teacher characteristic can have multiple effects on professional development.

Like years of teaching experience, teachers’ personal beliefs about their roles influence their motivation toward professional development. Alan espoused:

Frankly speaking, what students really need is a figure that can play the role like a parent for them, who can understand students’ need and problems and can guide them to reach their fullest potential....[To assume this role] I need to learn more and more. I believe my pre-service training would not be enough for this. Thus, I need to keep improving my knowledge either by reading books, Googling on the internet, or attending training or seminars. (AL/MC)

Susan explicating her effort to make her teaching and learning attractive to students,

As an English teacher, my concern is how to create enjoyable learning situations for my students. Because, you know, English as a subject is a scourge for students ... One way [to improve my competency to create such learning] is to participate in training or read related literature. (SU/MC)

Though teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning are often implicit, the above assertions from Alan and Susan suggest that these beliefs do shape their thoughts and actions including their learning.
The subject areas in which teachers teach can be also an important influence for their professional development needs. When asked about her TPD experiences, Susan, the English teacher, stated:

[TPD is] not that effective, Why? What teachers really need is not there [not covered in MGMP]…particularly for me as an English teacher, for example, I really want that what we learn in MGMP can improve my [English] speaking ability. You know, English teachers are judged by their speaking ability. It is very ironic for me as an English teacher but I cannot speak English properly. (SU/MC)

In other words, the nature of subject areas tends to influence teachers’ views of their TPD needs. In another part of the interview when asked about the kind of TPD opportunities provided by the school, Susan added: “[The school] arranges school MGMP and invites school supervisors [as speakers]. But you know, it is merely about general topics such as teaching documents. It does not specifically address particular subject areas” (SU/MC). The need to accommodate different subject areas or specialties is also crucial during the implementation or experimentation stage when teachers want to try out or apply TPD ideas in their classes as Alan urged:

Personally, as a mathematics teacher, I had tried to apply the idea to my class. But, you know, the problem is that there are also other subject teachers such as, Indonesian, English, or the sciences. In my subject, a teacher may already know how to apply an idea to the subject, but how about other subjects? (AL/MC)

It seems that teachers’ “concerns about” wholesale TPD comes from the perception that each subject is unique and hence TPD needs to have some focus on different subject areas.

5.5 School Conditions for Professional Learning

This section highlights findings about the conditions at the school that influence teacher learning and changes in TPD. The determinants of conditions at Mac School range from historical background, principals, personnel structures, resources and
students, to beliefs/norms that exist at the school which then shape teacher learning and change. The findings about school conditions were entirely generated from the interviews with the principal and teachers.

School conditions arise from and embody schools’ histories. Interviews with the principal and teachers suggest that Mac School had a critical incident that adversely affected teachers’ morale and performance. One of the interview questions for teachers was “How would you describe your school conditions in relation to your professional development?” Alan’s response to this question unveiled a historical incident that had impacted on the current condition of the school in general and TPD in particular. He told the story:

Mac School, until the end of 2012, had been in what may be called a ‘mismanagement situation’. I can say that because during that time, I did it [professional development] all by myself. Why? I did not know exactly what happened but support or facilities for teachers to improve their professionalism were very limited….I regretfully tell you that during that time teachers in general nonchalantly performed their teaching duties. (AL/MC)

Mr B, the principal, similarly recalled this mismanagement situation:

When I first stepped into Mac School, I was shocked with conditions in the school. Classroom and school cleanliness were terrible. I went into the classrooms and I found some classes were left unattended by teachers. The school’s resources and facilities were poorly maintained. The school was like an abandoned school….One thing I knew from teachers’ stories was that the previous principal rarely stayed at school or just stayed for a couple of hours and left. (PR/MC)

Alan’s and Mr B’ stories about this mismanagement incident indicate that one particular situation in the past can have a profound impact on present and future conditions.

Each of the interviewed teachers underscored the important role of the principal in teacher professional development. For Alan, the principal is an enforcer (giving direction) for teachers’ TPD:
The principal is very influential. You know, it is even greater in our context or culture where we regard the principal as the ‘eldest’. Thus, training, MGMP, seminars and the like will be readily available for teachers if the principal provides the necessary support. But if he [the principal] does not, then professional development will only become the interest of particular teachers [those who have strong motivation] and the rest will look the other way. Thus, I think in this school, we really still need the principal to play that role and if the principal leads us to the right, then all school personnel will go to the right; if the principal guides us to the left; all will go to the left. (AL/MC)

In a hierarchical society or organisation, a central figure that can authoritatively orchestrate all members is highly desirable. For Susan and Anton, the principal is a TPD motivator and facilitator. Susan commented: “[The principal] strongly motivates teachers at school. He’s trying hard to send his teachers to training” (SU/MC). In a more straightforward comment, Anton posited: “I think his [the principal’s] main role is as a facilitator and that what he usually does [is], to provide [TPD] opportunities and to make sure they run well” (AN/MC). The interview data showed that in relation to teachers’ TPD, the principal has multiple roles.

Principals as top managers influence the use of TPD. In his efforts to rejuvenate the school after the previous principal’s mismanagement, Mr B, for example, deliberately used TPD as a strategy to revive or boost his teachers’ spirits or morale. Mr B pointed out: “I get all teachers on board. When there is training, I send them [to participate in the training]. I get them involved [in the training] so that they get more spirit” (PR/MC). Mr B’s use of TPD as a strategic management tool shows that the purpose of TPD can be tailored to suit a particular situation.

At Mac School, one particular circumstance that exerts an influence on teacher learning and change is students. Students’ socio-economic circumstances, for example, affect teachers’ TPD motivation and perceptions. For Susan, the fact that the majority of
students at Mac School are from low socio-economic levels became a powerful motivation for her to continually develop her professionalism. She said:

You see, the condition of our students in this school – they mostly come from low income families. So as their teacher, I try my best to help them. This is the thing that keeps motivating me [to improve my competency]. I need to find ways so that they can graduate with good results to say the least. I need to help them, so that students whose parents are only street vegetable sellers will not become street vegetable sellers too [when they graduate]. (SU/MC)

Alan said students’ socio-economic backgrounds were an important issue that should be considered in teacher learning. He said:

Teachers in this school need to take into account the socio-economic backgrounds of students here; they mostly come from poor families. That is also one of the challenging factors. Why? You know, it is very different to deal with students from such backgrounds. (AL/MC)

Alan is suggesting that teachers need to be able to connect what they learn in their TPD to the immediate circumstance of their teaching activity.

Teachers need adequate resources or facilities to help them experiment and or apply TD ideas into practices. In this sense, school resources/facilities considerably influence teacher learning and change. When asked what facilitated or hindered his professional development, Alan confessed: “Tell you the truth, it is the poor and limited resources and facilities we have here in our school that primarily inhibit my professional development” (AL/MC). Susan said:

Just recently I attended the USAID training. I know the presented materials [ideas] are great but unfortunately it is our school resources/facilities, you know, so limited … [for example] I want to use [a technology] but sadly the electricity cannot support it. (SU/MC)

Alan and Susan gave accounts of the inadequacy of school resources/facilities suggesting that teacher learning and change are “resources or facilities dependent” – accessible resources or facilities help teachers to structure their learning.
Collectively, teachers can have either positive or negative affect on teacher learning and change. For example, Alan considered one of the reasons for the ineffectiveness of school-based TPD to be that the majority of teachers at Mac School were senior or veteran teachers. He postulated:

I think for this school whose teachers are mostly veteran teachers, school- or teacher-based professional development is not appropriate yet. Why? Because their [veteran teachers’] insights and ideas are below standard [outdated] and thus, teacher sharing [of knowledge] at the school is not productively developed. (AL/MC)

Alan’s explication of this issue may be another reason why teachers believe that informal TPD is less influential. Another example of this emerging collective view was the norm of interaction among teachers at Mac School. When asked about factors at the school that facilitate or hinder her professional development, Susan pointed out that her colleagues’ unsupportive attitudes toward her experimentation or application of ideas gained from TPD is discouraging. She said:

You know what? When I try out something new in my class, there are still some of my colleagues who cynically comment ‘she/he is doing it to show off’. I know, there are still some teachers who stick to those old-fashioned styles and that’s why, they criticise. That kind of disapproval gets me down. (SU/MC)

Again, this could be a reason for teachers not valuing informal TPD.

However, at the same time, both Alan and Susan maintained that their fellow teachers are their TPD supporters. Susan stated: “I usually discuss problems that I encounter with students with my friends” (SU/MC). In his story of implementing ideas gained from TPD, Alan stated: “I discuss this idea with other teachers…who, I think, are also willing to try [new things].” (AL/MC). Colleagues are teachers’ close neighbours to share ideas or discuss students, classes, or school problems.

To sum up, teachers at Mac School have low TPD participation in both formal and informal learning. The analysis of data has shown that a multiple interrelating
factors such as the management of TPD, ineffectiveness of principal, distant relationship among teachers and teachers’ TPD preferences shape this condition. In general, TPD programs are provided by government or external agencies which are very limited. Principals often need to lobby the government TPD providers so that their teachers can access spots in the TPD programs. Unfortunately, for some years Mac School had a principal who did not consider TPD as important and thus, teachers at Mac were not often invited to or involved in these government TPD programs. This situation was detrimental to teachers’ attitudes towards their TPD as shown by teachers’ lack of knowledge sharing or learning from and with their colleagues. In terms of professional development or learning, teachers at Mac School seem to keep their distance from each other; as a result, TPD becomes an individual, isolated matter. Participating teachers do not believe that they can learn from and with their colleagues and prefer to seek out “authorities” who can show and tell them what to do. It is, therefore, almost impossible to pin down teachers’ low TPD participation at Mac School to any single one of the aforementioned factors but rather all these factors interact to affect teachers’ TPD participation.

5.6 Summary

TPD opportunities for teachers at Mac School are characterised as externally-provided, formal and discriminatory. In other words, the TPD programs are structured learning situations such as workshops which are designed and delivered by external instructors, mostly from government agencies. Although the formal TPD programs are compulsory, they are limited to particular teachers who are favoured by authorities overseeing TPD. Informal learning such as dialogues and discussion among teachers at Mac School is not well practised which may be because of teachers assume “getting together among themselves” will yield no pedagogical benefits.
At Mac School, teachers who have more years of teaching experience and higher educational qualifications tend to have more formal TPD participation. Teachers from different teaching career stages (e.g., novice, middle, senior) and different subject areas have different orientations toward the form and content of TPD learning activities. With regards to teaching career stages, teachers’ motivations toward their TPD varies. Additionally, teachers’ pedagogical beliefs influence their motivation toward TPD. Teachers’ individual characteristics affect teacher learning with one characteristic being influenced by the other characteristics.

Multiple elements at Mac School influence teacher learning and change. First, Mac School had been in a mismanagement situation which unproductively affected teachers’ attitudes and actions towards their profession, including their professional development. Second, though new at Mac School, the principal was perceived by teachers to play fruitful roles on teachers’ TPD. Third, school resources and facilities impeded teachers’ efforts to experiment or apply TPD ideas into practice. Last, the majority of teaching personnel at Mac School were senior or veteran teachers whose knowledge and attitudes influenced the success of knowledge sharing among teachers.
Chapter 6  The Case of Pioneer School

6.1  Case Setting

Pioneer Junior High School, hereafter called Pioneer School, is located in the centre of the city of Parepare, one of the three municipalities (Kota) in Sulawesi Selatan province. Pioneer School is one of the preferred public schools in the city because of its reputation as a *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional* (RSBI, Pilot School to Become an Internationally Standardised School) from 2007 until the end of 2012. The Indonesian government established RSBIs as a strategy to boost the quality of national education by developing schools whose quality was comparable to high quality schools internationally. To do this, some public schools were chosen as RSBI schools that would use: a combined curriculum (national and international); English or bilingual (Indonesian and English) for instruction; and modern resources and facilities. However, the Constitutional Court of Indonesia legally annulled the status of RSBI schools in 2013 following the judicial review sought by protesters against RSBI. The protesters claimed that the existence of RSBI schools was discriminatory because they were only for rich people due to the expensive tuition fees as compared to regular public schools. RSBI schools were said to violate the right of every Indonesian citizen to access quality education as mandated by the Constitution.

Pioneer School is a big school. As can be seen from Table 6.1, Pioneer School has an average of 300 new student enrolments every year and a total of more than 800 in the school with at least 27 classes in each year seven to nine. According to school data, the majority (around 86%) of the students attending Pioneer School come from middle income families (SMPN 2 Parepare, 2012).
Table 6.1 Number of Students and Classes for Three Consecutive Years at Pioneer School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Total (Yr.7+8+9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Students)</td>
<td>(Classes)</td>
<td>(Students)</td>
<td>(Classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 shows the composition of personnel at Pioneer School. Pioneer School has one principal, 71 teachers and 15 administrators to serve its hundreds of students. Out of the total number of teachers, 57 teachers have a bachelor’s degree or above and as it is the case in public school in Indonesia, 47 of all teachers in Pioneer School are civil servants. In addition, as shown in Figure 6.1 the composition of teachers with regard to their teaching experience is quite varied.

Table 6.2 Number of School Personnel at Pioneer School and their Educational Qualifications (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Junior Sec.</th>
<th>Senior Sec.</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>Undergrad.</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD/Dr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fulltime-permanent teachers (PNS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fulltime-temporary teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fulltime-permanent administrators (PNS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fulltime-temporary administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.1 Teachers at Pioneer School – years of teaching experience

Mrs S, the principal, graduated from a teacher training institute in 1992. She spent two years as a teaching assistant in her alma mater and in another higher institution, hoping to secure an academic position at university level. Unfortunately, with her bachelor’s certificate in science education, it was difficult for her to secure one. She then applied for a position as a teacher through the national test for civil servants. She passed the test and was appointed a PNS teacher in December 1994. She taught science to junior high school students in one junior public school in the city of Parepare for 10 years before she moved to Pioneer School in April 2005. Other than teaching, Mrs S also assumed responsibility as a vice principal prior to her appointment as acting principal in 2012 and definitive principal in May 2013.

Garrick, the first interviewee, is an English teacher. Garrick comes from a family of educators; his parents and most siblings are teachers. He initially did not want to be a teacher but in 1988 because of his family influence, he opted to go to Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP, Teacher’s College) in his home town and studied English. He finished his degree in 1993 but it was not until 1995 that he became a PNS teacher. He was first posted to a public junior high school in a neighbouring district to
the city of Parepare and taught English there for about 10 years before transferring to Pioneer School in 2006. Garrick is a very active teacher in TPD activities, both as a participant and a facilitator/instructor. He earned the status of *Instruktur Nasional* (National Instructor) which is a credential for training teachers in TPD programs, particularly those initiated by or provided by the government.

The second Pioneer School teacher interviewed was Rachel. Rachel is a mathematics teacher. Like Garrick, Rachel prepared for her teaching career at the local STKIP in Parepare in 1991 and while she was at the college, began teaching mathematics to senior high school students. In 1998, a year after graduation she was appointed a PNS teacher of mathematics at Pioneer School. In terms of opportunities to develop her competencies, Rachel suggested that being married to a mathematics teacher was a huge advantage because she has a readily available discussion partner for her instructional problems.

The third teacher interviewed from Pioneer School was Tini. Tini is an English teacher who earned a bachelor’s degree in English teaching from the *Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan* (FKIP, Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Studies) in a public university in Makassar. Upon completing her study in 2006, she spent several years teaching English in numerous positions such as a private teacher, an instructor for informal education and a contracted teacher. In 2010, Tini passed the test for PNS teachers and was appointed an English teacher at Pioneer School. Tini is a young, enthusiastic teacher who was doing her master’s degree at the time of the interview.
6.2 Features of TPD Learning Activities and Teachers’ Perceptions towards TPD

This section follows the presentation structure of the previous chapter highlighting the same points of analysis. These include teachers’ formal and informal TPD participation; intensity of formal TPD; TPD needs and opportunities; and TPD barriers. In each of these categories, findings from the teacher questionnaires are presented first, followed or elaborated by data from the interviews with the principal and teachers.

In general, the level of teachers’ TPD participation at Pioneer School is high. Figure 6.2 shows that around 83% of teachers reported participating in some formal TPD learning activities during the 18-month period prior to completing the questionnaire. The level of TPD participation seems closely related to TPD opportunities made available to teachers. When asked his opinion about TPD opportunities available for teachers, Garrick stated: “I think, what the government has been done to teachers is enormous…We’ve got lots of training invitations coming to school” (GK/PI). The many training invitations coming to Pioneer School likely contribute to teachers’ generally high level of TPD participation. These many training invitations can be attributed to the status of Pioneer School as a former RSBI school as will be shown in Section 6.4 about the school conditions for professional learning. Local, regional and central education authorities give priority to teachers at government-pilot schools like Pioneer School to participate in government TPD programs rather than those from general public schools.
Although there are lots of TPD opportunities offered to Pioneer School, the TPD opportunities are not equally distributed and not all teachers at Pioneer School participate in TPD as indicated in Figure 6.2. There are likely a number of reasons for this paradox which will be explicated in Section 6.3 about teacher characteristics that influence teacher learning and change. Some teachers at Pioneer School seem to have lack of awareness and motivation and problems with work ethic that hamper their learning (e.g., low awareness and motivation to participate in TPD).

Similar to Map School, the intensity of TPD participation differs greatly among teachers at Pioneer School. As can be seen from Figure 6.3, on average, teachers had 81.8 hours of TPD participation among all teachers who reported their participation hours. However, the high standard deviation of this variable (SD = 69.70) indicates that there is a large amount of variation in the number of hours of TPD participation. For example, there are 235 hours of difference between the lowest and highest intensity of TPD participation (highest = 240 hours, lowest = 5 hours). In other words, TPD opportunities are not equally distributed among teachers.
Figure 6.3  Intensity of participation in formal TPD learning activities of Pioneer School teachers

Formal TPD learning activities come in various forms or types. In the teacher questionnaire for the current study, teachers were asked to indicate their participation in any forms/types of learning activities listed. Figure 6.4 shows that the two most common forms/types of formal learning activities that teachers reported participating in were workshops/training (75%) and teacher networks (69%).

Figure 6.4  Participation level by form/type of TPD learning activity at Pioneer School (Formal)
Data from the interviews with the principal and teachers support these statistical figures. In the interviews, one of the questions asked of the principal was “What types of TPD activities have your teachers participated in?” Mrs S answered: “As usual, we have workshops and training that are formally provided by either the district, the province or the central government” (PR/PI). For teachers, the question was “In general, can you tell me about TPD activities you have participated in?” Most teachers named workshops/training and the teacher network (MGMP). Rachel, for example, replied: “I try my best to be actively involved in MGMP” (RL/PI). Similarly, Garrick said: “Usually, if there is a training [invitation], the school will send relevant teachers…. Nowadays, the school [principal] is steering us to participate in MGMP” (GK/PI). The above accounts of the principal and teachers suggest that the most commonly accessed forms of TPD learning activities are usually those that are made available or endorsed by authorities. In other words, most formal TPD opportunities for teachers at Pioneer School are externally mandated and provided.

The interviews with the principal and the teachers about teachers’ TPD participation further unveiled some important findings about TPD learning activities for these teachers. The first one is about the effective forms of TPD. The interview participants had different opinions about what counts as an effective form of TPD learning activity. Teachers used comparative and superlative expressions to convey their opinions about effective forms of TPD learning activity. Table 6.3 summarises each interview participant’s perceptions on the most effective forms of TPD learning activity, along with reasons they gave for its effectiveness. These perceptions add more detail to the features of TPD in which teachers participated.
Table 6.3 Teacher Perceptions on Effective Form of TPD Learning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
<th>Effective Forms</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S</td>
<td>I think workshops are the best [most effective] because if it is a training, teachers only listen to lectures and that’s it, finished. But if it is a workshop, there is a product. Teachers work on or create something that is useful for them. (PR/PI)</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>- actively involves teachers to think and work&lt;br&gt;- produces concrete, applicable results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrick</td>
<td>[among other forms] I’ll say workshops have the most impact on teachers. Why workshops? Because teachers think and do something. I’m telling you, teachers no longer want to listen to theory presentations. Don’t give teachers theories, let them find it out and practice it. (GK/PI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tini</td>
<td>I think it would be great if we had seminars. Particularly here in Parepare, seminars, educational seminars in particular are very rare. (TI/PI) You know what, something that you never heard before or new ideas and innovations you do not happen to know, you mostly can find all of this stuff in seminars (TI/PI.2)</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>- keeps teachers up-to-date with current or new information, ideas or innovations in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>For me, MGMP is the best. Because at the MGMG when a colleague faces some problems, all members come to help to find solutions. Besides, we meet twice a month compared to one-day seminars. (RL/PI)</td>
<td>MGMP (Teacher Network)</td>
<td>- derives from teachers’ actual problems&lt;br&gt;- offers practical solutions&lt;br&gt;- is ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second finding relates to the tendency of MGMP to be a form of control by the authorities. MGMP was originally envisioned to be collegial network in which teachers could help each other to improve their instructional competencies based on their local knowledge and expertise. However, there is evidence that MGMP is being used as a new form of authoritarian control, as Garrick explained:
MGMP can be seen as a form of government control at the lowest level because among educator forums, MGMP is the lowest teacher forum. [Therefore] there are usually orders from MKKS [educator forums for principals] who come to MGMP asking the members to do particular tasks. Thus, MGMP needs to invite teachers to follow up this request. That is what usually happens in MGMP. (GK/PI)

What can be inferred from Garrick’s remark is that a collaborative or collegial form of TPD, in a hierarchical bureaucracy, can be turned into a new way of telling teachers what to do. This finding suggests that TPD is highly influenced by the broader political and social conditions within which TPD operates.

The last finding is about the problem of ideas or skills implementation following TPD. An important indicator of the success of TPD is whether or not teachers implement ideas learned from TPD into their practices. Garrick observed that it seems to be the case for most teachers that they have participated in numerous TPD activities but what teachers learned from those TPD is not evident in their practice. Garrick reasoned:

The problem is that teachers do not have that kind of awareness [to make use of it]. When they are back to schools, they are just back to what they did before. It’s like they do not have an intention to improve their competencies, their professionalism. (GK/PI)

Tini postulated another reason for why TPD ideas do not transfer into practice: “The barriers [for implementing TPD ideas] are that teachers are given too many materials to learn, too many targets or expectations to meet with too little time for trials or experimentation” (TI/PI). Garrick’s and Tini’s accounts suggest that teacher learning and change is shaped by teacher character as well as the content, process and structure of TPD.

Interviews with teachers also point out some of the weaknesses or barriers of the formal TPD in which they have participated. TPD opportunities are occasional and limited as Tini reported: “From time to time, we have training [invitations] but spaces
are limited. You know, there are many teachers here but only a few get chosen to represent the school” (TI/PI). In their active participation in MGMP, Garrick and Rachel said that inadequate financial support impeded the potential of MGMP for teacher development. Garrick stated: “Actually, MGMP has a great benefit for only if it is well-supported financially” (GK/PI). Similarly, when asked her opinion on her TPD participation, Rachel said: “I think what we do in MGMP is great and needs to be improved. Unfortunately, for mathematics [MGMP], we have very limited funding” (RL/PI). In addition to financial constraints, Rachel posited that the lack of local experts to act as TPD facilitators is another shortcoming in TPD. As she pointed out: “Especially in Parepare, there are very few experts in mathematics. I thought if we have experts that we can always discuss things with, I believe we could learn more” (RL/PI).

In contrast to their formal TPD participation, teachers at Pioneer School participated less in informal TPD learning activities. Figure 6.5 shows that around 77% of teachers reported having undertaken informal learning activities, a percentage that is slightly lower than the percentage of teachers’ formal TPD participation which is about 83% as shown (from Figure 6.2).
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*Figure 6.5  Level of participation in informal TPD learning activities of Pioneer School’s teachers*
A lower frequency of informal learning is also evident from the comparison of teacher TPD participation by forms/types of TPD learning activities (formal and informal). As can be seen in Figure 6.6, the four highest percentages of teacher TPD participation are informal dialogue/discussion, workshop/training, reading literature and teacher network with 78%, 74%, 74% and 69% respectively. Put in different words, teachers’ participation or engagement in informal learning is not different to their participation in formal learning despite the ubiquity of informal types of learning such as dialogue, discussion and reading activity. As will be illustrated in Section 6.3 about teacher characteristics and Section 6.4 about school conditions, there are indications that the lower frequency of teacher participation in informal learning is influenced by factors playing at either the school or teacher level.

Regardless of the lower participation rates in informal learning in the above figures, all the interviewed teachers at Pioneer School said that they practised some kinds of informal learning such as dialogue or discussion with colleagues, reading and
browsing the internet to improve their competency. Tini, for example, said: “Of course, as a teacher, I need to continuously improve myself. Thus, I consult with my fellow teachers, browse the internet and read books” (TI/PI).

Teachers at Pioneer School generally have a high level of demand in all areas of developmental need listed in the questionnaire. Figure 6.7 highlights that except for the need for TPD training for teaching in a multicultural setting (89%), the percentage for the needs of the other ten areas of development are above 90%. Figure 6.7 also demonstrates that coping with student indiscipline and misbehaviour, school management and administration and content knowledge are the three areas of the greatest development need (all = 96%). The high need for TPD on coping with student discipline and misbehaviour may indicate Pioneer School has problems in this area. However, there was no data found from the questionnaire or interviews to support this. Instead, teachers like Garrick and Tini suggested the students at Pioneer School are one of the drivers for teachers’ professional development; Garrick and Tini felt compelled to continuously improve themselves to cater for their high achieving students. A possible reason for this is the status of Pioneer School as a prestigious school. Teachers are under constant pressure from parties who have a stake in the privileged status of the school to maintain students’ order and discipline and, thus, teachers feel a need for knowledge and skills related to coping with students’ behaviour.
The high needs in all areas of development in Figure 6.7 correspond to teachers’ perceptions about the adequacy of their TPD opportunities. As shown in Figure 6.8, almost all teachers reported wanting more TPD than they had received (96%). In other words, teachers at Pioneer School believed they had not had sufficient TPD opportunities.

![Figure 6.7 Areas of developmental needs](image)

![Figure 6.8 Percentage of teachers wanting more TPD at Pioneer School](image)
The barriers that typically prevent teachers from participating in or receiving more TPD relate to their work. As can be seen from Figure 6.9, around 45% of teachers indicated their work schedule hindered them from participating in or receiving more TPD. Although there is no data either from questionnaires or interviews to support the possibility, this barrier may be attributed to the relatively heavy workloads of teachers teaching in a big, popular school like Pioneer School.

![Factors Preventing Teachers from TPD](image)

*Figure 6.9*  Factors preventing teachers at Pioneer School to participate in/receive more TPD

### 6.3 Teacher Characteristics

This section presents the result of analysis on teacher characteristics that influence teacher learning and change. In the case of Pioneer School, these influential characteristics include: educational qualifications, years of teaching experience, family background, teachers’ attitudes to TPD and motivation and work. This section follows the structure of presentation of case one where it starts with findings from the questionnaire data, which is then followed by findings from interview data.

The results of the questionnaire data analysis reveal that, in general, teachers with higher educational qualifications and more years of teaching experience have more
hours or a higher intensity of formal TPD participation. Table 6.4 shows that teachers with a master’s degree or higher had an average of 121 hours of formal TPD participation while those with a bachelor’s degree or lower had an average of 72.91 hours. In terms of years of teaching experience, Table 6.4 also indicates teachers with 6-10 or more years of teaching experience had more hours of formal TPD participation (at least 60 hours) compared to those with 1–2 or 3–5 years of teaching experience with only 23 and 48 hours of formal TPD participation respectively.

Table 6.4 Average Hours of Teachers’ TPD Participation Based on Level of Educational Qualification and Years of Teaching Experience at Pioneer School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Characteristics</th>
<th>Teachers with Bachelor degree or lower</th>
<th>Teachers with Master degree or higher</th>
<th>Teachers with 1-2 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 3-5 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 6-10 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 11-15 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 16-20 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 20+ years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means (Hours)</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding indicates that teachers who have more “capital” such as higher educational qualifications or more years of teaching experience have better or more chances to participate in formal TPD opportunities. In a situation where most TPD opportunities are externally provided and schools are invited or asked to send one or two representatives, schools or principals appear to choose teachers with more of this kind of capital. This could be the case because teachers with more capital (e.g. have more knowledge or experience) could be better able to cascade knowledge upon returning to their school. This finding may be one reason for the unequal distribution of TPD opportunities as reported earlier.

For some teachers, family background also exerts an influence on teacher learning and change. Family can serve as a resource for knowledge and motivation. For instance, Garrick, whose family (his parents, most of his siblings and his wife) are
educators, repeatedly disclosed the influence of his family on his professional development. He learnt a lot from his parents: “My parents used to tell me that there are two fundamental things that teachers need to know; ‘didaktik [didactic] and metodik [method]’. I think not many teachers know about these; I learnt many things from my parents” (GK/PI). In other parts of the interview, he mentioned his wife as his supporter and discussion partner: “Tell you what, there is one figure that keeps me moving: my wife. You know, my wife is also an English teacher, we learn a lot from each other; we exchange ideas” (GK/PI). A similar experience was reported by Rachel, the mathematics teacher whose husband is also a mathematics teacher. She said: “My husband is also a mathematics teacher, so if I encounter some [mathematics] problems, I consult him” (RL/PI). It is evident from Garrick’s and Rachel’s comments that teachers’ backgrounds functions as a personal context that can have a profound effect on teacher learning.

Teachers’ attitude toward their professional development is instrumental. They tend to pursue what gives them returns. For example, Rachel, who is very active in MGMP, revealed some of her learning experiences:

You know, during this kind of time [recess/lunch time], if I have problems, I’ll directly ask or consult my fellow teachers….That is my initiative that any time I have problems, my first response is to directly talk to my friends at school, or sometimes I call my colleagues at MGMP. If not, I also usually try to find solutions on the internet. (RL/PI)

In other words, teachers who are active in learning are those who see gains or benefits from their learning. Unfortunately, according to Rachel, this is not always the case for teachers at Pioneer School. Rachel further posited: “To tell you the truth, at this school there are only few teachers that you can share with, others either they are ignorant or unconcerned” (RL/PI). Similarly, Tini raised this issue in her interview by saying: “Teachers share less here. If they have problems they do not ask [for help], they keep it
for themselves” (TI/PI). While Rachel’s active engagement in her learning could be a personal attribute, teachers’ minimal exchanges or solitary inclinations, despite Rachel’s and Tini’s accounts, may have to do with workplace norms in the Indonesian context. The common view held by teachers in Indonesia is that teachers are respected, knowledgeable figures capable of solving problems of their own. Thus, seeking for help could mean a loss of status (Bjork, 2005).

One thing that became increasingly clear in the interviews was that teachers’ lack of awareness and motivation hampered teacher learning and change. The following quote from Garrick demonstrates his experience on this issue, though a specific reference to MGMP was made:

As you know if there is a training invitation from the district or province, the places are very limited – only one or two per school. For MGMP, all teachers are welcome but still only one or two teachers come to the MGMP meetings. Thus, I think it is all dependent on teachers’ awareness. If they feel that they need MGMP, then they will come. (GK/PI)

Rachel reflected on this lack of awareness and motivation issue as well. She said: “Out of eight mathematics teachers here, there are only two or three who are active in MGMP; the others just want the results of what we do at MGMP” (RL/PI). The lack of awareness and motivation to participate in TPD may account for the proportion of teachers who, in the questionnaire, reported they did not participate in any TPD activities.

Closely related to teachers’ lack of awareness and motivation is the issue of teachers’ work ethic. Both Garrick and Mrs S argued that teachers’ work ethic has unfavourably influenced teacher performance in general and professional development in particular. For instance, Mrs S explained: “I have lots of teachers who, though they
have been trained at the national level, when they return to the school they still the same as they are used to be” (PR/PI). When asked the reason for this problem, Mrs S said:

It actually depends on a teacher’s character and this character is influenced by their initial motivation to be teachers. There are people who become teachers because it is their calling. They want to educate the future generation, make a difference and so on. While for others, becoming teachers are their last resort. You know what? It is the latter ones who usually become ignorant, perfunctory teachers. (PR/PI)

In a similar vein, Garrick explained: “If teachers have been lazy from the beginning, when they were first appointed to be teachers, then they will be that kind of lazy teacher until they retire. I have seen this happen to many teachers, they never change” (GK/PI).

6.4 School Conditions for Professional Learning

At Pioneer School, findings about the school conditions that influence teacher learning and change are categorised into three major areas: the reputation of Pioneer School as a prestigious school; norms of collegial and professional interaction; and the principal’s character. The first impression when analysing teachers’ responses was that they were proud of their school as being one of the best in town. Garrick, for example, said: “You know, we are an A-type [accredited] school, an ex-RSBI and a pilot school for the 2013 curriculum [new piloted curriculum]” (GK/PI). Due to this reputation, Pioneer School attracts hundreds of applicants every school year. Garrick said that there is an entrance or selection test for students and only high-achieving students are admitted to the school. The fact that the students are high-achieving has a positive influence on teachers as Garrick explained: “We teachers at Pioneer School deal with smart students and if teachers regard this as a challenge then we need to try hard to meet this challenge” (GK/PI). The same sentiment was expressed by Tini when asked about what features of the school positively affected her professional development. Tini said: “I will say that the positive thing about this school, though I have only been teaching...
here for three years, is the students. I think all students are very capable. They have been selected, you know” (TI/PI).

Coming with this reputation are some privileges from the government. For example, Pioneer School enjoyed financial and technical assistance from the government that was not provided to general public schools. With this financial support, Pioneer School provided more resources and facilities to support teaching and learning. Mrs S said: “If we are talking about the government support, I should be very grateful because with the money that this school is provided with, I can afford all the amenities that the school needs” (PR/PI). In terms of formal TPD opportunities, local, regional and central education authorities give priority to teachers at government-pilot schools like Pioneer School to participate in government TPD programs rather than those from general public schools. This may also be the reason for the generally high levels of formal TPD participation at Pioneer School.

Collectively, teachers’ poor attitudes toward TPD can make the conditions of a school unconducive to teacher learning. At the school level, there is an indication that teachers at Pioneer School lack “collegial and professional interactions”. A collegial and professional interaction simply means an exchange among teachers to improve their instructional capabilities rather than the “hello” exchanges between teachers in the hallway or staff room. Garrick said that when teachers returned from training, they normally did not share what they had learned and at the same time other teachers did not want to ask the returning teachers what they have learned. Tini described her learning experiences with her colleagues at school as follows:

To be frank, I found some friends I could ask ‘can you explain how to do this?’ or ‘what did you learn in that training?’ They will help and tell me. But some teachers that I thought had more experience or are more knowledgeable, are very reluctant. It seems that they want to keep it for themselves; they do not want to share. (TI/PI)
The success or failure of teacher training may well depend not only on individual learning but also on the quality of collegial and professional interactions among teachers.

Principals are key influential figures that shape the conditions of the school for teacher learning. Leadership, communication and vision are amongst the common attributes of school principals considered to exert an influence on teacher learning. Garrick raised another interesting attribute in the following remark:

In my observation, I often find that if a principal is a physical education teacher, for example, then the school will excel in physical education. The same true is true for other subjects. Incidentally, the principal here is a science teacher, thus things related to science become prominent. Among other things this means that science teachers have more professional development opportunities. (GK/Pl.1)

It may be true that this is Garrick’s personal perception, but it supports the proposition that one small trait can matter substantially in one context or it can exert a considerable influence at a broader level.

All in all, teachers at Pioneer School have high participation rates in formal TPD activities but low rates in informal, internal ones. One factor that contributes to the high formal TPD participation is the status of Pioneer School as a government piloted school that is offered many TPD opportunities from the government. However, teachers that participate in these government-provided TPD do not generally impart or share knowledge and skills gained from TPD with their colleagues at the school. As a result, teachers at Pioneer School have few “learning” interactions amongst themselves. In addition to the teachers’ isolated relationship in learning, the principal of Pioneer School does not seem to exhibit a supportive role in teacher learning. Although teachers at Pioneer School have high participation in formal, external TPD activities, the learning itself does not fruitfully occur within and among teachers which is not caused
by a single factor. It may be caused by the infectivity of formal TPD that passively treat participating teachers as knowledge consumers and thus TPD are taken for granted. It may have to do with teachers’ solitary attitude or it could also be a consequence of a lack of leadership from the school’s principal. From the case of Pioneer School, it can be argued that factors influencing teacher learning and change are multiple and interrelated.

6.5 Summary

Pioneer School is a reputable junior high school. Students admitted to the school are students with high academic potential. The school enjoys some financial and technical assistance from the government. Its reputation generates some challenges and benefits for its teachers’ teaching as well as their learning. Dealing with students who have high academic ability can be perceived as a challenge which means that teachers have to continually develop themselves. Likewise, ample TPD opportunities from government or adequate school resources and facilities are a huge advantage for teacher development.

To improve competencies, teachers at Pioneer School formally participate in government-provided/mandated TPD programs in the form of workshop training and teacher networks (MGMP). Teachers vary in their TPD endeavours and in their perceptions of effective forms of TPD learning activity. Though teachers’ participation is generally high in formal TPD activities, their involvement in informal learning activities/forms is relatively low. Teachers in general perceive their work schedules as a barrier preventing them from participating in more TPD.

Some characteristics of teachers are seen as hampering their learning and change. Teachers’ lack of awareness and motivation and perfunctory attitudes toward their profession in general and professional development in particular contribute to the
quality and quantity of their TPD endeavours. When teachers are reluctant to share their knowledge or expertise, teacher learning and change can stagnate.

At the school level, Pioneer School seems to have no mechanism to facilitate teachers learning from each other. Or, if there is one, it does not work. Teachers also do not interact in a way that enables them to learn from each other. Every aspect of a principals’ personal and professional attributes affects the way they run their schools. Interestingly, the principal’s subject background at Pioneer School is believed to influence her management of teachers’ TPD.
Chapter 7  The Case of Map School

7.1 Case Setting

Map Junior High School, hereafter called Map School, is located in one of the sub-districts of kabupaten (district) Wajo and is about 30 kilometres from the capital city of the district, Sengkang. It is one of the only two public junior high schools in the area and was established in 1992. As can be seen from Table 7.1, over the last four years Map School has served an average of 189 students every year. Although Map School is categorised as a small suburban school, the student-teacher ratio is close to the ideal ratio as stipulated by the Indonesian government: 20:1 for junior high schools. The majority of students who attend the school come from low socio-economic and low education backgrounds (e.g. farmers, rice field labours).

Table 7.1 Number of Students and Classes for Four Consecutive Years at Map School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Total (Yr.7+8+9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number (Students)</td>
<td>Number (Classes)</td>
<td>Number (Students)</td>
<td>Number (Classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 shows the number of teachers and administrative staff at Map school along with their educational qualification. The teaching staff at Map School comprises 21 teachers including the principal and most of them are teacher PNS (13 teachers). All but one of these teachers has an undergraduate degree, which is the minimum educational requirement for teachers in Indonesia. The school has four administrators, two of which are civil servants and the other two are full-time temporary administrators.
Table 7.2 Number of School Personnel at Map School and their Educational Qualification (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Junior Sec.</th>
<th>Senior Sec.</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>Undergrad.</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD/Dr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fulltime-permanent teachers (PNS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fulltime-temporary teachers (Honorer)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fulltime-permanent administrators (PNS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fulltime-temporary administrators (Honorer)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1 indicates that in terms of years of teaching experience, the majority of teachers at Map School have been teaching for 6-10 years or more (around 89%). Some of them have been teaching since the early years when the school was established, including Mr A who is the current principal of Map School.
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**Figure 7.1** Teachers at Map School – years of teaching experience

Mr A’s career as an educator started in 1993 when he was appointed as a PNS teacher at Map School just one year after the school was established. Before becoming
the principal of the school, Mr A had different administrative roles as a coordinator or a vice principal for various school matters. In fact, he had been a vice principal for 14 years consecutively before he became the principal at Map School in 2010. He earned a D2 (two-year diploma) in mathematics from a local teacher college when he was first appointed as a teacher and now holds a master’s degree in the same subject.

Rudolf was one of the three teachers interviewed at Map School. He is a social science teacher who received his bachelor’s degree in teaching in 1999 in history from the first and only public teacher education institute in the province: IKIP Makassar. IKIP Makassar was transformed into a university in mid-1999. His teaching career began in 2003 when he was appointed as a government-contract teacher at Map School and he later earned his full status as a PNS teacher in 2007. Now, he is one of the certified teachers who has been granted the so-called teacher professional allowance – an allowance that doubles a teacher’s salary upon certification.

Raul, who is an Indonesian language teacher, was the second teacher interviewed at Map School. Raul had attended various teacher preparation programs. He started with a three-year teacher preparation program at secondary level in Sekolah Pendidikan Guru (SPG, Teacher Education School) in 1986. After completing the SPG in 1989, he continued his preparation at the tertiary level by enrolling in a bachelor’s degree in curriculum and instructional technology at IKIP Makassar which he completed in 1994. He also has varied teaching experience. While doing his bachelor’s degree, he started to teach at a private primary school. Upon completion of his bachelor’s degree, he became a teacher at a private senior secondary school. In 2002 he became a government-contract teacher and in 2007 was appointed as a PNS teacher. His appointment as a PNS teacher meant that he had to teach a subject that he had never
taught before: Indonesian. To qualify for teaching Indonesian, he undertook another teacher preparation program on this subject.

Mindy, the final interview participant from Map School, is an English teacher. Like Rudolf, Mindy began her journey to be a teacher when she entered SPG in 1984. Completing the SPG program in 1987, she continued her teacher education by enrolling into the IKIP Makassar and completed her bachelor’s degree in English teaching in 1990. Not long after her graduation, in 1991 she was accepted as a PNS teacher and spent three years teaching in a junior public high school in a neighbouring sub-district before transferring to Map School.

7.2 Features of TPD Learning Activities and Teachers’ Perceptions towards TPD

The findings related to the topics of this section are presented in a similar structure to those of the previous two cases. These findings include teachers’ formal and informal TPD participation, intensity of formal TPD, effective forms of formal TPD, TPD needs and opportunities and TPD barriers. Details of the findings in each of these areas are provided in this section.

Generally, at Map School teachers participated in formal TPD at a modest level. As shown in Figure 7.2, about 78% of teachers reported having participated in formal TPD learning activities in the 18 months prior to completing the questionnaire. The teachers’ modest levels of TPD participation at Map School were echoed in the teacher interviews. For example, Rudolf complained about a lack of TPD opportunities for him and his colleagues, particularly those provided by the government:

Our big problem here is the dearth of training for teachers. … Here in Wajo [district] training opportunities for teachers are very rare. And if there is one, a workshop or training for example, the places are limited or are only offered to particular schools, and others are not invited. In some cases, the district [authority] promised that other schools would be
invited in the next round. We were waiting but the invitation never came. (RF/MP)

Mindy pointed out other reasons why teachers at Map School do not get the chance to be involved in most of those government TPD programs: “What happens here is that only teachers around Sengkang [district capital city] or who have connections [with district authorities] will be invited” (MY/MP).
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*Figure 7.2* Level of participation in formal TPD learning activities of Map School’s teachers

The interviewed teachers pointed out the shortcomings of government-provided TPD opportunities. Raul mentioned three of them:

[Firstly] personally, I am not satisfied with what the government has provided. I mean, one to two [TPD opportunities] in a very long time is not enough…[Secondly] if a [TPD] program is from the government, teachers as participants are expected to submissively listen to facilitators’ lectures…[Thirdly] another problem if the professional development programs are provided by government programs is that the teaching and learning process at school is disturbed [as teachers have to leave their classrooms]. (RU/MP)

Raul’s account implies that TPD opportunities, particularly those provided by the government, are occasional; they treat teachers as passive learners and are conducted away from the school. TPD programs can also be disruptive to the teaching and learning
process when there is no available substitute teacher to cover for teachers who go to training. The government-provided TPD programs in Indonesia mostly take the form of a cascade model which can be seen as another shortcoming. Mindy suggested:

It would be better if there is a training or MGMP, all teachers are invited to participate. There is a problem if only one [representative] teacher is sent to participate. Let’s say teacher A is invited while teacher B who has the same subject as A is not invited. Later at school, this teacher A usually does not have the chance or time to train teacher B. (MY/MP)

Mindy’s point is that the cascade model may not always be appropriate given the heavy teaching responsibilities of teachers. Mr A, the principal, pointed out another problem with TPD opportunities provided by the government. He particularly highlighted this problem in relation to teachers’ implementing ideas from TPD in their schools or classes. He maintained:

[Government-TPD programs] lack follow-up. I mean, there isn’t any assistance after teachers complete training. Ideally, teachers who complete a particular training are provided with assistance. At certain times providers need to come to schools to observe and evaluate the implementation of ideas gained from teacher training programs at schools and provide help if needed. (PR/MP)

In addition to teachers’ modest levels of formal TPD participation, the intensity or number of hours of teachers’ TPD participation at Map School is also generally low and unevenly distributed, as in other schools. Figure 7.3 shows that 50% of teachers had less than 19 hours of TPD during the prior 18-month period. However, a small percentage of others reported having more than 100 hours (22%). This low and uneven distribution of TPD participation may also be ascribed to the practice of authorities choosing or inviting teachers to TPD programs based on proximity and personal connections, as Mindy suggested.
In terms of forms of formal TPD learning activities, Figure 7.4 highlights that the most frequently mentioned form is workshop/training with 77% of teachers reporting they had participated in this form. Surprisingly, the percentage of teachers participating in MGMP was relatively low (only 61%) despite its popularity as the most advocated and supported teacher networking and learning forum by the government. Reports by Rudolf and Mindy about MGMP confirm teachers’ low participation in this form or type of TPD. Rudolf noted:

I have been here for 10 years and I remembered that I had just been to MGMP twice. That was when I was still a contract teacher. Since I became a PNS teacher in 2007, there has been never any MGMP. (RF/MP)

Mindy experienced practically the same situation. She said: “A few years ago, I always participated in MGMP, but not in the last few years” (MY/MP). Although the interviewed teachers at Map School reported MGMP activities to be irregularly
conducted, both Rudolf and Mindy claimed MGMP was one of the most effective forms of TPD.

According to interviewed teachers at Map School, MGMP has some effective features. Raul provided an in-depth explanation on this matter:

For me, MGMP is the most effective one. Why? Because what we learn and do at MGMP, say designing learning materials, is more applicable and suitable compared to those learning materials endorsed by training providers which often require lots of sophisticated media. If it is held among teachers who design and develop learning materials along with their media, they are made up based on local ideas, which makes them easier for teachers to use. Frankly speaking, I usually find the information presented in the training asking me to do such-and-such is difficult to implement because they are very rigid. (RU/MP)

For Raul, the TPD contents or ideas should be applicable and suitable in light of schools’, teachers’ and students’ circumstances and TPD activities are structured around teachers from same schools. Mindy added her evaluation on the effectiveness of MGMP:

I think the most effective one is MGMP. Because MGMP involves a weekly meeting, so if we face problems we can consult with other

Figure 7.4 Participation level by form/type of TPD learning activity at Map School (Formal)
teachers at the meeting. Seminars or workshops are also good but it only lasts for one day. At MGMP teachers can meet more often….What usually happens at MGMP is that teachers work in groups, developing a learning material, for example, and each group makes a presentation about how to deliver the material in class. From these presentations, I can pick up things that are suitable or applicable to my classes. (MY/MP)

Mindy emphasises frequency and duration of TPD activities as a key for TPD effectiveness. Rudolf commented similarly:

In my opinion, it is MGMP. You know, MGMP activities can last for the whole semester and teachers meet every week. I think that is a very good chance for teachers to learn together; we can share what we know. This compared to workshops which only last for one or two days and the facilitators are gone after the workshop. At MGMP, we get together with teachers from the same subject area; we can make our syllabus together for example. (RF/MP)

The above perceptions on the attributes that make MGMP effective suggest some important points. First, effectiveness derives from multiple factors such as frequency and duration, content, structure and process. Thus, effectiveness is not dependent on a single factor. Closely connected to the first point is that the influence of these factors cannot be discretely ascribed to the sum of individual factors but rather to the interrelationship of these factors.

Having noted all the good qualities of MGMP, Mindy raised an interesting point about the benefits of participating in TPD regardless of its form. Mindy said:

I think any form of [TPD] opportunities – workshops, training or MGMP; they all can be useful. You know, though if we just, in our term, ‘come, sit, listen and go’ to these opportunities, there is always a little thing we can get, to say the least. What I mean is that by listening to talks [or lectures], there are always one or two things that can be learned. (MY/MP)

For Mindy, in a situation where TPD is very rare, participating in any TPD opportunity is worthwhile. Although it is sometimes argued that participation in TPD does not
equate to or guarantee learning, Mindy’s assertion implies that participation in whatever form of TPD can lead to learning.

In contrast to participation in formal TPD, teachers’ informal TPD participation is particularly high. As can be seen from Figure 7.5, very high percentages of teachers at Map School reported participation or engagement in dialogue/discussion (100%) and reading professional literature (95%) to improve their teaching. Data from the interviews with teachers and the principal reinforced this finding. One of the questions for teachers in the interview was “In general, can you tell me about any TPD activities you have participated/engaged in?” Teachers’ answers to this question included: “learn with and from friends”; “ask questions to friends”; and “share with friends”. In addition to these dialogue and discussion types of informal learning, teachers mentioned reading or reviewing references and browsing teaching-related topics over the internet as other forms of informal learning.
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*Figure 7.5* Participation level by form/type of TPD learning activities at Map School (Formal and Informal)
One reason for these teachers’ high engagement in informal TPD is that informal learning is encouraged and facilitated at Map School. When asked “Are there any TPD activities conducted in or provided by your school? If yes, what are they and how are they conducted?” Mr A disclosed the common practice of informal learning at Map School:

Before I answer that question let me tell you what I believe. For me, students’ success is closely related to teacher professionalism. Thus, to improve students’ competency, I make Fridays development days. I use this development day to provide guidance and assistance to help teachers improve their competencies. Fridays are our school forums to talk about our problems: teaching, assessment, students and other things. (PR/MP)

Rudolf’s story of his experience illustrates the practice of informal learning at Map School:

Compared to other schools, the opportunities to develop ourselves here are reasonable enough….For example, if we have a friend who has a chance to participate in training, upon his or her return to school, we will ask him/her about what he/she has learned. By doing that we all learn, regardless of our teaching subject. (RF/MP)

A similar story was told by Raul:

As well as the regular school meetings on Fridays, we also have casual sharing during break times. Teachers who have been to training share their experiences or give some guidance or suggestions. But this sharing just occurs over a light conversation or dialogue, not too formal. (RU/MP)

The interview data reveals that teachers at Map School are also provided with some formal TPD activities such as in-service training or mentoring/coaching which are internally initiated and conducted by the school. Mr A, for example, pointed out: “Since 2010, I have tried to accommodate my teachers to improve their competencies by providing some training at school” (PR/MP). In addition to school-based training, Raul mentioned mentoring or coaching activity at Map School in his interview:
Based on teachers’ career levels, I mean those experienced or senior teachers are appointed by the principal to mentor or to coach other teachers. For example, I have a mentor, though he teaches a different subject but he is my senior. He helps me a lot; he provides lots of useful advice on teaching-related matters. (RU/MP)

Both Mr A and Raul further reported that TPD opportunities that are internally facilitated by the school are more effective than those provided or mandated by the government for a number of reasons. Mr A said:

For me, I tend to see internal professional development as more effective. Why? Because what teachers learn and do is very closely related to their teaching conditions. I know [external TPD] programs are also important but they merely serve as reinforcement. You know, any activities to develop teachers’ professionalism should be derived from and based at school. Professional development from external sources is only needed for particular things that cannot be handled by the school, something that the school is not capable of. (PR/MP)

A similar argument was put forward by Raul:

If the initiatives for teacher professional development are left to the school, the professional development of teachers would be more focused compared to initiatives from the government [external], I think. The most important thing for school-initiated professional development is that the government provides the school with the necessary resources. I believe that if the school has the resources, any initiatives for developing teachers’ professionalism will function well. (RU/MP)

The development needs of teachers are an important factor to consider when designing TPD. In this regard, the development needs of teachers at Map School are centred on the knowledge and skills needed for planning, executing and evaluating their teaching and learning processes. As can be seen from Figure 7.6, 100% of teachers reported that their greatest development need was in the area of educational standards while over 80% of them indicated a high development need in areas such as classroom management, student assessment, information and technology skills, pedagogical content knowledge and school management and administration. The high needs in these areas may be driven by the urgent need of schools and teachers to meet the SNP
(National Standards for Education). These national standards include standards for graduate competency, teaching content, instructional processes, teachers and educational personnel, structure and infrastructure, school management, budgeting and evaluation and assessment. Based on the above eight national standards, schools are evaluated, accredited and certified and thus, schools and teachers strive to meet or comply with these national standards. Consequently, the need for TPD opportunities to improve teachers’ knowledge and skills related to the national standards is seen to be high.
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*Figure 7.6 Areas of developmental needs*

With such high development needs in numerous areas of teaching, it is not a surprise that teachers want more TPD opportunities than they have received. Figure 7.7 shows that 94% of teachers at Map School wanted more TPD opportunities than they had received. This statistical figure is also in agreement with the finding about teachers’ perceptions about the lack of TPD opportunities previously mentioned.
Of the six barriers nominated in the questionnaire, the most cited barrier that respondents said best explained what had prevented them from participating in or receiving more TPD related to teachers’ workloads. As shown in Figure 7.8, around 60% of teachers reported their work schedule prevented them from participating in or receiving more TPD. Raul commented on this issue:

I know that it is very important to give teachers as many professional development opportunities as possible. However, these opportunities, particularly those from the government, often conflict with our duties, you know, the mandatory 24-hour contact time. That’s the problem because teachers cannot just leave their classes behind [for attending TPD programs]. (RU/MP)

It is worth noting that none of the teachers at Map School gave lack of support as a reason for not participating in TPD. As will be reported in Section 7.4 about school conditions, this relates to the influence of the principal’s leadership on teachers’ TPD.
Teacher Characteristics

At Map School, the characteristics of teachers that influenced teacher learning and change are: level of educational qualifications, years of teaching experience, certification status, teacher awareness and commitment toward their development. Details of these findings are presented in subsequent sections.

The questionnaire data demonstrates that teachers with higher educational qualifications generally had more hours or higher intensities of formal TPD participation. As shown in Table 7.3, teachers with a master’s degree at Map School had an average of 188.7 hours of formal TPD participation compared to those with a bachelor’s degree or lower who had only an average of 42.6 hours. In terms of years of teaching experience, Table 7.3 also shows that teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with 20 years or more had more hours of TPD participation than those with 11 to 20 years of teaching experience. To some extent, these statistical figures illuminate the norm of TPD practice in Indonesia where teachers with “higher”

Figure 7.8 Reasons preventing teachers at Map School from participating in/receiving more TPD

7.3 Teacher Characteristics

At Map School, the characteristics of teachers that influenced teacher learning and change are: level of educational qualifications, years of teaching experience, certification status, teacher awareness and commitment toward their development. Details of these findings are presented in subsequent sections.

The questionnaire data demonstrates that teachers with higher educational qualifications generally had more hours or higher intensities of formal TPD participation. As shown in Table 7.3, teachers with a master’s degree at Map School had an average of 188.7 hours of formal TPD participation compared to those with a bachelor’s degree or lower who had only an average of 42.6 hours. In terms of years of teaching experience, Table 7.3 also shows that teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with 20 years or more had more hours of TPD participation than those with 11 to 20 years of teaching experience. To some extent, these statistical figures illuminate the norm of TPD practice in Indonesia where teachers with “higher”
or “more” attributes get more advantages including opportunities to participate in more TPD programs than those the fewer such advantages.

Table 7.3  
Average Hours of Teachers’ TPD Participation Based on Level of Educational Qualification and Years of Teaching Experience at Map School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Characteristics</th>
<th>Teachers with Bachelor degree or lower</th>
<th>Teachers with Master degree or higher</th>
<th>Teachers with 6-10 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 11-15 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 16-20 years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers with 20+ years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means (Hours)</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>188.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>114.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another teacher characteristic that influenced teacher learning or development is teacher certification status. For example, when asked about his endeavours to improve his competency, Rudolf not only mentioned the kinds of activities that he undertook but also revealed the motive for his professional development endeavours:

Like I said, I learn from and with my colleagues. But if I ask my friends and they also do not know the answer, I’ll browse the internet, try to find the answers there. If I do not do all these things, I’m stuck; I will not have any improvement. I need to be professional because I have been certified. (RF/MP)

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the current educational reforms in Indonesia are geared toward certifying teachers who have fulfilled professional standards. The certified teachers are then labelled professional teachers who are not only entitled to professional allowances but are also obliged to have the specified competences and performances. For Rudolf, the label of professional teacher serves as a driving force for improving his competency.

For Raul and Mr A, teachers’ awareness and commitment toward their professional development are fundamental for the effectiveness or success of any TPD endeavour. Raul highlighted this issue when he was asked about his TPD experiences:
It’s very often that the MGMP meetings are held because teachers ask for it. In our Indonesian [language] MGMP, for example, most of the meetings are initiated by teachers who ask the head of MGMP to hold the meetings. Teachers’ desire to initiate the meeting is the thing that makes MGMP effective…[whereas] in our school, teachers often come up with some ideas of what we need to discuss in the scheduled regular school meeting. (RU/MP)

In his interview, Mr A was asked about factors that hindered teacher learning and he answered:

In any opportunity to develop teachers, the key is the teachers’ commitment. Tell you what, no matter how hard I try to facilitate them to improve, if they do not have a strong commitment, if they do not have targets for their own development, the [TPD] opportunities are meaningless. (PL/MP)

7.4 School Conditions for Professional Learning

This section presents findings about the conditions in the school that influence teacher learning and change from TPD. At Map School, there were three broad influential conditions which included: the geographical circumstances of Map School, the norm of collegial and professional interaction and the principal. These findings were inductively generated from the interviews with the principal and teachers.

“Geographical circumstance” refers to the distance of Map School from the education authorities at the district or provincial levels. This geographical issue has two critical implications for teachers’ TPD at Map School. Firstly, it makes Map School or its teachers less “appealing” to educational authorities. Mindy explained: “What happens here is that only teachers around Sengkang [district capital city]…will be invited. Teachers like us who are far from the city are more often than not, not invited” (MY/MP). In a context or system where the priority of TPD programs is to fill a quota (number of teachers covered by the programs), it is a common practice that education authorities overseeing TPD will fill up the quota with schools or teachers that they can easily access (e.g. nearby schools or teachers). Thus, schools or teachers that are
difficult for the authorities to access, like teachers at Map School, are very likely to be overlooked because they are far away. This practice could be also one reason for teachers’ not-very-high levels of formal TPD participation at Map School as reported in the previous section. Secondly, the issue of distance affects the ability of Map School and its teachers to access information about TPD opportunities which, in turn, limits their TPD participation. Rudolf, for example, said:

One of our problems here is the lack of information either from Sengkang or Makassar. You know what? Very often we just know that there was training once it was finished. Had we known it, the school may have sent one of its teachers. (RF/MP)

Data from the interviews with the principal and teachers revealed that teachers at Map School enjoy equal sharing and teachers engage in professional exchanges or talks which exert a positive influence on their professional development. One of the interview questions exploring the influence of school conditions on teacher learning was “Do you think conditions at your school are conducive to your learning/development? [If yes] How? [If no] Could you tell me what impedes your learning/development?” Raul answered this question: “I think here, we are pretty good because every Friday we have a school meeting. So, if the principal has new information or teachers encounter some problems during the week, they can all be discussed in that meeting” (RU/MP). In another part of the interview, he added: “Sometimes, we have two or three teachers browse the internet to review an idea or a topic related to teaching or student learning” (RU/MP). Rudolf reported that “If we have a friend who has a chance to participate in training, upon his or her return to school, we will ask him/her about what he/she has learned” (RF/MP).

The interview data further indicates that the collegial and professional interaction that is widely practised by teachers at Map School is strongly shaped by the
practices of Mr A as principal. There are some leadership qualities or attributes enacted by the principal that come into play to support and enable these practices.

There are two broad expressions that the interviewed teachers used to describe the principal’s qualities with regards to their professional development: “TPD provider” and “TPD supporter”. For example, Rudolf admiringly described Mr A’s work as principal in the following account:

The current principal’s efforts to improve the quality of teaching are outstanding; he is very different to his predecessors. I have been through three different principals and I find that Mr A is the only principal who always provides support for any initiatives to improve our profession or our students. Before him, I remember that when training invitations came to school, the principal would say, ‘I think we do not need that; it costs lots money. Besides, we have other more important things to pay for’. The current principal, in contrast, is very supportive. He sometimes lends the school his own money if the school funds have not yet come. He said, ‘It is not a big deal because this is for improving the quality of our teachers and students’….The good thing about this school is that we are fully supported by the principal: I mean, the principal always provides us with the support we need. (RF/MP)

In the same manner, Raul illustrated the principal’s considerable influence on student achievement as a result of teacher development:

There has been a significant improvement in student performance in national examinations since 2010. I mean, our students used to be in the lower ranks but since Mr A was appointed as the principal, we have had better results. You know why? Because there have been ample opportunities given to teachers to develop their teaching. Like I said, he provides the necessary support – he pays training fees or provides internet access. (RU/MP)

The analysis of the interview data showed that Mr A undertook two broad roles that manifested in many of his actions. Firstly, as Mindy briefly reported: “I feel what the principal has done so far is pretty good. I mean, if he has some or new information, he’ll share it with us” (MY/.MP.1). This was echoed by Raul: “Thank goodness, we have really good [TPD] opportunities here because we have a loyal principal….His
coordination [relationship] and communication with teachers in particular are very close and open” (RU/MP).

Second, the data analysis revealed the principal’s actions as a TPD initiator who actively sought TPD opportunities for his teachers. Mindy said: “You know, the principal, if he visits *Dinas* Sengkang [the educational authorities’ office at the district level] and he knows that there are some training programs coming up, he’ll register our school [teachers]. He is very active on this matter. That’s what I observe” (MY/MP). Similarly, Raul reported: “The principal will send us to any available training opportunities that he knows of” (RU/MP).

Lastly, the analysis of the data showed Mr A’s own learning and his endeavours to motivate his teachers to learn. For Rudolf, Mr A’s active learning through his participation in TPD programs acted as a good role model for teachers: “For me, the principal is a professional teacher. You know, he is very active in USAID programs, so he is our reference to ask if we have problems or if there is something that we do not understand” (RF/MP). In another part of the interview, Rudolf added another story:

> The principal always encourages teachers to look for training opportunities and says that the school will bear the cost. I remember one day I came to see him and told him that I knew of a training and I wanted to go. He said, ‘Okay, that’s good. Let me know if you need some money for that’. But I told him that all I needed was his permission because I believed that I need this training for my own improvement. (RF/MP)

Raul had the same impression of Mr A’s encouragement for teachers to develop themselves. He said:

> Teachers are often offered a [TPD] opportunity. [But] if there isn’t any available training, he’ll tell us, ‘You are free to do any [TPD] activities as long they do not interfere with your teaching schedule or hours’. So, I do feel our principal is very supportive on this matter. (RU/MP)

In conclusion, teachers at Map School enjoy a condition in which learning and change is fruitfully encouraged, supported and facilitated, although they have limited
TPD opportunities for those provided by the government. This condition is shaped by a number of interrelated factors. Firstly, teachers at Map School have a strong commitment and motivation toward their professional development. This commitment and motivation arise from a circumstance where a legion of activist teachers of Map School who take responsibility to develop their school, teachers who want to make a difference in their students’ lives, and teachers who are often “overlooked” by government TPD providers and thus, seek or initiate TPD activities for themselves. Secondly, teacher sharing is widely valued and practiced by teachers at Map School. In a circumstance where TPD opportunities are very limited, any TPD is a precious learning opportunity not only for teachers who participate in the TPD but also for all teachers at the school. Therefore, teachers at Map School make use of any meeting at school (formal and informal) to share information and knowledge. Thirdly, the Principal also actively seeks TPD opportunities for his teachers, structures learning activities at the school for teachers and provides the necessary supports to facilitate in their learning. All of these factors are at play in shaping teacher learning and change at Map School.

7.5 Summary

Map School is a small public high junior school situated in rural area. The student cohort comprises children from families with low socio-economic and educational status. Despite its challenges, the school has a principal who possesses a commitment to professional learning for teachers who, for the most part, have strong motivation and commitment to improve their school, their students and their own instructional practices.

With regards to formal TPD, teachers at Map School generally do not have a high participation rate in formal TPD due to multiple constraints. These constraints include a lack of TPD opportunities, difficulties in accessing information about
available TPD programs, and educational authorities’ tendency to privilege particular teachers or schools closer to educational district offices. In addition to these constraints, teachers perceive formal TPD to be unproductive for a number reasons, including: they are infrequent and short in duration; they are rigid; or they are disruptive to instructional processes at school. For teachers, MGMP or TPD opportunities that are arranged internally and provided by the school are seen to be effective because: they are frequent and ongoing; they enable sharing of new ideas; and the solutions they advocate are applicable in real situations.

In contrast with their formal TPD participation, teachers’ engagement in informal learning or TPD activities was exceptionally high at Map School. Informal learning in the form of collegial and professional dialogue or discussion, reading teaching-related references or browsing and reviewing educational articles over the internet are encouraged and facilitated by the school and are widely practised by teachers. In short, teachers at Map School enjoy a collegial, professional and supportive environment.
Chapter 8  Cross-Case Analysis

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a cross-case analysis of the three cases in the current study. The presentation of this cross-case analysis is organised around the findings to address purpose of the study. Whilst the previous finding chapters (Chapter 5, 6 and 7) demonstrated that the influences of TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school condition on teacher learning and change were present in each of the case study school, this chapter will identify the nature of influences of TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school condition on teacher learning as well as an emerging additional influence to teacher learning in Indonesian context. This chapter starts with the influences of each factor and concludes with a summary of findings from individual case and cross-case analysis.

8.2 Influences of TPD Learning Activities

Teachers participate in various types of TPD opportunities or programs to improve their pedagogical knowledge and skills. Sometimes these learning activities are formal and designed and mandated by parties external to teachers. At other times they are informal, and voluntary, and arise from teachers’ daily practices and interpersonal communication and interaction with others. TPD can also be either a personal or collaborative undertaking.

The type or form of TPD opportunities influences teachers’ TPD participation. The externally provided formal TPD activities, for example, generally deem teachers as passive consumers of knowledge who acquire facts through a memorisation and imitation as Raul stated: “In this TPD activity, there will be facilitators or instructors who will present some materials and we, the teachers as participants, need to carefully listen to the facilitators’ presentation” (RU/MP). The externally provided TPD activities
reflect a traditional type of TPD that rests on deficit logic and authoritarian structure and process (Barton, 2000; McDonald, 2011). That is, teachers lack knowledge and skills to teach well and thus, need to “stock up on” their teaching repertoire with knowledge and skills generated by authorities. In a typical authoritarian TPD, the TPD providers/facilitators are deliverers/transmitters of knowledge and skills and teachers are receivers and implementers of what has been delivered/transmitted to them. In such TPD activities, teachers are passive receivers of knowledge generated by authorities.

In addition to teachers’ passive TPD participation, type or form of TPD learning activities affects teachers’ perceptions of what makes TPD powerful or effective to facilitate their learning. Based on the data collected from the three case study schools, it became apparent that teachers associate the effectiveness of TPD with content, structure and process of particular type or form of TPD learning activities.

All interview participants believed that the content of TPD learning activity should be based or focused on daily instructional problems or practices that happen at schools and in classrooms. Mr A, the principal of Map School, who actively provided school-based TPD activities for his teachers, said: “The way I see it, the professional development opportunities provided by the school are more effective. Why? Because what we deal with are things that relate to the school’s conditions, relate to teachers’ teaching” (PR/MP). Rachel expressed a preference for MGMP: “For me, MGMP is the best one because, if we have difficult topics to teach, we can share them with friends to find the possible ways to deliver them to students” (RL/PI).

According to teachers, TPD learning activities whose content was based on daily instructional problems/practice are more likely to offer suitable and applicable ideas or innovations. With special reference to MGMP, Raul explained this point:

Most of the time the meetings [TPD activities] held at MGMP are initiated by teachers and in that way the meetings become very effective.
You know why? Because what we learn and do at MGMP, say designing learning materials, are more applicable and suitable….They [learning materials] are made up based on the local ideas which make it easier for teachers to use. (RU/MP)

In the context of school-based TPD activities, Tini said:

We teachers know the weaknesses or problems of our school and our students. Thus, it would be more effective if we all worked together to fix the problems. The point is that how we can all learn together….This is often much better than those [TPD programs] from government with unclear goals or objectives. (TI/PI)

The need for the content of TPD learning activity to be based on daily instructional problems/practice has to do with the suitability and applicability of solutions or innovations generated from TPD activity to schools, teachers or student situations. When teachers cannot see the suitability and applicability of a TPD activity, the content of TPD tends to be dampened which is often the case for external or government-provided TPD as in Tini’s account.

In addition to the content of TPD, participants perceived the structure of TPD to be influential. Two findings emerged from the data analysis regarding this element: sustainability and collective participation. Sustainability refers to the degree to which TPD activities or programs last or continue over time. Collective participation refers to the extent to which a TPD program is organised for teachers who come from the same context such as the schools, grades or subjects.

The majority of TPD programs are one-shot and unsustainable. As reported in the previous chapters (Chapters 5, 6 and 7), teachers perceive TPD opportunities to be limited and occasional. For example, in terms of intensity of teachers’ TPD participation, Table 8.1 highlights the mean of teachers’ TPD hours across the three schools during the last 18-month period and it shows that on average, among the teachers who reported their TPD participation hours, teachers had 56.22, 81.81 and 66.94 hours of TPD
participation respectively at Mac School, Pioneer School and Map School. This is a TPD hour of an average of just under five hours per month.

Table 8.1 Average Hours of Teachers’ TPD across the Three Schools for 18 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Mean (Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mac School</td>
<td>56.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer School</td>
<td>81.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map School</td>
<td>61.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it is not a surprise that teachers perceived effective TPD to be those that are frequent and continuous or ongoing – in other words, sustainable. With a special reference to MGMP, the following teachers’ accounts pointed to the issue of sustainability: “Something like MGMP, I think, is good…because at MGMP there is a weekly meeting….Teachers meet more often at MGMP” (TI/PI); “Though seminars or workshops are also good but they only last for one day. At MGMP teachers can meet more often” (MY/MP); or “For me, MGMP is effective because it often lasts for three months in one term and has a weekly meeting which becomes a great opportunity for teachers to learn together” (RF/MP). The reasons why TPD programs are unsustainable vary. It may be because of the lack of commitment of its organisers: “Actually, at this school we have the schedule for [school] MGMP but unfortunately it does not run as it has been planned or scheduled” (RL/PI). Also, TPD programs are unsustainable because teachers regard TPD programs merely as a series of unrelated projects, as shown in the following evaluation from Anton:

What has been happening so far is that lots of [TPD] activities or programs are unsustainable; many of them are disconnected from each other. There is an indication for teachers to associate particular TPD programs with particular projects; you know, this project and that project. (AN/MC)
According to Rachel, TPD opportunities should be available for teachers or conducted by teachers on a regular basis to support teachers’ continuous improvement: “I feel like, I’m back where I used to be because they [TPD opportunities] are not sustained” (RL/PI).

Adding to the need for TPD programs to be structured in a timely manner is the notion of collective participation. The fact that the majority of the interviewed teachers in the three case study schools perceived internal or school-based TPD activities to be more effective than those run externally is reinforced by the notion of collective participation. Raul, for example, maintained: “If the initiatives for teacher professional development are left to the school, the professional development of teachers would be more focused compared to initiatives from the government [external], I think” (RU/MP). Mindy who scrutinised the practicality of the cascade model, which is commonly adopted in government-based TPD, advocated for the alternative of whole school/teacher participation in TPD:

I often mention at school that in Sidrap [neighbouring district] teachers hold an MGMP meeting [TPD activity] at the beginning of each semester and all teachers are invited to attend. So, for example, there is one particular meeting for Indonesian teachers and then all Indonesian teachers are facilitated regardless of the numbers; all Indonesian teachers are involved. I think this [arrangement] is much better. (MY/MP)

The last element of TPD learning activity that teachers viewed to be crucial is its process – that is, how teachers are engaged in TPD activities. As mentioned earlier, teachers are often treated as grateful TPD receivers or compliant participants who are expected to submissively listen to the so-called experts. Treating teachers as passive participants, according to teachers, is no longer appropriate. Garrick, who is also a national teacher trainer, criticised the traditional mode of TPD:

Nowadays, if teachers participate in training, they do not want to be dictated or to listen to mere presentations anymore. They prefer to work
Regardless of the type of [TPD] activities, teachers need to think and act in the activities, not only “come, sit, listen and go”. (GK.PI)

Garrick’s observation and evaluation implies that to be effective, TPD needs to actively engage teachers during the course of the activities. Teachers’ active engagement can take many forms. Mindy for example, perceived MGMP as effective because it enables teachers to share and observe practices: “At MGMP, we usually work in groups and each group will have to present their work. So, from this presentation, teachers may pick up something that would work for them or suit their students” (MY/MP). Rachel had a similar experience to Mindy’s:

We had a lesson study the other day at our MGMP. So each member took a turn to perform a teaching practice and the others became observers. After each performance we got together to discuss strengths and weaknesses. There would be corrections sometimes coming from the members. Most of the time, we would bring the results of this lesson study to our schools, particularly those we thought are suitable for our school. (RL/PI)

Teachers perceived powerful TPD learning activities to be ones that enable them to actively access each other knowledge and experiences in the forms of discussion, sharing and observation.

In short, the effect of TPD learning activities is not only on teachers’ improved instructional knowledge and skills but also on how teacher think and act on their professional learning.

8.3 Influences of Teacher Characteristics

Teachers’ characteristics can constructively (or unconstructively) influence their learning and change. In the current study, teachers’ characteristics include: years of teaching experiences, personal experiences about teaching and learning and economic
status. These characteristics shape the ways teachers feel, think and act on their professional learning.

Years of teaching experience in terms of career stage influence teachers’ preferences regarding the form and content of TPD learning activities. Table 6.3, for example, highlighted teachers’ different perceptions of which forms of TPD learning activity are effective. These different perceptions to some extent indicate that teachers’ TPD preferences are related to years of teaching experience. In addition, years of teaching experience also affect teachers’ choices for the content of TPD. Anton, the senior teacher, posited that he preferred a learning activity that allowed him “to understand the underlying concepts” of the ideas being presented (AN/MC). Anton is expressing a preference for theoretical or conceptually-based learning. Compared to Anton, Alan and Susan, who are in their middle career stage, are more inclined toward learning activities that offer practical ideas: “things that can be directly used” (AL/MC) or “[allow the teacher to] create enjoyable learning strategies to be used in the class” (SU/MC). On the other hand Tini, the novice teacher, said she would like to have TPD learning activities that give something that she had “never hear[d] before or new ideas and innovations [she does not] happen to know” (TI/PI). Teachers’ preferences towards particular forms and contents of TPD learning activities to some extent reflect Huberman’s (1995) model of teacher career stage which suggests that teachers utilise different forms or types of learning activities across their careers. This is also in line with Choy et al. (2006) and Richter et al. (2011) who found different trajectories of teachers’ participation in learning activities.

Similar to teaching experience, teachers’ personal experiences exert an influence on their learning. These personal experiences are varied and very rich. They can be the result of something that happened many years before they commenced their teaching
careers. For example, it was Susan’s dream to be an English teacher and she declared: “It is the teacher’s responsibility to improve his/her competency because becoming a teacher is an inner call” (SU/MC). Garrick, on the hand, was particularly impressed by his own teachers from when he was at school: “I remembered my teacher. Although he did not have a high educational qualification, the way he presented his lesson was very attractive…. [Therefore, I think] the key for effective teaching is how to present the lesson in the most interesting way and that is what we need to learn” (GK/PI). Such an experience can also be something that a teacher has encountered in the course of their career progression. Although Anton initially had no a great passion for becoming a teacher, he finally fell in love with the profession. He said: “As time goes by I feel teaching is my life…it becomes my hobby….So a professional teacher is one who wholeheartedly devotes himself or herself to the profession” (AN/MC). Raul, who was a contract teacher for more than a decade before becoming a teacher PNS, told his story:

Since being appointed as a civil servant, I feel that I need to be more responsible. In particular, I have a responsibility to educate my students. So I have made a commitment to myself that any tasks related to teaching have to be done in timely manner….All aspects of the profession that have been stipulated by the government must be seriously and carefully carried out. (RU/MP)

Teachers across the three schools repeatedly articulated the feeling of being insufficient or inadequate as the reason for their continuous TPD efforts. The following excerpts illustrate this point: “I need to learn more and more because I will not be able to teach my students lots of things if I only rely on the knowledge and skills gained from my pre-service education” (AL/MC); “I always feel inadequate in my knowledge because things keep changing and developing….Thus, I am compelled to further improve my professionalism again and again” (RL/PI); and “As a teacher I need [TPD] opportunities. I can’t just stick to what I already know. Simply put, what I am today
should be better than what I was yesterday” (RF/MP). These teachers believe that being professional involves ensuring that they can successfully perform their instructional tasks.

Both teachers’ professional and personal experiences greatly affect the formation of teachers’ beliefs about learning which in turn influence their decisions and actions toward TPD. In this study, an image of “being professional” (Hargreaves, 2000b) or a sense of “professional self” (Kelchtermans & Vandenberghe, 1994) arises as a driver that orients teacher learning and change.

The current study shows that improvement on the economic status of teacher tends to be positively related to teachers’ attitudes toward their TPD. As mentioned earlier, certified teachers in Indonesia get a professional allowance which doubles teachers’ incomes. Participating teachers in the current study who had been certified demonstrated positive and active attitudes toward improving their professionalism. According to Alan, teachers who have been certified take a more active role toward their own profession, including their professional development:

Professional [certified] teachers do not need to wait for instruction from principals because they already get the professional allowance which is a large amount. Thus, teachers do not need to wait for the principal to provide things that they need to support their profession….Myself, for example, I spent lots of money on buying books, so that I can read literature that I need to improve my teaching. (AL/MP)

Similarly, Rudolf, who is one of the certified teachers at Map School, commented: “I am expected to be professional as I have been certified and thus am seen as a professional. That’s why I think as a professional teacher – I need to learn more and more” (RU/MP). Teachers have been underpaid for quite long where in many cases need to part-time jobs and, thus, the improvement of teachers’ economic status resulting from the certification seems a positive driver for teacher learning and change. This is in

Individually, teacher characteristics may have a difference influence on teacher learning. Professional and personal experience, for example, can serve as a basis for teachers evaluating forms or contents of TPD learning activity that are suitable for their needs and circumstances or economic status can function as a resource for teachers undertaking or participating in more learning activities. Collectively, teacher characteristics affect feelings, thoughts and actions that teachers enact toward their learning.

8.4 Influences of School Conditions

School conditions influence TPD. Every aspect of school contributes to school capacity to create conditions that either promote or hinder teacher learning and change. In the current study, school-level influences include: knowledge sharing among teachers, technical and moral supports, students, school status and principal leadership for professional development. These topics are discussed in the following sections.

Knowledge sharing is essential for teacher learning. Unfortunately, according to teachers, knowledge sharing is not part of common practice at Mac and Pioneer Schools and this may be impeding teacher learning. The lack of knowledge sharing among teachers at Mac School is reflected in teachers’ accounts of the ineffectiveness of internal/school-based TPD. Alan, for example, believed: “When teachers are relating to each other [in internal TPD]…they only talk about Mac School; there is nothing new. [Thus] knowledge sharing does not develop” (AL/MC). The same belief was expressed by Mr B, the principal: “[If] it’s just among themselves [teachers] … it’s not effective;
it’s trivial” (PR/MC). Teachers at Mac School do not perceive themselves to be benefiting from internal/school-based TPD activity because they view this type of TPD as being “just among us” and they believe that there is nothing of value to share. Lack of knowledge sharing among teachers was also evident at Pioneer School teachers. Tini repeatedly expressed her disappointment about teachers not wanting to share in her school:

Teachers share less here. If they have problems they do not ask [for help], they keep it to themselves….some teachers that I believe have had more experience or are more knowledgeable are very reluctant to help. It seems that they want to keep their knowledge to themselves; they do not want to share. (TI/PI)

So far, it seems that the situation described at Mac and Pioneer School has not fostered the kinds of practices among teachers where they can access each other’s knowledge and experiences: knowledge sharing is neither valued and nor practised. This limits teacher learning to externally-provided TPD opportunities and also makes knowledge less beneficial as the knowledge is kept at the individual teacher level.

One of the distinctive features of Map School with regard to TPD is that knowledge sharing is a common practice among teachers and the principal at the school and is structured into the school timetable. Teachers at Map School have a weekly Friday meeting, arranged by the principal, in which “every problem is shared and discussed” (MY/MP). On some occasions, “two or three teachers browse the internet to review an idea or a topic related to teaching or student learning” (RU/MP). Rudolf gave another example:

If we have a friend who has a chance to participate in training, upon his or her return to school, we will ask him/her about what he/she has learned. By doing that, we all learn regardless of teachers’ teaching subject. (RF/MP)
Knowledge sharing is a common practice that supports the professional development of teachers at Map School. This finding supports previous studies that identify sharing of knowledge among educators as one of the key conditions for successful teacher learning (see for examples: Beatrice Avalos, 2011; Doecke et al., 2008; Garet et al., 2001).

Teachers need moral and technical support to put TPD ideas into practice. The need for this moral support, for example, was highlighted by Susan when she pointed out her colleagues’ responses to her experimenting or applying TPD ideas in her class. She said: “When I try out something new in my class, there are still some of my colleagues who cynically comment, ‘she is doing it to show off’….That kind of disapproval gets me down” (SU/MC). Susan felt that her friends’ unsupportive responses toward her experimenting or applying an idea gained from TPD discouraged her learning.

In addition to moral support, teachers need adequate resources and facilities to aid their learning, including opportunities to experiment with applying ideas from TPD. At Mac School and Map School, the inadequacy of schools’ resources and facilities such as electricity, materials and supplies, as well as required equipment was reported to impede or limit teacher learning. The following accounts from teachers at these two schools exemplify this issue:

Just recently I attended the USAID training. I know the presented materials [ideas] are great but unfortunately it is our school resources/facilities, you know, so limited…[for example] I want to use [a technology] but sadly the electricity cannot support it. (SU/MC)

I have to admit that there are lots of things that can be learned from participating in those training sessions. For me, models of instruction are my particular interest and when I use these models, I can see their impact on my students. But, it must be supported with some media or other resources such as worksheets or modules for students and sadly, these resources are limited here. (RU/MP)
Teachers at Pioneer School, on the other hand, are better equipped, as noted by Rachel: “The school is reasonably supportive of teacher development…internet is provided…if teachers need some resources, the school will promptly provide” (RL/PL). According to Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002), adequate resources and facilities are particularly salient to supporting teachers with experimenting and applying TPD ideas in their classrooms.

There is one actor or agent at the school level that, for better or worse, shapes each of the school elements mentioned above: the school’s principal. Teachers perceived the importance of the principal in terms of the roles they play in teachers’ professional development. Teachers feel that principals play various roles. Firstly, principals are TPD providers or facilitators as Anton and Raul pointed out: “I think his [the principal’s] main role is as a facilitator and that is what he usually does – [That is], to provide the [TPD] opportunities and to make sure they run well” (AN/MC); “He [the principal] provides the necessary support: pays the training fee or provides the internet access” (RU/MP).

Secondly, principals are TPD motivators. Raul and Rudolf proudly described their principal: “The principal always encourages teachers to look for training opportunities and says that the school will bear the cost” (RF/MP); “Teachers are often offered an [TPD] opportunity. [But] If there isn’t any available training, he’ll tell us, ‘You are free to do any [TPD] activities for as long they do not interfere with your teaching schedule or hours’” (RU/MP).

Thirdly, principals are TPD gatekeepers, particularly in the context of government-provided TPD opportunities, as described by Garrick:

I think the principal has a great responsibility toward teachers’ professional development for a number of reasons: she is the closest authority to teachers; she knows her teachers’ needs; she knows her teachers’ characteristics; and she knows her teachers’ competency. The
government just sends training invitations to schools but who’ll decide which teachers to send? Of course, the principal because she has the knowledge about which training suits which teachers. (GK/PI)

These various roles define principal’s leadership in TPD. It seems that principals need to be able to effectively play these different roles for powerful teacher learning to occur. Some of these roles are similar to those Bredeson and Johansson’s (2000) study that reported crucial importance of the principal in terms of the roles they play in teachers’ professional development.

Each school has its distinct features that affect teacher learning. Mac School is situated in an urban district with the majority of students coming from low socio-economic backgrounds. Some teachers embrace this situation as a challenge that has a positive effect on their motivation to learn. Driven by her desire to make a difference in her students’ lives, Susan said:

I try my best to help them. This is the thing that keeps motivating me [to improve my competency]. I need to find ways so that they can graduate with good results to say the least. I need to help them, so that students whose parents are only street vegetable sellers will not become street vegetable sellers too [when they graduate]. (SU/MC)

Map School is located in a remote area, quite distant from district or province authorities and this affects teachers’ access to TPD opportunities. Mindy pointed out: “What happens here is that only teachers around Sengkang [district capital city]...will be invited. Teachers like us who are far from the city are more often than not, not invited” (MY/MP). Rudolf also commented on this issue:

One of our problems here is the lack of information either from Sengkang or Makassar. You know what? It is very often that we just find out that there was training once it has finished. Had we known about it, the school may have sent one of its teachers. (RF/MP)

However, it may be because of the scarcity of external/formal TPD opportunities that teachers at Map School participate in more internal or school-based TPD to compensate.
On the other hand, Pioneer School is a favoured public school that enjoys some privileges from the government. As previously mentioned, this school gets extra financial support from the government so the school can afford to provide the necessary resources and facilities to support teacher learning and changed classroom practices. The student population could also be seen as an advantage for teacher learning at Pioneer School, as noted by Garrick: “Teachers at Pioneer School deal with smart students and if teachers regard this as a challenge then [they] need to try hard to keep up with this challenge” (GK/PI). Put simply, each school has its own unique advantages and constraints that exert an influence on teacher learning.

School conditions influence TPD in various ways. They affect the kinds of supports (technical, emotional and managerial or leadership supports) needed for teacher learning and change. They also determine values and practices that either facilitate or hinder teacher learning.

8.5 Influences of Context

In addition to TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school condition as influences to TPD identified by (Opfer & Pedder, 2011b), the current study found that context in which TPD is undertaken also exerts a substantial influence. A distinction is deliberately made between “context” and “setting” in this study. Context refers to the broad, extended time, place and circumstances in which a phenomenon occurs while the setting is the specific, finite time, place or circumstance in which a phenomenon occurs (e.g., school/case settings in Chapter 5, 6 and 7). In this study, the context deals with the general values and practices in the national education system of Indonesia and this section is devoted to present the influences of such context on TPD.

TPD at the three case schools is conducted in a bureaucratic control and authoritarian structure. This authoritarian mode applies to both externally provided and
internally initiated TPD. Across the three case study schools, there was always an interviewed teacher who mentioned the practice of “come, sit, listen and go” when teachers attended an externally provided TPD: a practice that indicates teachers’ inactive or passive TPD participation. In general, for the externally provided formal TPD activities, teachers are expected to be compliant participants who, during the course of TPD, are expected to submissively listen to lectures or talks of presenters. In such TPD, teachers are receivers and implementers of knowledge and skills delivered by TPD providers/facilitators. This practice may be common among teachers because teachers have been conditioned to perform such practices. Anton, the veteran teacher at Mac School, commented on the perpetuation of this practice in TPD:

> Years ago in the era of PKG [a national TPD program] in the 1980s, the [TPD] activity was called teacher upgrading and after that there was teacher training. There’s also workshops for teachers. But you know what, they are all pretty much the same: teachers just sit and listen. I know there are some discussions going on [in the TPD activity] now but many of those activities are still conducted in the mode of “come, sit, listen and go”. (AN/MC)

The image of teachers as knowledge receivers and TPD providers/facilitators as authorities of knowledge does not only apply to externally developed/provided TPD activities. This also happens in internally initiated TPD activities or school/teacher-based TPD activities. As described in the individual case study, teachers at Map School perceived that their school provided them an adequate amount of internal school-based TPD. One of these activities involved school supervisors as training facilitators. Unfortunately, what often happens is that the school supervisors play the role of imposers rather than facilitators. As Rudolf stated: “What the school supervisors mainly do is ask us ‘to do this and that’ without proper explanation. Thus, when the training is finished, we often still do not know what to do” (RU/MP). Hence, it is the facilitators who make the TPD authoritarian. A different story, but with the same message, came
from Mac School. The teachers and principal at Mac School perceive TPD from external sources to be more effective than internal/school-based ones. Further, Mac School teachers believed the internal ones would only be effective if external experts were involved in delivering them. Alan, for example, asserted the need for external facilitators to make school-based TPD effective: “Only if we have facilitators from outside [school] who can guide us will the professional development activities at school be alive” (AL/MC). In the case of Mac School, it is the teachers who make the TPD authoritarian.

TPD activity that is initiated by teachers can also turn into a form of authoritarian TPD. MGMP, for example, which was originally intended as a collegial network forum for teachers, becomes a mechanism of control and command for communicating what teachers need to do. According to Anton, MGMP has been degraded into a bureaucratic tool:

Now the activity in MGMP is more like a ‘task distribution’ where teachers will be grouped and each will be assigned to a particular task, say each group developing a syllabus for chosen topics to be covered for one semester. So, the objective is how to get the task done. (AN/MC)

In Garrick’s observation, MGMP hierarchically functions as a governmental agency at the lowest level of the chain of command of government bureaucracy:

MGMP can be seen as a form of government at the lowest level because of all the educator forums, MGMP is the lowest teacher forum.… [Therefore] there are usually orders from MKKS [educator forums for principals] coming to MGMP asking the members to do particular tasks. Thus, MGMP needs to invite teachers to follow up this [MKKS] request. That is what usually happens in MGMP. (GK/PI)

MGMP in the Indonesian context is an example of how a collegial form of TPD activity can be transformed into a new way for authorities to tell teachers what to do.
The bureaucratic control is overwhelming to the extent that even for developing their professional skills, teachers think that they still have to wait for direction from authorities, as explained by Raul:

If the question is about who is responsible [for teachers’ TPD] then I can say that structurally teachers are in the position of waiting. I mean if it [TPD] is a formal one, we wait. We just need to wait for support [direction]…of about what we need to do to develop ourselves. (RU/MP)

Being accustomed to conforming to government demands, teachers fall into a “culture of compliance” (Hargreaves, 2003). This is a culture characterised by unquestioning compliance with the demands of authorities.

8.6 Summary

This chapter presents a cross-analysis of the three cases. The data analysis shows that each case is unique and rich with multiple influences with regards to teacher learning and change. To summarise the data from the three schools, Table 8.1 highlights the key findings according to their corresponding research questions that guided this research.

Table 8.2 Research Questions and Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are the features of TPD learning activities in which teachers participate and what are their perceptions about their TPD learning activities? | - Authoritarian model of TPD.  
- Participation levels in formal TPD higher than in informal TPD.  
- TPD participation based on invitations from external agencies/authorities.  
- Formal TPD participation generally high but the TPD opportunities unevenly distributed.  
- Instrumental, rigid, occasional and unsustainable TPD. |
What teacher characteristics influence their learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?

- A tendency of teachers with higher levels of educational qualifications and more years of teaching experience to have greater formal TPD participation (have more TPD hours).
- Years of teaching experience influencing teachers’ TPD motivation and orientation.
- Teachers’ teaching subjects affecting teachers’ choices over effective types/forms of TPD.
- Teachers’ personal, professional and social circumstances influencing teachers’ views, feeling and action on their learning.

At the school level, what influences support, or impede, teacher learning and change in the context of TPD as a complex system?

- Variation of teachers’ competencies.
- Beliefs and attitudes.
- Students’ abilities.
- Principals.
- Technical facilities and resources.
- Schools norms.

Table 8.1 presents a comparison of the attributes of TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions in the three case study. Table 8.1 shows that each school has some similar and different attributes in relation to the three factors/aspects of TPD: learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions. The attributes may either facilitate or restrict teacher learning and change. Also, the attributes do not only influence their corresponding factors but all together affect TPD at school level. Therefore, for example, it can be seen from Table 8.1 that Map School has more facilitative attributes than Mac School and Pioneer School have.

In sum, TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions are influential to teacher learning and change. They affect views and actions that teacher enact on their learning. They also affect the kinds of supports, values and practices that are played at schools. In addition, the TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions are considerably influenced by the context in which they situate. They are part a context and thus, properties, behaviours or practices that they exhibit are often product of that context.
Table 8.1 Comparison of TPD Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School Conditions at the Three Case Study Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mac School</th>
<th>Pioneer School</th>
<th>Map School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPD Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>- Rare, occasional and unequally distributed TPD opportunities</td>
<td>- Lots of external/government provided TPD opportunities but unequally distributed among teachers</td>
<td>- Limited external/government provided TPD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mostly formal, external/government provided TPD opportunities</td>
<td>- Focus on compliance to government/authorities’ agendas</td>
<td>- Wide-range, regular and on-going school/teachers initiated TPD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on prescribed/mandated changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on school/teachers instructional tasks or problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>- A majority of senior teachers</td>
<td>- Varied teaching year of teaching experiences (career stages)</td>
<td>- Varied teaching year of teaching experiences (career stages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Almost all teachers with tertiary level of educational qualification</td>
<td>- Almost all teachers with tertiary level of educational qualification</td>
<td>- All but one teacher with tertiary level of educational qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Poor motivation and willingness towards professional development</td>
<td>- Individually committed teachers towards professional development</td>
<td>- Highly motivated and committed teachers towards professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Conditions</strong></td>
<td>- Limited learning exchanges (e.g., dialogue, discussion or sharing over teaching and learning information/knowledge)</td>
<td>- Enjoying some financial and technical assistances from government</td>
<td>- Weak financial and technical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students from low social economy families</td>
<td>- Academically high-achieving students</td>
<td>- Students from low social economy families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of adequate financial and technical supports towards TPD</td>
<td>- A new principal experiencing weak relations with her teachers</td>
<td>- Strong values and practices of learning exchanges among teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A new principal with outward orientation for TPD opportunities</td>
<td>- Only a few teachers wanting to share and learn together</td>
<td>- A highly supported and facilitative principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 9  Discussion and Conclusions

9.1 Introduction

This final chapter presents the last four parts of the study: discussion of findings, implications of the study, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research and conclusions. This chapter begins with a discussion of the research findings from previous chapters (Chapter 5, 6, 7 and 8) to address the purpose of the study. The purpose was to develop an understanding of the nature of TPD in an Indonesian context by researching three aspects/factors of TPD – learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions – that influence teacher learning and change. The discussion is then structured around these three influential aspects/factors in shaping TPD in each of the three case studies. The discussion includes bureaucratic control and authoritarian structure as a contextual influence to TPD and TPD as a complex TPD system at a school level. Following the discussion, the implications of the study, its limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are presented. Finally, conclusions will be presented to complete the chapter.

9.2 Discussion of Findings Concerning the Purpose of Study

9.2.1 TPD at the Three Case Study Schools

The data analysis shows that each case is unique and rich with regards to teacher learning and change. As described earlier, the influence of TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions on teacher learning and change are present in each case study school, the magnitude of their influence, however, varies. The variation, in turn, shapes the nature of TPD in each case study school. This section describes the nature of TPD in each case study school based on the magnitude of each influence.
Of the three case study schools, it is at Mac School where the influence of TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions on teacher learning and change are relatively weak. The majority of TPD opportunities that are available for teachers are formal, externally provided, mostly by government. They are limited, occasional and unequally distributed among teachers. Teachers perceive these formal, externally provided TPD to bring little learning to teachers because they mainly focus on the making of teaching documents such as the syllabus, lesson plans or student worksheets which are required by the government (e.g., for implementation of a new curriculum, supervision or certification purpose). Avalos (2004) observed that this is mostly the case in developing countries trying to introduce an educational reform agenda where the focus of TPD programs is to “teach the reform” to teachers. Informal, internal TPD opportunities, on the other hand, are not well-valued. Teachers and principals at Mac School view “getting together among themselves” for learning purpose to give little intellectual benefits. They, therefore, have very limited TPD opportunities that are developed or enacted by teachers or school to enable them to get together to share or discuss.

At Mac School, two teacher characteristics are evident to influence TPD. Firstly, teachers with more years of teaching experiences (senior) and or higher educational qualification tend to have higher level participation in formal, government-provided TPD programs than teachers with less years of teaching experiences (junior) and or educational qualification. Second, teachers’ years of teaching experiences in terms of teacher career negatively affect their TPD. Most teachers at Mac School are senior teachers. Interviewed teachers perceived that knowledge of these veteran teachers are out-dated which makes knowledge sharing less productive. It is also reported that the veteran teachers’ motivation or willingness to develop or update their knowledge erode.
The veteran teachers at Mac School may have reached the point where they felt that “there is little else to learn in teaching” (Hargreaves, 2000a, p. 155) and thus lose the motivation to learn.

Similar to TPD learning activities and teacher characteristics, the condition at Mac School does not fruitfully support for teacher learning and change. In addition to the majority of veteran teachers’ out-dated knowledge and low motivation towards their professional development, Mac School have problems with its teachers’ morale and performance towards their profession in general and TPD in particular. Professional learning is not a common practice or a norm for teachers at Mac School, only a few teachers want to share and learn together. Teachers who try to improve their instruction by experimenting a new innovation or idea often get cynical comments than encouraging supports from their colleagues. Teachers who want to develop themselves also find inadequate or scarce technical and financial resources hindering their learning.

Mr B, the newly appointed principal, recognises the importance of TPD for his teachers but with his preference towards formal, external TPD, he restricts a wide array of learning activities that teachers can utilise to improve their instruction.

In short, TPD at Mac School can be seen as limited and restrictive. Teachers do not have enough TPD opportunities and TPD opportunities that are made available for teachers are restricted to a particular type or form: formal, externally provided TPD learning activities.

Teachers at Pioneer School receive lots of TPD opportunities from government and the school also provide in-house training. However, like Mac School, the TPD opportunities are unequally distributed among teachers; particular groups of teachers participate in or receive more TPD opportunities, especially the government-provided TPD programs. The government-provided TPD programs are generally perceived only
for succeeding particular “projects” that are typically unsuitable or inapplicable to school’s, teachers’ or students’ circumstance. In addition, the function of TPD is often “downgraded” as authorities’ tool (school, district or state) to control teachers. Informal learning such as dialogue, discussion and personal reading, on the other hand, is less practiced by teachers at Pioneer School. For these reasons, the available TPD opportunities are seen to bring little pedagogical benefit.

At Pioneer School, teachers’ years of teaching experiences (senior) and or educational qualification also have a positive relation to teachers’ level of TPD participation in formal, government-provided TPD programs. Teachers with these characteristics tend to have high participation in formal, government-provided TPD programs. There are sufficient TPD opportunities offered to teachers; very few, however, are interested to participate or teachers may have participated in many TPD programs but do not practice the expected improvements or changes. According to Borko (2004), teachers generally celebrate and are excited about opportunities to develop their instructions; teachers at Pioneer School, however, are less interested and motivated about their professional development which makes TPD opportunities that are provided or available to them less beneficial for their learning and change.

The conditions of Pioneer School does not allow for collegial and professional exchanges which restrict the potential of teacher learning. For example, some teachers are frequently sent to TPD programs but they generally do not want to share what they learn and, at the same time, other teachers lack of curiosity to ask. Teachers keep what they know to themselves; have minimal “learning” exchanges with colleagues; and incline to solitary. Morally, teachers perceive to not having an obligation for other learning and institutionally, the school does not seem to have a structure that enable collective learning. M. Park and So (2014) found that learning through and with
colleagues was a key component of teacher learning and growth; Pioneer School, however, lacks values and practices that allow teachers to professionally exchange among them to improve their instructional qualities.

All in all, TPD at Pioneer School is individual and restrictive. It is individual because teachers merely undertake TPD for their own personal sake and what they get out of their TPD are kept for themselves. Teachers individually undertake their learning removed from colleagues. It is restrictive in a way that the focus of TPD is not on learning but merely on imposed or prescribed changes; the school and colleagues do not value and support teachers’ learning.

At Map School, formal TPD opportunities for teachers, particularly those provided by the government, are very limited. Similar to Mac and Pioneer School, formal, government-provided TPD opportunities are unequally distributed to teachers of different status or category. Informal, school-based TDP activities, however, are common and wide-ranging. There are various informal learning conducted among teachers at Map School including individual or peer internet-browsing for educational innovations or ideas, knowledge sharing from teachers returning from TPD program and instructional-related exchanges during recess. Some TPD activities are also initiated and conducted by the school such as in-service training, a school weekly meeting for discussing issues during the week and peer support or mentoring.

Teachers at Map School typically have positive views and active attitudes toward their professional development. Teachers at Map School believe that teachers need to continuously improve themselves so that they can keep up with ever-changing condition and situation of their students. They actively seek learning opportunities, celebrate learning and intend to learn with and from others. Teachers’ strong dispositions toward their professional development become one of the key factors for
productive TPD at Map School. Hodkinson and Hodkinson (2005) suggested that individual teachers’ dispositions help the structure and practices of TPD in which they work.

Map School is conducive for teacher learning and change. Two things that help create this condition: collegial and professional relationship among teachers and supportive principal. Firstly, teachers engage in investigation of pedagogical issues or innovations with their colleagues. Senior teachers help out their younger colleagues in peer support and mentoring program. At school meeting, every teacher is welcome to put up any ideas for other teachers to take up or scrutinise. Teachers’ strong commitment and motivation toward their professional development seem to positively relate with these values and practices. Secondly, Mr A, the principal of Map School, values and supports professional development of his teachers. He encourages, motivates and celebrates professional learning and also structures time for collaborative teacher learning. He actively initiates and seeks TPD opportunities for his teachers as well as for himself. In Bredeson and Johansson’s (2000) terms, the principal of Map School is: a steward of learning who values teacher learning and commits to it; a role-model of life-long learning who participates actively in TPD in his school; and an instructional leader who utilises a variety of strategies and activities to encourage and celebrate learning.

In sum, TPD at Map School is expansive, valued and supported. Although government-provided TPD opportunities are very rare for teachers at Map School, there is a wide range of learning activities that teachers are involved. Teachers and principal have strong commitment and motivation toward their professional development by actively seeking, initiating, engaging and celebrating learning individually and collectively.
The present study identified variations of TPD at the three case study schools. The schools can be described as having a facilitative or restrictive TPD or lying between the two ends. A school with the richest values and practices of TPD has a facilitative TPD while a school with the poorest values and practices of TPD has restrictive TPD. Figure 9.1 sets out a number of features, characteristics or conditions which relate to facilitativeness or restrictiveness of TPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitative</th>
<th>Restrictive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ A sufficient and wide range of TPD opportunities</td>
<td>✓ Limited and occasional TPD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Regular, ongoing TPD opportunities</td>
<td>✓ A narrow range of TPD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A focus on teacher learning (e.g., finding new teaching/learning strategies, solving daily pedagogical issues)</td>
<td>✓ A focus on meeting mandated, prescribed changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Valued and practiced of collegial and professional interaction among teachers</td>
<td>✓Disconnected to schools’, teachers’ and students’ needs and circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ High emotional, technical and leadership supports from colleagues and principals</td>
<td>✓ Isolated, individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Impoverished knowledge sharing and pedagogical exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Constrained supports to enhance professional development from colleagues and principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.1 Continuum of facilitativeness-restrictiveness of TPD

The above features are not new as they have been widely reported (Burney & Elmore, 1999; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Desimone et al., 2002; Ingvarson et al., 2005; Lewis, 2002), yet such reports generally fail to mention that these identified features emerge from multiple factors, among other things: TPD learning activities, teachers and schools. In other words, they are not generated by a single factor. In practice, TPD in each of the case study school in the current study lies at some stages of the continuum of facilitativeness-restrictiveness of TPD. One school has a facilitative TPD in relation to some features and less with others. Using this framework, it can be concluded that TPD at Map School was more facilitative than TPD.
at the other two case study schools because Map School displayed more of the facilitative features, characteristics or conditions. TPD at Pioneer School can be viewed to be restrictive but was better than TPD at Mac School because Pioneer School had more sufficient TPD opportunities.

The current study found that the context in which TPD situates is highly influential. Bureaucratic control and authoritative structure that have been long entrenched in education in Indonesia are identified as contextual factor greatly influencing TPD of teachers at the three case study schools.

The present study argues that in the Indonesian context, TPD is approached and managed in an authoritarian manner. The autocratic nature of TPD in Indonesia is influenced by the long history of a “bureaucratic authoritarian state” in Indonesia (Kuncoro-Yakti, 1988). Using the lens of bureaucratic authoritarian theory, Kuncoro-Yakti investigated the influence of the Orde Baru (New Order) policy on Indonesia’s economic growth. He categorised Indonesia as a “late-late-late industrialising country” which used state intervention to help launch the industrialising process and maintained that “in an effort to develop hegemony [to support economic development goals]…the state is continuously compelled to control its apparatus, to make sure it represents its interests” (p. 10). In the education sector, teachers, particularly those who earn the status of civil servants (PNS teachers), are part of the state apparatus and thus are obliged to implement orders and directions (e.g., specified curriculum, instructional procedures and national assessments) according to what the state has determined as the “national good” (Bjork, 2005; Nielsen, 1998).

The autocratic nature of TPD in Indonesia can also be attributed to a simplistic view of how teachers learn, which is a view held by educators, policy makers and TPD providers. Pitsoe and Maila (2012) argued that “teacher professional development
activities have adopted a positivist approach...[which] flows from the theoretical frameworks of a mechanistic world-view” (p. 320). Professional development programs that adopt this world view influence the practice of TPD in several ways.

Firstly, due to the influence of a mechanistic world view, TPD programs are driven by the logic of accumulation. Based on this logic, to improve teachers’ knowledge and skills is to ask or mandate teachers to participate in more and more TPD. In terms of TPD participation, the current study found that teachers across the three case study schools generally have high levels of participation in formal TPD (Figures 5.2, 6.2 and 7.2) including large numbers of hours of formal TPD participation (Figures 5.3, 6.3 and 7.3). However, this does not always mean learning or improvements in the quality of teaching. In the case of Pioneer School, for example, the principal Mrs S expressed her disappointment towards teachers who had participated in numerous TPD opportunities but seem not to practise or enact the expected changes or improvements. This example implies that while teachers may participate in TPD, they may have little use for their learning experiences. Thus, the present study views teachers’ TPD participation as only one of the many dimensions of learning. Participation can be seen as a prerequisite for learning, but not as the learning itself. Teachers need to engage, experiment and reflect on TPD ideas for meaningful learning to occur, and they need to enact the expected changes or improvements accordingly. This is in accordance with Hill’s (2009) evaluation noting that teachers’ participation in TPD does not mean results.

Secondly, and closely related to the ‘accumulation’ view of teachers’ learning, TPD programs are largely organised in a top-down manner where TPD providers, in most cases the government, have the power to control what and how teachers learn. In this respect, the government is regarded as the initiator, organiser and manager of TPD
programs while teachers are grateful receivers who will “come, sit and listen” to expert presenters and then return to their schools to implement the transmitted knowledge. The image of a hierarchical relationship between government and teachers in TPD is so deeply entrenched that teachers think that what they need to do for their professional development is to wait for a TPD invitation or “TPD project” to come to their schools. To stay with the example of teachers’ high participation in formal, government-provided TPD, teachers’ high level of participation for TPD providers may be a good measure of success of their programs but it does not always equate with teachers’ improved quality or practices. Teachers’ high level of participation may mean nothing but teachers’ compliance to authorities. Teachers participate in TPD because they are mandated by schools, districts, or states. Also, teachers who are generally more oriented to participate in external TPD opportunities, or to invite external experts to come to schools and train teachers display the attitude of being compliant to authorities in some ways. Teachers’ tendency to wait for directions and their outward-looking orientation (external TPDs and facilitators) seem to emanate from the long practice of authoritarianism in the Indonesian education system.

Lastly, a mechanistic world view influences the widely held view of TPD as a knowledge transmission process: knowledge is transmitted from one mind to another. Like other countries that have introduced large-scale educational changes, the Indonesian government has long adopted a cascade model of TPD for introducing major innovations into the system. Analysis in the current study shows that in government-provided TPD, participants who represent their schools are trained to use particular ideas or innovations and are also generally expected to cascade the ideas to their fellow teachers upon returning to their schools. Although the cascade model of TPD may be timely and financially efficient for an education system with such a large population of
teachers like Indonesia, knowledge to be learned from any TPD opportunities does not only transmit from one teacher to another but also interacts with teacher characteristics and school conditions. Teachers in the present study perceive that what is presented in their TPD is often too general with respect to their subject areas, or the ideas are too rigid, inappropriate or not feasible in light of students’ or schools’ conditions. Teachers therefore abandon the ideas or never really engage with them in order to seriously enact them. In investigating a cascade training program implemented in Sri Lanka, Hayes (2001), argued that “it is not the cascade model per se which is the problem, but the manner in which it is often implemented. A prime cause of failure is a purely transmissive mode of training at all levels” (p. 138).

The research reported in the current study shows that TPD in the three case study schools are authoritarian. For formal TPD, government or international agencies overseeing TPD decide the “good things” to promote as teaching innovations for teachers and design and deliver TPD programs to disseminate these innovations. Teachers are then mandated to participate in the TPD programs, casting teachers as grateful participants who will “come, sit, listen and go” back to their respective schools to implement the innovations. For informal TPD, teachers or schools initiate TPD learning activities and invite external experts who can show and tell what is right and wrong in their teaching. Therefore, although teachers’ perceptions of effective TPD in the three case study schools are generally similar to what has been reported in the Western literature, the content, structures and processes of TPD in these schools are heavily influenced by the enormous bureaucratic control of Indonesia’s education system.
9.2.2 Complexity of Teacher Professional Development

Whilst all the three case study schools displayed examples of facilitative and restrictive attributes that relate to TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions, they are not present to same extent. Therefore, each case study school in regard to TPD operates like a complex system. From a complexity theory point of view, a school can be viewed as a complex system of interacting agents. In a school, teachers interact with students, other teachers, principals, administrators, parents and so forth. In each of these interactions, an individual teacher’s actions are different or unique and, as previously explicated, may result from a confluence of pedagogical beliefs, prior knowledge, experiences and status. However, at the same time, there are “constraints placed on that variation by the interaction of actors within the organization and between them and the larger environment” (O’Day, 2002, p. 5) which further shape teachers’ actions. That is, an agent’s action greatly depends on others’ actions and vice versa. The fact that the majority of teachers at Mac School are veteran teachers who are perceived to have out-dated knowledge and low motivation on their professional development greatly contributes to school condition where teachers are sceptical of learning from and with others. At Pioneer School, both Garrick and Rachel participated actively in district MGMP and Tini pursued her Masters degree. Individually, they are teacher-learners with strong motivation and commitment towards professional development but turn into discouraged learners when dealing with their colleagues because of their colleagues’ reluctance to share. The interaction of agents in complex system gives rise to emergent behaviours that would not rise through independence (Davis & Sumara, 2006; Hoban, 2002; Opfer & Pedder, 2011a; Wheatley, 2009).

In contrast to Mac School and Pioneer School, TPD at Map School is relatively facilitative because every teacher actively participated and the principal provided the
necessary support and encouragement. Learning, as Stacey (2003) suggested, “is an activity of interdependent people” (p. 325). Thus, teacher learning rarely happens in isolation. There is an important role for others in every dimension of teacher learning. One reason for the proliferation of ideas such as collaborative learning, learning community and community of practice in teacher learning can be attributed to the notion that members of a complex system co-evolve and shape each other (Kauffman, 1993).

The relationship of agents in complex systems defines a network. A school can be seen as a special type of network that is an “all-channel network, in which every node [an individual, an organisation, a group, or part of a group/organisation] is connected to every other node” (Arquilla & Ronfeldt, 2001, p. 1). According to Davis and Sumara (2006), because of the relationship of agents, “most of the information within a complex system is exchanged among close neighbors” (p. 5). Since information or knowledge is dispersed, shared and circulated throughout the system, “[k]nowledge creation is then understood as an active process of communication between humans” (Stacey, 2001, p. 5). Thus, one cannot expect learning to occur or knowledge to flourish in a school where relationship and communication among teachers at the school is weak or too loose. This might be the case for teachers at Mac and Pioneer Schools where they felt knowledge sharing was pointless. The present study argues that communication is a major means for teachers to convey support and exchange information, ideas or knowledge. This argument is consistent with the study by Park, Oliver, Johnson, Graham and Oppong (2007) that investigated the nature of interaction between teachers seeking accreditation and their colleagues. Teachers seeking accreditation were involved in a series of TPD activities to acquire the prerequisite competencies or standards for accreditation. Analysis by Park et al. showed
that during the process of practising the competencies at schools, the dominant type of interaction between teachers seeking accreditation and their colleagues is support that takes various forms including collaboration, sharing or emotional support. Park et al. further suggested that regardless of the type of support, the major means for teachers to convey support for one another was through various forms of communication that include: story-telling, conversation/di dialogue or discussion.

According to Davis and Sumara (2006), because of the interrelationship and interdependency of agents, “most of the information within a complex system is exchanged among close neighbors” (p. 5). Since information or knowledge is dispersed, shared and circulated throughout the system, “[k]nowledge creation is then understood as an active process of communication between humans” (Stacey, 2001, p. 5). Thus, one cannot expect learning to occur or knowledge to flourish in a school where communication among teachers or other parties at the school is weak or too loose. This might be the case for teachers at Mac and Pioneer Schools where they felt knowledge sharing was pointless. The present study argues that interaction and communication is a major means for teachers to convey support and exchange information, ideas or knowledge. This argument is consistent with the study by Park, Oliver, Johnson, Graham and Oppong (2007) that investigated the nature of interaction between teachers seeking accreditation and their colleagues. Teachers seeking accreditation were involved in a series of TPD activities to acquire the prerequisite competencies or standards for accreditation.

Up to this point, the current study has shown that:

1. The influence of TPD learning activities, school characteristics and school conditions are present in each case study school;

2. The influences, however, vary in emphasis or magnitude;
3. Bureaucratic control and authoritarian structure is identified as another influence on TPD in all case study school; and

4. Schools in relation to TPD operate as complex system where all factors have influences to either facilitate or restrict teacher learning and change.

In other words, TPD is multidimensional and the three factors, along with the elements within each factor, are related according to a particular TPD’s setting and context. Take the case of Susan at Mac School who wanted to share what she learned from TPD with her colleagues but they were not interested. In this case, TPD learning activities and teacher characteristics may fruitfully coalesce but the school conditions (norms of collegial and professional interaction) may interfere with teacher learning. In contrast, although there are rare and irregular formal, government-provided TPD opportunities, TPD is facilitative at Map School. There are various, regular and fruitful learning opportunities because teachers have strong motivation and willingness to learn, things and enjoy sharing knowledge with their colleagues; teachers and the principal value, encourage and support learning. Each factor contributes and shapes teacher learning and change.

A visual representation of TPD as complex and relational in the present study is shown in Figure 9.1. First, the small circles represent the influential factors of TPD along with their elements. Second, the lines connecting the small circles suggest that the relationship among is non-linear rather than linear-causative. In other words, all factors simultaneously affect TPD. Third, the big circle represents TPD as a system. It is important to note here that all circles are conceptual boundaries that delimit the aspects, elements or areas of investigation for the current study. Fifth, the arrows outside the big circle indicate that there are other systems, factors, or elements operating outside TPD system that are influential both to TPD as a system itself and to its individual factors.
Lastly, the ovals are systems, factors, or elements that together form the context of the current study. Therefore, this thesis argues that although learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions teacher learning have individual influences on TPD, it is the combined influences that make TPD facilitative or restrictive for particular teachers in different schools.

![Figure 9.2 TPD as complex and relational](image)

Initially, the current study set out to only look into the three aspects of TPD: TPD learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions. However, as the study evolved it was found that context exerted influences on these three aspects. In the current study, although the people of Indonesia are now in the so-called Era Reformasi (Reformation), the effect of enormous authoritarian control in education by authorities in power for decades is still evident among policymakers, government officers, teacher educators, principals and teachers, and this effect shapes the TPD practices in the current system. The government authorities overseeing TPD still assume that they are in the position to decide and order the “ideal good” for teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, still believe that what they need to do is to wait for authorities’ directions.
9.3 Implications of the Study

The current study has shown that multiple factors come at play to influence TPD and each has effect on TPD. It is almost impossible to associate the quality of TPD to one single factor. Rather, it is the combination among the influential factors that make TPD facilitative or restrictive to teacher learning and change. The current study suggests that one of the most productive ways of improving teacher learning is through creating more facilitative features, characteristics or conditions of TPD which are appropriate to particular teachers or schools. Theoretically, because of the multidimensionality of factors and their effects, it is difficult to have exact outcomes of TPD programs for every teacher.

The current study supports the notion of TPD as highly contextual (Bolam & McMahon, 2004; Kelchtermans, 2004). That is, how and what teacher learns depends on the context in which he or she lives and works. Any attempt to establish an invariant type, form or model of teacher learning that works in every instance would be simplistic. Thus, in the Indonesian context the availability and sustainability of TPD opportunities are more important than the forms or types of TPD learning activities, as teachers will gratefully take up any TPD opportunities. Teachers are more likely to take TPD ideas on board if they are mandated by authorities.

The findings from the present study carry a number of practical implications. First, teachers not only need more and continuous TPD opportunities but also need more variations of forms and types of TPD to accommodate the particular needs and their circumstances and schools. Second, TPD has different dimensions: access to TPD, participation/engagement in TPD, and experimentation and application of TPD ideas, thus assessing the outcome or quality of TPD based on the level of participation is inadequate. In the Indonesian context, a teacher may have a high level of TPD
participation simply because he or she frequently gets invited due to his or her personal or political affiliations with authorities overseeing TPD. Therefore, a more comprehensive set of criteria, incorporating the different dimensions of TPD for evaluating the outcomes and qualities, is needed. Last, in contexts where TPD opportunities are government-provided or mandated, the co-administration of TPD programs, involving the government agencies overseeing TPD, teachers and schools, is more likely to influence teacher learning and change as it will bring external (the government) and internal (the teachers and schools) agendas together. In this respect, MGMPs, which are locally managed and administered by teachers and administratively and financially supported by central and local government, have the potential to be powerful TPDs.

9.4 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Study

Fieldwork to collect data in the current study was undertaken within a short period of time (less than a month). The present study would have benefitted from a longer exposure to participants and research sites and tracked not only self-reported teachers’ TPD experiences but also evidence of outcomes and qualities of these TPD experiences on teachers’ instructional practices and interrelationship among influential factors. The complexity theory which was used a theoretical lens in the current study puts a strong emphasis on the interrelationship of agents within a system where one agent can feed back or influence (or be influenced by) other agent. That is, there is interplay among agents. At the outset, the current study was intended to find out such interplay, however, there was no enough time to collect data allowing for such investigation. Ideally, this study could also have collected data from TPD providers to enrich the interpretations of the findings.
This study was set to be descriptive of how TPD works in an education system as large and diverse as Indonesia’s. This study offers a context-based understanding of TPD practices through the stories, experiences and views of social actors, in this case teachers. Based on the similarities in the stories, policy-makers, educationalists, researchers, principals and teachers may find TPD ideas and practices that may or may not work in light of their own circumstances and contexts.

Taking the complexity and contextual characteristics of TPD, it is very unlikely that it would be possible to formulate final, coherent or universal theories, models, types or forms of TPD. Here, the researcher aligns with those who “try to take the contextual characters [and complexity] of [T]PD seriously and use the findings from research as fragmented pieces of knowledge that can be applied by researchers, [T]PD providers and teachers to inform and improve their particular practices” (Kelchtermans, 2004, p. 219). Therefore, in general, it would be very interesting to see the process of the current study applied in different regions and schools to test the findings of the current study. In particular, the current study suggests other areas for research such as:

- a follow-up evaluative case study to investigate the outcomes, qualities and impacts of teachers’ TPD on student learning and achievement;
- a developmental study that systematically designs, develops, implements and evaluates TPD programs for particular teachers or schools, to consider which features of TPD work for which teachers or schools;
- a longitudinal study of teachers’ TPD to track how teachers learn and change over a suitable period of time and to examine patterns of evolution of teacher learning and change.

9.5 Conclusions
The present study sets out to develop an understanding of the nature of TPD in an Indonesian context by investigating three factors/aspects of TPD: learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions identified by Opfer and Pedder (2011b) to influence teacher learning and change. For this investigation, the fieldwork was conducted in three schools in three different regions (city of Makassar, city of Parepare and district of Wajo) in South Sulawesi province in Indonesia. The study employed a multiple case study design in which questionnaires and interviews were used to collect teachers’ TPD experiences. Complexity theory was used as the theoretical lens.

The findings of the current study supports Opfer and Pedder’s (2011b) position advocating the existence and influence of learning activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions on TPD. The finding further extends this position by suggesting that although the influences of these factors are present in schools, the nature and magnitude of their influences vary. That is, one school may have a strong quality on one factor but weak on the other. This finding suggests that efforts need to be focused on creating those attributes, characteristics or conditions that are facilitative for teacher learning and change rather than on targeting or specifying exact outcomes of learning for every teacher in every instance.

Moreover, considering values and practice of TPD to be rooted in a particular context, it is argued in the current study that TPD in Indonesia needs some degree of authoritativeness. Teachers are more likely to participate in TPD programs/activities and to take TPD ideas on board if the TPD programs or ideas are endorsed by authorities. This may be one of the reasons that limit the value of teachers sharing their experiences informally.

The findings of this study suggest that TPD is multidimensional. There are various factors come at play to influence TPD. Although it is difficult to take all the
influential factors into consideration, paying attention only on one factor, say on learning activity, teacher, school or context alone, would be simplistic. This study argues that the presence of good or ideal TPD learning activities, individual teachers and conditions within schools is not enough to ensure success in TPD. Unless these factors coalesce, TPD will probably remain less than optimal and may have a trivial impact even for those participating in the TPD opportunities or programs.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Rahman</td>
<td>A/Prof. Garry Hoban</td>
<td>Dr. Wendy Nielsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Student</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education, UoW</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone: +61424137441</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 42214450</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 4221 4569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ar541@uowmail.edu.au">ar541@uowmail.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ghoban@uow.edu.au">ghoban@uow.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:wnielsen@uow.edu.au">wnielsen@uow.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Teachers,

You have been asked to take a part in a research project to investigate how TPD activities have been implemented and their impacts on teachers’ practices as perceived by teachers. It is also intended to examine the influence of teachers’ characteristics and school condition toward teachers’ learning and teaching. The following information is prepared to assist you to consider participating in this research project.

Why is this study being carried out?

This study is conducted to refine the instruments of research that aims at finding out:
- The features of teacher professional development (TPD) activities that teachers have participated in as well as the impacts of those TPD activities on teachers’ professional practice.
- The influence of teacher characters on teacher learning in TPD activities.
- The influence of school conditions or circumstances (factors) on teacher learning.
- The interplay between learning/TPD activities, teacher characteristics and school level influences to bring change to teacher teaching and learning.

What will you need to do?

If you take part in the study:
- You will need to commit to being involved in the study for a total of 50 minutes period of time.
- You will be asked to fill out a brief questionnaire. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Typical questions are for the questionnaire: What is your employment status as a teacher? What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed? Or how many days of professional development did you attend during the last 18 months?
- Following the questionnaire, if you are interested to take a part in the subsequent phase, you will involve in a phone interview which will last for 30 minutes approximately. The interview will be audiotaped for interview efficiency and accuracy. Interview questions can be: How do you learn in your TPD activities? What were the features of TPD activities that helped you to learn? Or What do you think of your principal’s role in your learning? Can you give examples?

Will I be paid for taking apart in this study?

You will not be paid to take part in this study.

How will my privacy be protected?

All the information gained from the questionnaire and interview will not be seen and used other than me. Your information will not be given to any other person or parties without your permission/consent. Hard copy data will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the University. Any computer files (e.g. audio recorded interview) will be stored on a computer at the University under password protection (known only to the researcher). All personal information will be coded without names during and after the study. Any publications arising from the study will not contain any personal identifying information. At the
conclusion of the study all data will be digitalised, password protected and kept/saved in researcher’s supervisor’s office at the University of Wollongong.

**What are the risks and benefits associated with this study?**
Apart from a total of 50 minutes of your time for completing questionnaire and involving in interview, I can see no risks for you. The results of this study will provide inputs for the refinement of instruments of the research which aims to investigate how TPD can be better designed and implemented to help improve teachers’ practices and learning.

**Is taking part in the study voluntary?**
Yes. Your involvement in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation from the study at any time and withdraw any data that you have provided to that point (if you participate in interview). Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with me, any parties in your school and or University of Wollongong.

**Are there any relevant information I need to know?**
There will be a contact person (coordinator) appointed in your school to help researcher organise and administer research instruments and documentation. Questionnaires, information sheets and consent forms will be distributed by your contact person on 10 June 2013. The completed consent forms and questionnaires must be put in a sealed envelope (provided) and returned to your school contact person by 24 June 2013 at the latest. The interview will be conducted during the period:

- Makassar : 29 October – 2 November 2013
- Parepare : 5 – 9 October 2013
- Wajo : 12 – 16 October 2013

For your interview time, you can indicate your preferred time by completing the specified form in the very last section of the questionnaire.

**If you have any further questions or concerns**
Any enquiries you may have regarding this research project should be directed to me or my supervisor at the address given above. Any concerns or complaints about the way the research is or has been conducted can be directed to the Ethics Officer of the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee on (+61) 2 4221 4457 quoting the application code: HE13/135.
Appendix 3b
Participant Information Sheet for Teacher Participants (Indonesian)

PENELITIAN DENGAN JUDUL: Teacher professional development in Indonesia: The interplay between teacher learning activities, teacher characteristics, and school-level influences
(Pengembangan profesi guru di Indonesia: Keterkaitan antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh sekolah)

LEMBAR INFORMASI PENELITIAN UNTUK GURU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peneliti</th>
<th>Pembimbing</th>
<th>Pembimbing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Rahman</td>
<td>A/Prof. Garry Hoban</td>
<td>Dr. Wendy Nielsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Student</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education, UoW</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone: +61424137441</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 42214450</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 4221 4569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ar541@uowmail.edu.au">ar541@uowmail.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ghoban@uow.edu.au">ghoban@uow.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:wnielsen@uow.edu.au">wnielsen@uow.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bapak/Ibu Guru Yth,

Melalui lembar informasi ini, Bapak/Ibu diundang untuk berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan penelitian yang menginvestigasi bagaimana kegiatan pengembangan profesi (PP) guru dilaksanakan serta dampak dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi tersebut terhadap kinerja/mutu guru sesuai persepsi guru yang bersangkutan. Penelitian ini juga mencoba mengkajikan keterkaitan dan saling mempengaruhi keterkaitan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh (kondisi) sekolah terhadap peningkatan mutu guru. Informasi yang disajikan dalam lembaran ini bertujuan sebagai bahan pertimbangan Bapak/Ibu untuk berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini.

Untuk apa penelitian ini dilaksanakan?
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui:
• Karakter dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi yang telah diikuti oleh guru serta dampak kegiatan PP tersebut terhadap kualitas atau mutu guru.
• Pengaruh karakter guru terhadap partisipasi dan pembelajaran guru dalam kegiatan PP serta implementasi dari pengetahuan dan keterampilan yang didapatkan dalam kegiatan PP tersebut di sekolah/kelas.
• Pengaruh kondisi sekolah terhadap terhadap partisipasi dan pembelajaran guru dalam kegiatan PP serta implementasi dari pengetahuan dan keterampilan yang didapatkan dalam kegiatan PP tersebut di sekolah/kelas.
• Keterkaitan dan pengaruh antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan kondisi sekolah dalam memengaruhi perubahan/peningkatan mutu guru.

Apa yang harus saya kerjakan?
Jika Bapak/Ibu terlibat dalam penelitian ini, maka Bapak/Ibu diminta meluangkan waktu selama 50 menit untuk melakukan kegiatan sebagai berikut:

Apakah saya akan dibayar dalam kegiatan ini?

240
Bapak/Ibu tidak akan dibayar untuk terlibat dalam kegiatan ini.

Bagaimana privasi saya dijaga?

Apakah resiko dan manfaat dari penelitian ini?
Tidak ada resiko yang Bapak/Ibu akan alami baik yang berdampak kepada pribadi maupun profesi, selain dari total waktu 50 menit yang Bapak/Ibu luangkan untuk mengisi kuesioner dan diwawancarai. Secara umum, hasil dari penelitian diharapkan berkontribusi terhadap perbaikan sistem pengembangan profesi guru yang ada di Indonesia.

Apakah keterlibatan dalam penelitian ini sukarela?

Apakah ada hal lain yang perlu saya ketahui?
Di setiap sekolah akan ada Koordinator sekolah yang membantu peneliti dalam pengelolaan dan administrasi instrumen dan dokumentasi penelitian ini. Kuesioner, lembar informasi, dan formulir kesediaan terlibat akan didistribusikan oleh Koordinator pada tanggal 10 Juni 2013. Kuesioner yang telah diisi dimasukkan ke amplop yang tersedia dan dikembalikan kepada Koordinator paling lambat tanggal 24 Juni 2013. Wawancara akan dilaksanakan dalam rentang periode:

- Wilayah Kota Makassar : Tanggal 29 Oktober s.d. 2 November 2013
- Wilayah Kota Pare-Pare : Tanggal 5 s.d. 9 Oktober 2013
- Wilayah Kab. Wajo : Tanggal 12 s.d. 16 Oktober 2013

Jika Bapak/Ibu bersedia untuk terlibat dalam wawancara tersebut, mohon melengkapi isian yang terdapat pada bagian akhir kuesioner dan mencantumkan tanggal dan waktu pilihan wawancara Bapak/Ibu.

Untuk informasi lebih lanjut
Jika Bapak/Ibu membutuhkan informasi lebih jauh tentang penelitian ini, Bapak/Ibu bisa menghubungi saya atau pembimbing saya melalui kontak detail yang tersedia di atas. Jika ada keberatan atau keluhan atas penelitian ini, Bapak/Ibu bisa menghubungi bagian Ethics Officer of the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee pada nomor telepon (+61) 2 4221 4457 dengan menyebutkan kode aplikasi: HE13/135.
Appendix 4a

Participant Information Sheet for Principal Participants (English)

RESEARCH TITLE: Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR PRINCIPAL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Rahman</td>
<td>A/Prof. Garry Hoban</td>
<td>Dr. Wendy Nielsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Student</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education, UoW</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone: +61424137441</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 42214450</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 42214450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ar541@uowmail.edu.au">ar541@uowmail.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ghoban@uow.edu.au">ghoban@uow.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Principals,

You have been asked to take a part in a research project to investigate how TPD activities have been implemented and their impacts on teachers’ practices as perceived by teachers. It is also intended to examine the influence of teachers’ characteristics and school condition toward teachers’ learning and teaching. The following information is prepared to assist you to consider participating in this research project.

Why is this study being carried out?

This study is conducted to refine the instruments of research that aims at finding out:

- The features of teacher professional development (TPD) activities that teachers have participated in as well as the impacts of those TPD activities on teachers’ professional practice.
- The influence of teacher characters on teacher learning in TPD activities.
- The influence of school conditions or circumstances (factors) on teacher learning.
- The interplay between learning/TPD activities, teacher characteristics and school level influences to bring change to teacher teaching and learning.

What will you need to do?

If you take part in the study you will involve in a interview which will last for 30 minutes approximately. The interview will be recorded for interview efficiency and accuracy. Interview questions can be: Can you describe your relation to your teachers in general? What types/kinds of TPD activities that your teachers participated in? Or How would you describe the conditions of your school in relation to the professional development of your teachers?

Will I be paid for taking apart in this study?

You will not be paid to take part in this study.

How will my privacy be protected?

All the information gained from the questionnaire and interview will not be seen and used other than me. Your information will not be given to any other person or parties without your permission/consent. Hard copy data will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the University. Any computer files (e.g. audio recorded interview) will be stored on a computer at the University under password protection (known only to the researcher). All personal information will be coded without names during and after the study. Any publications arising from the study will not contain any personal identifying information. At the conclusion of the study all data will be digitalised, password protected and kept/saved in researcher’s supervisor’s office at the University of Wollongong.

What are the risks and benefits associated with this study?
Apart from a total of 30 minutes of your time for interview, I can see no risks for you. The results of this study will provide inputs for the refinement of instruments of the research which aims to investigate how TPD can be better designed and implemented to help improve teachers’ practices and learning.

**Is taking part in the study voluntary?**
Yes. Your involvement in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation from the study at any time and withdraw any data that you have provided to that point (if you participate in interview). Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with me, any parties in your school and or University of Wollongong.

**Are there any relevant information I need to know?**
The interview will be conducted during the period:

- Makassar : 29 October – 2 November 2013
- Parepare : 5 – 9 October 2013
- Wajo : 12 – 16 October 2013

You can indicate your approval to participate and preferred time for interview by contacting me by phone or email.

**If you have any further questions or concerns**
Any enquiries you may have regarding this research project should be directed to me or my supervisor at the address given above. Any concerns or complaints about the way the research is or has been conducted can be directed to the Ethics Officer of the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee on (+61) 2 4221 4457 quoting the application code: HE13/135
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Participant Information Sheet for Principal Participants (Indonesian)

LEMBAR INFORMASI PENELITIAN UNTUK KEPALA SEKOLAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peneliti</th>
<th>Pembimbing</th>
<th>Pembimbing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Rahman</td>
<td>A/Prof. Garry Hoban</td>
<td>Dr. Wendy Nielsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Student</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education, UoW</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone: +61424137441</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 42214450</td>
<td>Phone: (+61) 2 4221 4569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ar541@uowmail.edu.au">ar541@uowmail.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ghoban@uow.edu.au">ghoban@uow.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:wnielsen@uow.edu.au">wnielsen@uow.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bapak/Ibu Kepala Sekolah Yth,

Melalui lembar informasi ini, Bapak/Ibu diundang untuk berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan penelitian yang menginvestigasi bagaimana kegiatan pengembangan profesi (PP) guru dilaksanakan serta dampak dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi tersebut terhadap kinerja guru sesuai persepsi guru yang bersangkutan. Penelitian ini juga mencoba mengkaji keterkaitan dan saling mempengaruhiannya kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh (kondisi) sekolah terhadap peningkatan mutu guru. Informasi yang disajikan dalam lembaran ini bertujuan sebagai bahan pertimbangan Bapak/Ibu untuk berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini.

Untuk apa penelitian ini dilaksanakan?
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui:
- Karakter dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi yang telah diikuti oleh guru serta dampak kegiatan PP tersebut terhadap kualitas atau mutu guru.
- Pengaruh karakter guru terhadap partisipasi dan pembelajaran guru dalam kegiatan PP serta implementasi dari pengetahuan dan keterampilan yang didapatkan dalam kegiatan PP tersebut di sekolah/kelas.
- Pengaruh kondisi sekolah terhadap terhadap partisipasi dan pembelajaran guru dalam kegiatan PP serta implementasi dari pengetahuan dan keterampilan yang didapatkan dalam kegiatan PP tersebut di sekolah/kelas.
- Keterkaitan dan pengaruh antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan kondisi sekolah dalam mempengaruhi perubahan/peningkatan mutu guru.

Apa yang harus saya kerjakan?

Apakah saya akan dibayar dalam kegiatan ini?
Bapak/Ibu tidak akan dibayar untuk terlibat dalam kegiatan ini.

Bagaimana privasi saya dijaga?
Semua informasi/data yang didapatkan melalui kuesioner dan wawancara tidak akan digunakan oleh individu selain saya. Informasi yang Bapak/Ibu sampaikan tidak akan disebarkan/disampaikan ke pihak/organisasi lain tanpa persetujuan Bapak/Ibu. Semua data akan disimpan dalam file kabinet yang terkunci di Universitas Wollongong. Data dalam bentuk file komputer disimpan dengan kata sandi yang
hanya diketahui oleh peneliti. Semua data pribadi dikodifikasi sehingga tidak ada informasi personal yang merujuk ke individu/organisasi tertentu. Pada akhir penelitian, data akan digitalisasi, dilindungi dengan kata sandi, dan disimpan di file kabinet terkunci di kantor pembimbing peneliti di Universitas Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia selama 5 tahun.

**Apakah resiko dan manfaat dari penelitian ini?**
Tidak ada resiko yang Bapak/Ibu akan alami baik yang berdampak kepada pribadi maupun profesi, selain dari total waktu 30 menit yang Bapak/Ibu luangkan untuk diwawancarai. Secara umum, hasil dari penelitian diharapkan berkontribusi terhadap perbaikan sistem pengembangan profesi guru yang ada di Indonesia.

**Apakah keterlibatan dalam penelitian ini sukarela?**

**Apakah ada hal lain yang perlu saya ketahui?**
Wawancara akan dilaksanakan dalam rentang periode:

- Wilayah Kota Makassar : Tanggal 29 Oktober s.d. 2 November 2013
- Wilayah Kota Pare-Pare : Tanggal 5 s.d. 9 Oktober 2013
- Wilayah Kab. Wajo : Tanggal 12 s.d. 16 Oktober 2013

Untuk wawancara tersebut, mohon Bapak/Ibu mencantumkan tanggal dan waktu pilihan wawancara Bapak/Ibu dengan melengkapi isian yang ada pada bagian akhir Formulir Kesedian Terlibat Kepala Sekolah.

**Untuk informasi lebih lanjut**
Jika Bapak/Ibu membutuhkan informasi lebih jauh tentang penelitian ini, Bapak/Ibu bisa menghubungi saya atau pembimbing saya melalui kontak detail yang tersedia di atas. Jika ada keberatan atau keluhan atas penelitian ini, Bapak/Ibu bisa menghubungi bagian Ethics Officer of the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee pada nomor telepon (+61) 2 4221 4457 dengan menyebutkan kode aplikasi: HE13/135.
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Consent Form for Teachers (English)

CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS

RESEARCH TITLE: Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences

RESEARCHER: Abdul Rahman

I have been given information about the study of research project entitled “Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences” and discussed the study and the research project with Abdul Rahman who is conducting this research as part of a Doctor of Philosophy requirements supervised by A/Prof Garry Hoban in the faculty of Education at the University of Wollongong.

I have been advised of the risks and benefits associated with this research and have had an opportunity to ask Abdul Rahman any questions I may have about the study and my participation.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I am free to refuse to participate and I am free to withdraw from the study at any time. My refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not affect my relationship to the researcher and with any parties in my school.

If I have any enquiries about the study, I can contact Abdul Rahman on +61424137441 or email ar541@uowmail.edu.au or A/Prof Garry Hoban on +6142214450 or email ghoban@uow.edu.au or if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the study is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.

By signing below I am consenting to (please tick):

☐ Participating in completing questionnaire.
☐ Having an audio recorded interview for 30 minutes with the researcher about the issues or topics that has been described to me in the information sheet.

Signed      Date

.......................................................................  ......./....../......

Name (please print)

.......................................................................
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Consent Form for Teachers (Indonesian)

FORMULIR KESEDIAAN TERLIBAT GURU

PENELITIAN DENGAN JUDUL: Teacher professional development in Indonesia: The interplay between teacher learning activities, teacher characteristics, and school-level influences (Pengembangan profesi guru di Indonesia: Keterkaitan antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh sekolah)

Peneliti: Abdul Rahman

Saya telah mendapatkan informasi yang cukup tentang penelitian yang berjudul “Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences” (Pengembangan profesi guru di Indonesia: Keterkaitan antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh sekolah). Saya juga telah mendiskusikan penelitian ini dengan saudara Abdul Rahman yang melaksanakan penelitian tersebut sebagai salah satu prasyarat mendapatkan gelar doctoral (Doctor of Philosophy) yang dibimbing oleh A/Prof Garry Hoban pada fakultas pendidikan Universitas Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia.

Saya telah diberitahu resiko dan manfaat dari penelitian ini dan juga telah berkonsultasi dengan saudara Abdul Rahman mengenai penelitian dan keterlibatan saya.

Saya mengerti dengan sadar bahwa keterlibatan saya dalam penelitian ini adalah sukarela. Saya bebas untuk menolak dan atau mengundurkan diri kapan saja dari penelitian ini. Penolakan untuk terlibat ataupun pengunduran diri tersebut tidak akan berdampak kepada hubungan saya dengan peneliti, pihak-pihak di sekolah saya dan ataupun pihak-pihak di Universitas Wollongong.

Jika saya membutuhkan informasi lebih lanjut tentang penelitian ini, maka saya dapat menghubungi saudara Abdul Rahman melalui telepon +61424137441 atau email ar541@uowmail.edu.au atau A/Prof Garry Hoban dengan nomor telepon +6142214450 atau email ghoban@uow.edu.au.

Saya yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini menyatakan (mohon dicentang) bersedia untuk:

- Berpartisipasi dalam pengisian kuesioner.
- Terlibat dalam wawancara terkam selama 30 menit dengan peneliti tentang topik sebagaimana yang dipaparkan dalam lembar informasi penelitian ini.

Tandatangan
.................................................................
Tanggal
.................................................................
Nama (mohon dituliskan)
.................................................................
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Consent Form for Principals (English)

CONSENT FORM FOR PRINCIPALS

RESEARCH TITLE: Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences

RESEARCHER: Abdul Rahman

I have been given information about the study of research project entitled “Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences” and discussed the study and the research project with Abdul Rahman who is conducting this research as part of a Doctor of Philosophy requirements supervised by A/Prof Garry Hoban in the faculty of Education at the University of Wollongong.

I have been advised of the risks and benefits associated with this research and have had an opportunity to ask Abdul Rahman any questions I may have about the study and my participation.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I am free to refuse to participate and I am free to withdraw from the study at any time. My refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not affect my relationship to the researcher and with any parties in my school.

If I have any enquiries about the study, I can contact Abdul Rahman on +61424137441 or email ar541@uowmail.edu.au or A/Prof Garry Hoban on +6142214450 or email ghoban@uow.edu.au or if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the study is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.

By signing below I am consenting to (please tick):

☐ Having an audio recorded interview for 30 minutes with the researcher about the issues or topics that has been described to me in the information sheet.

Signed       Date

..............................................  ......./...../.....

Name (please print)

..............................................
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Consent Form for Principals (Indonesian)

FORMULIR KESEDIANAN TERLIBAT KEPAK SEKOLAH

PENELITIAN DENGAN JUDUL: Teacher professional development in Indonesia: The interplay between teacher learning activities, teacher characteristics, and school-level influences (Pengembangan profesi guru di Indonesia: Keterkaitan antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh sekolah)

Peneliti: Abdul Rahman

Saya telah mendapatkan informasi yang cukup tentang penelitian yang berjudul “Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics and School-Level Influences” (Pengembangan profesi guru di Indonesia: Keterkaitan antara kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh sekolah). Saya juga telah mendiskusikan penelitian ini dengan saudara Abdul Rahman yang melaksanakan penelitian tersebut sebagai salah satu prasyarat mendapatkan gelar doktoral (Doctor of Philosophy) yang dibimbing oleh A/Prof Garry Hoban pada fakultas pendidikan Universitas Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia.

Saya telah diberitahu resiko dan manfaat dari penelitian ini dan juga telah berkonsultasi dengan saudara Abdul Rahman mengenai penelitian dan keterlibatan saya.

Saya mengerti dengan sadar bahwa keterlibatan saya dalam penelitian ini adalah sukarela. Saya bebas untuk menolak dan atau mengundurkan diri kapan saja dari penelitian ini. Penolakan untuk terlibat atau pengunduran diri tersebut tidak akan berdampak kepada hubungan saya dengan peneliti maupun pihak-pihak di sekolah saya dan ataupun pihak-pihak di Universitas Wollongong.

Jika saya membutuhkan informasi lebih lanjut tentang penelitian ini, maka saya dapat menghubungi saudara Abdul Rahman melalui telepon +61424137441 atau email ar541@uowmail.edu.au atau A/Prof Garry Hoban dengan nomor telepon +6142214450 atau email ghoban@uow.edu.au.

Saya yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini menyatakan (Mohon dicentang) bersedia untuk:

☐ Terlibat dalam wawancara terekam selama 30 menit dengan peneliti tentang topik sebagaimana yang dipaparkan dalam lembar informasi penelitian ini.

Tanda tangan

.................................................................  ....../...../.....

Nama (Mohon dituliskan)

.................................................................
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Permission Letter from OECD to Use TALIS Questionnaire

Subject: RE: TALIS Questionnaire
From: Julie.BELANGER@oecd.org (Julie.BELANGER@oecd.org)
To: ar541@ouowel.edu.au
Cc: Kristen.WEATHERBY@oecd.org
Date: Saturday, November 10, 2012 1:21 AM

Dear Abdul,

Thank you very much for your interest in TALIS! All the materials from the first cycle of TALIS are available on our website (www.oecd.org/talis) publicly and you are most welcomed to use the questionnaires and other materials for your research.

In particular, you should look at the Technical Report, which you can download from our website: http://www.oecd.org/edu/perschool/2374174.pdf

This report contains the questionnaires and also information concerning reliability.

I hope this information helps.

Best wishes,
Julie

---

From: Abdul Rahman [mailto:ar541@ouowel.edu.au]
Sent: 60 November 2012 05:27
To: TALIS.EDU@oecd.org
Cc: WEATHERBY, Kristen, EDU/EC5; BELANGER, Julie, EDU/EC5
Subject: TALIS Questionnaire

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a brief introduction, I’m a Ph.D student at the university of Wollongong, NSW Australia and currently developing my study proposal in the area of teacher professional development in Indonesian context. I’ve come across the TALIS questionnaire and I plan to employ the questionnaire in my proposed study. I’m writing to you for two things. First, I’d like to have permission to use this questionnaire. Second, I need information/data as how to report the validity and reliability of this questionnaire.

I really appreciate if you can help about these matters and looking forward your advice.

Best regards,

Abdul Rahman

Postgraduate Research Student
Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong
NSW, Australia
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TALIS Teacher Questionnaire

OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)
Teacher Questionnaire

Main Study Version (MS-12-01)
[International English, UK Spelling]

International Project Consortium:
International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), The Netherlands
IEA Data Processing and Research Center (IEA DPC), Germany
Statistics Canada, Canada
About TALIS
The first Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) is an international survey that offers the opportunity for teachers and principals to provide input into education analysis and policy development. TALIS is being conducted by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and [Name of country], along with some 23 other countries, is taking part in the survey.
Cross-country analysis of this data will allow countries to identify other countries facing similar challenges and to learn from other policy approaches. School principals and teachers will provide information about issues such as the professional development they have received; their teaching beliefs and practices; the review of teachers’ work and the feedback and recognition they receive about their work; and various other school leadership, management and workplace issues.
Being an international survey, it is possible that some questions do not fit very well within your national context. In these cases, please answer as best as you can.

Confidentiality
All information that is collected in this study will be treated confidentially. While results will be made available by country and by type of school within a country, you are guaranteed that neither you, this school nor any of its personnel will be identified in any report of the results of the study. [Participation in this survey is voluntary and any individual may withdraw at any time.]

About the Questionnaire
• This questionnaire asks for information about school education and policy matters.
• This questionnaire should take approximately 45 minutes to complete.
• Guidelines for answering the questions are typed in italics. Most questions can be answered by marking the one most appropriate answer.
• When questions refer to ‘this school’ we mean by ‘school’ national school definition.
• When you have completed this questionnaire, please [National Return Procedures and Date].
• When in doubt about any aspect of the questionnaire, or if you would like more information about it or the study, you can reach us by phone at the following numbers: [National Center Contact Information]

Thank you very much for your cooperation!
**Background Information**

These questions are about you, your education and the time you have spent in teaching. In responding to the questions, please mark the appropriate box.

1. **What is your gender?**
   - Female
   - Male

2. **How old are you?**
   - Under 25
   - 25-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60+

3. **What is your employment status as a teacher?**
   *Part-time employment is where the contracted hours of work represent less than 90 per cent of the normal or statutory number of hours of work for a full-time employee over a complete school year. Please consider your employment status for all of your teaching jobs combined.*
   - Full-time
   - Part-time (50-90% of full-time hours)
   - Part-time (less than 50% of full-time hours)

4. **Do you work as a teacher of <ISCED level 2> at another school as well as this school?**
   - Yes
   - No → **Please go to question 6.**

5. **If 'Yes' in the previous question, please indicate in how many other schools you work as a <ISCED level 2> teacher.**
   *Please write in a number.*
   - [ ] Schools

6. **What is your employment status as a teacher at this school?**
   *Please do not consider the probationary period of a contract as a separate contract.*
   - Permanent employment (an on going contract with no fixed end point before the age of retirement)
   - Fixed term contract for a period of more than 1 school-year
   - Fixed term contract for a period of 1 school-year or less
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7. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

Please mark one choice.

☐ <Below ISCED Level 5>
☐ ISCED Level 5B>
☐ ISCED Level 5A Bachelor degree>
☐ ISCED Level 5A Masters degree>
☐ ISCED Level 6>

8. In a typical school week, estimate the number of (60-minute) hours you spend on the following for this school.

This question concerns your work for this school only. Please do not include the work you do for other schools.

Please write a number in each row and round to the nearest hour in your responses. Write 0 (zero) if none.

a) Teaching of students in school (either whole class, in groups or individually)

b) Planning or preparation of lessons either in school or out of school (including marking of student work)

c) Administrative duties either in school or out of school (including school administrative duties, paperwork and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)

d) Other (please specify):

9. How long have you been working as a teacher?

Where possible exclude extended periods of absence (e.g. career breaks).

This is my first year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years More than 20 years

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

10. How long have you been working as a teacher at this school?

Where possible exclude extended periods of absence (e.g. career breaks).

This is my first year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years More than 20 years

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Professional Development

In this survey, **professional development** is defined as activities that develop an individual’s skills, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics as a teacher.

Please only consider professional development you have taken **after** your initial teacher training/education.

11. **During the last 18 months, did you participate in any of the following kinds of professional development activities, and what was the impact of these activities on your development as a teacher?**

For each question below, please mark one choice in part (A). If you answer 'Yes' in part (A) then please mark one choice in part (B) to indicate how much impact it had upon your development as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Participation</th>
<th>(B) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Courses/workshops (e.g. on subject matter or methods and/or other education-related topics) .................

b) Education conferences or seminars (where teachers and/or researchers present their research results and discuss educational problems) ..........

c) Qualification programme (e.g. a degree programme) .........................

d) Observation visits to other schools ....

e) Participation in a network of teachers formed specifically for the professional development of teachers .........................

f) Individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally .................................

g) Mentoring and/or peer observation and coaching, as part of a formal school arrangement .................................
12. In all, how many days of professional development did you attend during the last 18 months?
   Please round to whole days. Write 0 (zero) if none.
   [ ] [ ] [ ] Days
   If you answered '0' (zero) \( \rightarrow \) Please go to question 17.

13. Of these, how many days were compulsory for you to attend as part of your job as a teacher?
   Please round to whole days. Write 0 (zero) if none.
   [ ] [ ] [ ] Days

14. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, how much did you personally have to pay for?
   Please mark one choice.
   [ ] None  [ ] Some  [ ] All

15. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, did you receive scheduled time for undertaking the professional development that took place during regular work hours?
   Please mark one choice.
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Did not take place during regular work hours

16. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, did you receive a salary supplement for undertaking the professional development activities that took place outside regular work hours?
   Please mark one choice.
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Did not take place outside of regular work hours
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17. Thinking about less formal professional development, during the last 18 months, did you participate in any of the following activities, and what was the impact of these activities on your development as a teacher?

For each question below, please mark one choice in part (A). If you answer "yes" in part (A) then please mark one choice in part (B) to indicate how much impact it had upon your development as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Participation</th>
<th>(B) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Reading professional literature (e.g. journals, evidence-based papers, thesis papers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Engaging in informal dialogue with your colleagues on how to improve your teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Thinking of your own professional development needs, please indicate the extent to which you have such needs in each of the areas listed.

Please mark one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No need at all</th>
<th>Low level of need</th>
<th>Moderate level of need</th>
<th>High level of need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Content and performance standards in my main subject field(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Student assessment practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Knowledge and understanding of my main subject field(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (knowledge mediation) in my main subject field(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) ICT skills for teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Teaching students with special learning needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Student discipline and behaviour problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) School management and administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Teaching in a multicultural setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Student counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. In the last 18 months, did you want to participate in more professional development than you did?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No → Please go to question 21.

20. If 'Yes' in the previous question, which of the following reasons best explain what prevented you from participating in more professional development than you did?
   Please mark as many choices as appropriate.
   - ☐ I did not have the pre-requisites (e.g. qualifications, experience, seniority).
   - ☐ Professional development was too expensive/I could not afford it.
   - ☐ There was a lack of employer support
   - ☐ Professional development conflicted with my work schedule.
   - ☐ I didn't have time because of family responsibilities.
   - ☐ There was no suitable professional development offered.
   - ☐ Other (please specify): ________________________________________________
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Questionnaire for Pilot Study (English)

Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics, and School-Level Influences

PILOT STUDY

Questionnaire for Teacher Professional Development
These questions are about you, your education and the time you have spent in teaching. In responding to
the questions, please mark the appropriate box.

1. What is your gender?

Male  □  Female  □

2. How old are you?

< 25  □  25-29  □  30-39  □  40-49  □  50-59  □  60+  □

3. What is your employment status as a teacher?

□ 1  Full-time (PNS/Non-PNS)
□ 2  Part-time (50-90% of full-time hours)
□ 3  Part-time (less than 50% of full-time hours)

4. Do you work as a teacher of at another school as well as this school?

□ 1  Yes
□ 2  No  ➔ Please go to question 6.

5. If ‘Yes’ in the previous question, please indicate in how many other schools you work as a
teacher.

Please write in a number.

□□

6. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

Please mark one choice.

□ 1  Diploma 2
□ 2  Diploma 3
□ 3  Bachelor Degree (S1)
□ 4  Master (S2)
□ 5  Doctor/Ph.D (S3)

7. In a typical school week, estimate the number of (60-minute) hours you spend on the following
for this school.

This question concerns your work for this school only. Please do not include the work you do for other
schools.

Please write a number in each row and round to the nearest hour in your responses.
Write 0 (zero) if none.

a)  □□  Teaching of students in school (either whole class, in groups or individually).
b)  □□  Planning or preparation of lessons either in school or out of school (including
marking of student work).
c)  □□  Administrative duties either in school or out of school (including school administrative
duties, paperwork and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)
d)  □□  Other (please specify): __________________________________________________________
8. How long have you been working as a teacher?
This is
my first year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years More than
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐6 ☐7

9. How long have you been working as a teacher at this school?
This is
my first year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years More than
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐6 ☐7

Teacher Professional Development

In this survey, teacher professional development is defined as activities that develop an individual’s skills, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics as a teacher.

Please only consider professional development you have taken after your initial teacher training/education.

10. During the last 18 months, did you participate in any of the following kinds of professional development activities, and what was the impact of these activities on your development as a teacher?

For each question below, please mark one choice in part (A). If you answer ‘Yes’ in part (A) then please mark one choice in part (B) to indicate how much impact it had upon your development as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Participation</th>
<th>(B) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Courses/workshops (e.g. on subject matter or methods and/or other education-related topics)
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

b) Education conferences or seminars (where teachers and/or researchers present their research results and discuss educational problems)
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

c) Qualification programme (e.g. a degree programme S1/S2/S3)
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

d) Observation visits to other schools
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

e) Participation in a network of teachers formed specifically for the professional development of teachers
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

f) Individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

g) Mentoring and/or peer observation and coaching, as part of a formal school arrangement
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
11. In all, how many days of professional development did you attend during the last 18 months?  

*Please round to whole days. Write 0 (zero) if none.*

[ ] Days

*If you answered ‘0’ (zero) Please go to question 16.*

12. Of these, how many days were compulsory for you to attend as part of your job as a teacher?  

*Please round to whole days. Write 0 (zero) if none.*

[ ] Days

13. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, how much did you personally have to pay for?  

*Please mark one choice.*

None [ ] Some [ ] All [ ]

14. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, did you receive scheduled time for undertaking the professional development that took place during regular work hours?  

*Please mark one choice.*

Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, did you receive a salary supplement for undertaking the professional development activities that took place outside regular work hours?  

*Please mark one choice.*

Yes [ ] No [ ]

16. Thinking about less formal professional development, during the last 18 months, did you participate in any of the following activities, and what was the impact of these activities on your development as a teacher?  

*For each question below, please mark one choice in part (A). If you answer ‘Yes’ in part (A) then please mark one choice in part (B) to indicate how much impact it had upon your development as a teacher.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Participation</th>
<th>(B) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact small</td>
<td>impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a) Reading professional literature (e.g. journals, evidence-based papers, thesis papers) | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
| b) Engaging in informal dialogue with your colleagues on how to improve your teaching | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
17. Thinking of your own professional development needs, please indicate the extent to which you have such needs in each of the areas listed.

Please mark one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No need at all</th>
<th>Low level of need</th>
<th>Moderate level of need</th>
<th>High level of need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Content and performance standards in my main subject field(s)</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Student assessment practices</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Classroom management</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Knowledge and understanding of my main subject field(s)</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (knowledge mediation) in my main subject field(s)</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) ICT skills for teaching</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Teaching students with special learning needs</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Student discipline and behaviour problems</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) School management and administration</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Teaching in a multicultural setting</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Student counselling</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. In the last 18 months, did you want to participate in more professional development than you did?

☐₁ Yes
☐₂ No

19. If ‘Yes’ in the previous question, which of the following reasons best explain what prevented you from participating in more professional development than you did?

Please mark as many choices as appropriate.

☐₁ I did not have the pre-requisites (e.g. qualifications, experience, seniority).
☐₁ Professional development was too expensive/I could not afford it.
☐₁ There was a lack of employer support.
☐₁ Professional development conflicted with my work schedule.
☐₁ I didn’t have time because of family responsibilities.
☐₁ There was no suitable professional development offered.
☐₁ Other (please specify): _______________________________________________
In following phase of this project, I would like to conduct a telephone interview (approximately 30 minutes long) to get a deeper and detail information how teacher professional development activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions affect teacher teaching and learning. The interview will be conducted during the period of 27 – 31 May 2013. Please indicate your willingness to take part in the interview session by filling the following section.

I am interested in participating in a telephone interview for Phase two of this study.

Name : ____________________________________________

Mobile Phone : ______________________________________

Home Phone : _______________________________________

Preferred Interview date & time : 1. Date: ___________2013, ________AM/PM

2. Date: ___________2013, ________AM/PM
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Questionnaire for Pilot Study (Indonesia)

Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics, and School-Level Influences

PILOT STUDY

Kuesioner Pengembangan Profesi Guru
Pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan diri, pendidikan, dan masa kerja anda sebagai seorang guru. Untuk pertanyaan berikut, mohon dicentang pilihan atau diisi yang paling sesuai dengan kondisi anda.

1. **Apakah jenis kelamin anda?**
   - Laki-Laki
   - Perempuan

2. **Berapakah usia anda?**
   - < 25
   - 25-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60+

3. **Apakah status pekerjaan Anda sebagai guru di sekolah yang Anda tempati sekarang ini?**
   - Tetap (PNS/Non-PNS)
   - Tenaga kontrak (honorer/tidak tetap) dengan masa kontrak lebih dari 1 tahun
   - Tenaga kontrak (honorer/tidak tetap) dengan masa kontrak kurang dari 1 tahun

4. **Selain mengajar di sekolah ini, apakah Anda juga mengajar di sekolah lain?**
   - Ya
   - Tidak → Silahkan melanjutkan ke pertanyaan nomor 6.

5. **Jika anda menjawab ‘Ya’ pada pertanyaan nomor 4, berapa banyak sekolah yang anda tempati mengajar?**
   - Mohon dijawab dengan angka.

6. **Apakah jenjang pendidikan tertinggi yang telah anda capai?**
   - Diploma 2
   - Diploma 3
   - Sarjana (S1)
   - Master (S2)
   - Doktor/Ph.D (S3)

7. **Dalam kurun waktu seminggu, perkirakan jumlah jam (60 menit) yang anda habiskan untuk mengerjakan kegiatan-kegiatan berikut.**

   Pertanyaan ini hanya untuk kegiatan-kegiatan yang anda kerjakan di sekolah ini.
   Mohon dijawab dengan angka dan dibulatkan ke nilai jumlah jam yang paling mendekati.
   Tulis 0 (nol) jika tidak ada.

   a) Mengajar siswa (kelas, kelompok atau individual)
   b) Perencanaan atau persiapan pembelajaran pada jam atau di luar jam sekolah (termasuk memeriksa pekerjaan siswa)
   c) Tugas administratif yang anda kerjakan pada jam atau diluar jam sekolah (termasuk tugas administrasi sekolah)
   d) Lainnya (mohon dijelaskan): _________________________________
8. Berapa lama anda telah bekerja sebagai seorang guru?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahun pertama</th>
<th>1-2 tahun</th>
<th>3-5 tahun</th>
<th>6-10 tahun</th>
<th>11-15 tahun</th>
<th>16-20 tahun</th>
<th>Lebih dari 20 tahun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 5</td>
<td>☐ 6</td>
<td>☐ 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Berapa lama anda telah bekerja sebagai seorang guru di sekolah ini?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahun pertama</th>
<th>1-2 tahun</th>
<th>3-5 tahun</th>
<th>6-10 tahun</th>
<th>11-15 tahun</th>
<th>16-20 tahun</th>
<th>Lebih dari 20 tahun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 5</td>
<td>☐ 6</td>
<td>☐ 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dalam kuesioner ini, pengembangan profesi guru didefinisikan atau merujuk pada kegiatan-kegiatan yang bertujuan untuk mengembangkan/meningkatkan keterampilan, pengetahuan, keahlian dan karakteristik/kompetensi lainnya sebagai seorang guru.

Kegiatan yang dimaksud adalah kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang anda ikuti selain dari kegiatan pendidikan/pelatihan calon guru yang anda ikuti sebelum menjadi guru.

10. Dalam kurun waktu 18 bulan terakhir, apakah anda pernah mengikuti kegiatan-kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru di bawah ini, dan apakah dampak dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut terhadap profesi atau pekerjaan anda sebagai seorang guru?

Untuk setiap pernyataan berikut, centangah satu pilihan pada bagian (A). Jika anda mencentang ‘Ya’ pada bagian (A) maka anda diminta mencentang satu pilihan pada bagian (B) untuk mengindikasikan seberapa besar dampak kegiatan yang dimaksud terhadap pengembangan diri/profesi anda sebagai seorang guru.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Keikutsertaan</th>
<th>(B) Dampak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ya</td>
<td>Tidak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Workshop/Pelatihan (berkaitan dengan mata pelajaran, metode dan atau topik lain yang berkaitan dengan pendidikan)

b) Konferensi atau seminar (peneliti dan atau guru menyajikan dan mendiskusikan hasil-hasil penelitian/permasalahan pendidikan)

c) Program kualifikasi (penyetaraan atau peningkatan kualifikasi S1/S2/S3)

d) Observasi (observasi kelas atau sekolah)

e) Jaringan guru (MGMP ataupun jaringan guru lainnya)

f) Penelitian individu ataupun kolaborasi untuk pengembangan profesi

g) Mentoring atau coaching
11. Secara keseluruhan, berapa jam waktu yang anda telah luangkan untuk kegiatan-kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru selama kurun waktu 18 bulan terakhir?

Mohon dibulatkan ke dalam jumlah hari. Tuliskan 0 (nol) jika tidak ada.

[ ] Hari

Jika anda menjawab ‘0’ (nol) → Silahkan melanjutkan ke pertanyaan nomor 16

12. Dari jumlah keseluruhan, berapa hari yang merupakan kewajiban anda sebagai seorang guru untuk mengikuti kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut?

Mohon dibulatkan ke dalam jumlah hari. Tuliskan 0 (nol) jika tidak ada.

[ ] Hari

13. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang anda ikuti selama 18 bulan terakhir, seberapa banyak yang anda harus bayarkan secara pribadi?

Mohon dicentang salah satu.

[ ] Tidak ada
[ ] Sebagian
[ ] Semua

14. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang anda ikuti selama 18 bulan terakhir, apakah jadwal kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang anda ikuti dilaksanakan pada (mengambil) jam kerja/mengajar anda?

Mohon dicentang salah satu.

[ ] Ya
[ ] Tidak

15. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang anda ikuti selama 18 bulan terakhir, apakah anda menerima insentif (uang saku, honor atau sejenisnya) untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang dilaksanakan di luar jam kerja/mengajar anda?

Mohon dicentang salah satu.

[ ] Ya
[ ] Tidak

16. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang tidak terlalu formal yang anda lakukan selama 18 bulan terakhir, apakah anda pernah melakukan kegiatan-kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru di bawah ini, dan apakah dampak dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut terhadap profesi atau pekerjaan anda sebagai seorang guru?

Untuk setiap pernyataan berikut, centanglah satu pilihan pada bagian (A). Jika anda mencentang ‘Ya’ pada bagian (A) maka anda diminta mencentang satu pilihan pada bagian (B) untuk mengindikasikan seberapa besar dampak kegiatan yang dimaksud terhadap pengembangan diri/profesi anda sebagai seorang guru.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Keikutsertaan</th>
<th>(B) Dampak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ya</td>
<td>Tidak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Membaca literature berhubungan dengan profesi keguruan (buku, journal, laporan karya ilmiah)

[ ] 1 | [ ] 2 | [ ] 3 | [ ] 4

b) Dialog/diskusi dengan guru sejawat tentang bagaimana meningkatkan pembelajaran/pengajaran

[ ] 1 | [ ] 2 | [ ] 3 | [ ] 4
17. Pikirkan tentang pengembangan profesi yang anda butuhkan, mohon indikasikan sejauh mana kegiatan-kegiatan di bawah ini anda butuhkan.

Mohon dicentang salah satu pilihan di setiap pernyataan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pernyataan</th>
<th>Tidak dibutuhkan</th>
<th>Kurang</th>
<th>Sedang</th>
<th>Sangat dibutuhkan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Standar isi dan kompetensi mata pelajaran yang saya ajarkan</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Penilaian siswa</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Managemen kelas</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Pengetahuan dan pemahaman (kompetensi) mata pelajaran yang saya ajarkan</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Pengetahuan dan pemahaman (kompetensi) pedagogik tentang mata pelajaran yang saya ajarkan</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Keterampilan TIK untuk pengajaran</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Pengajaran untuk siswa bekebutuhan khusus</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Menangani perilaku bermasalah dan kedisiplinan siswa</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Managemen dan administrasi sekolah</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Pengajaran multicultural</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Konseling siswa</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Dalam kurun waktu 18 bulan terakhir, apakah anda menginginkan untuk mengikuti kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru lebih dari sekedar yang anda telah ikuti?

☐ 1 Ya
☐ 2 Tidak

19. Jika anda menjawab ‘Ya’ pada pertanyaan no 18, dari pernyataan berikut mana yang paling tepat menjelaskan alasan yang menghalangi anda untuk mengikuti kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru lebih dari sekedar yang anda sudah ikuti?

Mohon dicentang pilihan-pilihan (bisa lebih dari satu) yang sesuai dengan kondisi anda.

☐ 1 Saya tidak memenuhi persyaratan (kualifikasi, pengalaman, senioritas).
☐ 1 Kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut terlalu mahal/Saya tidak mampu.
☐ 1 Tidak ada dukungan dari sekolah (Kepala sekolah, ketua yayasan).
☐ 1 Kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut berbenturan/bersamaan dengan jadwal mengajar.
☐ 1 Saya tidak memiliki waktu dikarenakan tanggung jawab keluarga.
☐ 1 Kegiatan pengembangan professional guru yang ditawarkan tidak sesuai dengan yang saya butuhkan/inginkan.
☐ 1 Lainnya (mohon dijelaskan): ______________________________________________________
Saya tertarik untuk berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan wawancara dalam tahapan selanjutnya dari penelitian ini.

Nama : _______________________________________________

HP : _______________________________________________

Telepon Rumah : _______________________________________________

Preferensi Tanggal/Waktu : 1. Tanggal: ___________2013/Pukul _____________

2. Tanggal: ___________2013/Pukul _____________
Appendix 10a

Questionnaire for the Study (English)

Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: The Interplay between Learning Activities, Teacher Characteristics, and School-Level Influences

Questionnaire for Teacher Professional Development
These questions are about you, your education and the time you have spent in teaching. In responding to the questions, please mark the appropriate box.

1. **What is your gender?**
   - Male
   - Female

2. **How old are you?**
   - < 25
   - 25-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60+

3. **What is your employment status as a teacher?**
   - Full-time (PNS/Non-PNS)
   - Part-time (50-90% of full-time hours)

4. **Do you work as a teacher at another school as well as this school?**
   - Yes
   - No → Please go to question 6.

5. **If ‘Yes’ in the previous question, please indicate in how many other schools you work as a teacher.**
   Please write in a number.

6. **What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?**
   Please mark one choice.
   - Diploma 2
   - Diploma 3
   - Bachelor Degree (S1)
   - Master (S2)
   - Doctor/Ph.D (S3)

7. **In a typical school week, estimate the number of (60-minute) hours you spend on the following for this school.**
   This question concerns your work for this school only. Please do not include the work you do for other schools.
   Please write a number in each row and round to the nearest hour in your responses.
   Write 0 (zero) if none.
   a) Teaching of students in school (either whole class, in groups or individually).
   b) Planning or preparation of lessons either in school or out of school (including marking of student work).
   c) Administrative duties either in school or out of school (including school administrative duties, paperwork and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher).
   d) Other (please specify): ____________________________
8. How long have you been working as a teacher?

This is

my first year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years More than

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

9. How long have you been working as a teacher at this school?

This is

my first year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years More than

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

Teacher Professional Development

In this survey, teacher professional development is defined as activities that develop an individual’s skills, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics as a teacher.

Please only consider professional development you have taken after your initial teacher training/education.

10. During the last 18 months, did you participate in any of the following kinds of professional development activities, and what was the impact of these activities on your development as a teacher?

For each question below, please mark one choice in part (A). If you answer ‘Yes’ in part (A) then please mark one choice in part (B) to indicate how much impact it had upon your development as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Participation</th>
<th>(B) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Courses/workshops (e.g. on subject matter or methods and/or other education-related topics)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

b) Education conferences or seminars (where teachers and/or researchers present their research results and discuss educational problems)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

c) Qualification programme (e.g. a degree programme S1/S2/S3)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
d) Observation visits to other schools.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
e) Participation in a network of teachers formed specifically for the professional development of teachers

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

f) Individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
g) Mentoring and/or peer observation and coaching, as part of a formal school arrangement

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

h) Other

…………………………………………………

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
11. In all, how many hours of professional development did you attend during the last 18 months? Write 0 (zero) if none.

[ ] [ ] hours

If you answered ‘0’ (zero) Please go to question 15.

12. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, how much did you personally have to pay for?

Please mark one choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, did you receive scheduled time for undertaking the professional development that took place during regular work hours?

Please mark one choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. For the professional development in which you participated in the last 18 months, did you receive a salary supplement for undertaking the professional development activities that took place outside regular work hours?

Please mark one choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Thinking about less formal professional development, during the last 18 months, did you participate in any of the following activities, and what was the impact of these activities on your development as a teacher?

For each question below, please mark one choice in part (A). If you answer ‘Yes’ in part (A) then please mark one choice in part (B) to indicate how much impact it had upon your development as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Participation</th>
<th>(B) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Reading professional literature (e.g. journals, evidence-based papers, thesis papers) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

b) Engaging in informal dialogue with your colleagues on how to improve your teaching ... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

c) Other: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
16. Thinking of your own professional development needs, please indicate the extent to which you have such needs in each of the areas listed.

*Please mark one choice in each row.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No need at all</th>
<th>Low level of need</th>
<th>Moderate level of need</th>
<th>High level of need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Content and performance standards in my main subject field(s)</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Student assessment practices</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Classroom management</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Knowledge and understanding of my main subject field(s)</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (knowledge mediation) in my main subject field(s)</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) ICT skills for teaching</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Teaching students with special learning needs</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Student discipline and behaviour problems</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) School management and administration</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Teaching in a multicultural setting</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Student counselling</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Other:</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. In the last 18 months, did you want to participate in more professional development than you did?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

18. If ‘Yes’ in the previous question, which of the following reasons best explain what prevented you from participating in more professional development than you did?

*Please mark as many choices as appropriate.*

☐ 1 I did not have the pre-requisites (e.g. qualifications, experience, seniority).
☐ 2 Professional development was too expensive/I could not afford it.
☐ 3 There was a lack of employer support.
☐ 4 Professional development conflicted with my work schedule.
☐ 5 I didn’t have time because of family responsibilities.
☐ 6 There was no suitable professional development offered.
☐ 7 Other (please specify): _______________________________________________
In following phase of this project, I would like to conduct an interview (approximately 30 minutes long) to get a deeper and detail information how teacher professional development activities, teacher characteristics and school conditions affect teacher teaching and learning. The interview will be conducted during the period:

- Makassar : Tanggal 29 Oktober s.d. 2 November 2013
- Parepare : Tanggal 5 s.d. 9 November 2013
- Wajo : Tanggal 12 s.d. 16 November 2013

Please indicate your willingness to take part in the interview session by filling the following section.

I am interested in participating in a telephone interview for Phase two of this study.

Name : ___________________________________________

Mobile Phone : ___________________________________________

Home Phone : ___________________________________________

Preferred Interview date & time : 1. Date: ___________2013, __________AM/PM

2. Date: ___________2013, __________AM/PM
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KUESIONER PENGEMBANGAN PROFESI GURU
Sekilas tentang Penelitian

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendapatkan gambaran dan pemahaman tentang kompleksitas pengembangan profesi guru ditinjau dari keterkaitan dan saling mempengaruhinya kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan pengaruh (kondisi) sekolah dalam rangka peningkatan mutu guru. Diharapkan data yang dihimpun dalam penelitian ini bisa memberikan penjelasan tentang beberapa hal yang berkaitan dengan topik penelitian ini diantaranya; ciri-ciri kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru; dampak kegiatan pengembangan profesi bagi guru; karakter guru yang mempengaruhi pembelajaran guru dalam kegiatan pengembangan profesi, serta kondisi sekolah yang mempengaruhi peran kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru sebagai mekanisme peningkatan mutu guru.

Kerahasiaan

Semua informasi yang didapatkan dalam penelitian ini dijamin kerahasiaannya. Identitas sekolah ataupun individu/kelompok yang terdokumentasi tidak akan teridentifikasi/disebutkan dalam laporan ataupun publikasi hasil penelitian ini. Partisipasi Bapak/Ibu dalam penelitian ini adalah sukarela dan Bapak/Ibu bisa mengundurkan diri kapan saja.

Kuesioner Pengembangan Profesi Guru

- Kuesioner ini berisi pertanyaan tentang guru dan kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru.
- Pengisian kuesioner ini membutuhkan waktu sekitar 20 menit.
- Petunjuk pengisian/jawaban setiap pertanyaan dicetak miring. Umumnya pertanyaan dapat dijawab dengan memilih salah satu jawaban yang sesuai.
- Kuesioner yang telah diisi mohon dimasukkan ke dalam amplop yang tersedia, ditutup dan dikembalikan ke Koordinator Sekolah Bapak/Ibu.
- Jika Bapak/Ibu memiliki pertanyaan mengenai kuesioner ini ataupun membutuhkan informasi lebih lanjut tentang kuesioner atau penelitian ini, maka Bapak/Ibu bisa menghubungi peneliti melalui:

  Email : ar541@uowmail.edu.au
  Nomor HP : +61424137441 (Australia)

Terima kasih atas kerjasama Bapak/Ibu!
Latar Belakang


1. Apakah jenis kelamin Bapak/Ibu?
   - Laki-Laki
   - Perempuan

2. Berapakah usia Bapak/Ibu?
   - < 25
   - 25-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60+

3. Apakah status pekerjaan Bapak/Ibu sebagai guru di sekolah yang ditempati sekarang?
   - Tetap (PNS/Non-PNS atau Yayasan)
   - Tenaga kontrak (honorer/tidak tetap)

4. Selain mengajar di sekolah ini, apakah Bapak/Ibu juga mengajar di sekolah lain?
   - Ya
   - Tidak

5. Jika menjawab ‘Ya’ pada pertanyaan nomor 4, berapa banyak sekolah yang Bapak/Ibu tempati mengajar?
   Mohon dijawab dengan angka.
   - Sekolah

6. Apakah jenjang pendidikan tertinggi yang telah Bapak/Ibu capai?
   Mohon dicentang hanya satu pilihan
   - Diploma 2
   - Diploma 3
   - Sarjana (S1)
   - Master (S2)
   - Doktor/Ph.D (S3)

7. Dalam kurun waktu seminggu, perkiraan jumlah jam (60 menit) yang Bapak/Ibu habiskan untuk mengerjakan kegiatan-kegiatan berikut.
   Pertanyaan ini hanya untuk kegiatan-kegiatan yang Bapak/Ibu kerjakan di sekolah ini.
   Mohon dijawab dengan angka dan dibulatkan ke nilai jumlah jam yang paling mendekati.
   Tulis 0 (nol) jika tidak ada.
   a) □□ Mengajar siswa (kelas, kelompok atau individual).
   b) □□ Perencanaan atau persiapan pembelajaran pada jam atau di luar jam sekolah (termasuk memeriksa pekerjaan siswa).
   c) □□ Tugas administratif yang Bapak/Ibu kerjakan pada jam atau diluar jam sekolah (termasuk tugas administrasi sekolah).
   d) □□ Lainnya (mohon dijelaskan): __________________________________________
8. Berapa lama Bapak/Ibu telah bekerja sebagai seorang guru?

Tahun pertama 1-2 tahun 3-5 tahun 6-10 tahun 11-15 tahun 16-20 tahun 20 tahun
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Berapa lama Bapak/Ibu telah bekerja sebagai seorang guru di sekolah yang ditempati sekarang?

Tahun pertama 1-2 tahun 3-5 tahun 6-10 tahun 11-15 tahun 16-20 tahun 20 tahun
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pengembangan Profesi Guru

Dalam kuesioner ini, pengembangan profesi guru didefinisikan atau merujuk pada kegiatan-kegiatan yang bertujuan untuk mengembangkan/meningkatkan keterampilan, pengetahuan, keahlian dan karakteristik/kompetensi lainnya sebagai seorang guru.

Kegiatan yang dimaksud adalah kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti selain dari kegiatan pendidikan/pelatihan calon guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti sebelum menjadi guru.

10. Dalam kurun waktu 18 bulan terakhir, apakah Bapak/Ibu pernah mengikuti kegiatan-kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru di bawah ini, dan apakah dampak dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut terhadap profesi Bapak/Ibu sebagai seorang guru?

Untuk setiap pernyataan berikut, centilah satu pilihan pada bagian (A). Jika mencentang ‘Ya’ pada bagian (A), maka Bapak/Ibu diminta mencentang satu pilihan pada bagian (B) untuk mengindikasikan seberapa besar dampak kegiatan yang dimaksud terhadap pengembangan profesi Bapak/Ibu sebagai seorang guru.

(A) Keikutsertaan (B) Dampak
Ya Tidak Tidak Kurang Sedang Sangat

a) Workshop/Pelatihan (berkaitan dengan mata pelajaran, metode dan atau topik lain yang berkaitan dengan pendidikan)
☐ 1 2 3 4

b) Konferensi atau seminar (peneliti dan atau guru menyajikan dan mendiskusikan hasil-nilai penelitian/permasalahan pendidikan)
☐ 1 2 3 4

c) Program kualifikasi (penyetaraan atau peningkatan kualifikasi S1/S2/S3)
☐ 1 2 3 4

d) Observasi (observasi kelas atau sekolah)
☐ 1 2 3 4

e) Jaringan/perhimpunan guru (MGMP atau jaringan guru lainnya)
☐ 1 2 3 4

f) Penelitian individu atau/ataupun kolaborasi untuk pengembangan profesi
☐ 1 2 3 4

g) Mentoring atau coaching
☐ 1 2 3 4

h) Lainnya (mohon dituliskan):

___________________________________________

☐ 1 2 3 4

Pengembangan Profesi Guru
11. Secara keseluruhan, berapa jam waktu yang Bapak/Ibu telah luangkan untuk kegiatan-kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru selama kurun waktu 18 bulan terakhir?

_Tuliskan 0 (nol) jika tidak ada._

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti selama 18 bulan terakhir, seberapa banyak yang Bapak/Ibu harus bayarkan secara pribadi?

Mohon dicentang salah satu.

- [ ] Tidak ada
- [ ] Sebagian
- [ ] Semua

13. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti selama 18 bulan terakhir, apakah jadwal kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti dilaksanakan pada (mengambil) jam kerja/mengajar Bapak/Ibu?

Mohon dicentang salah satu.

- [ ] Ya
- [ ] Tidak

14. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti selama 18 bulan terakhir, apakah Bapak/Ibu menerima insentif (uang saku, honor atau sejenisnya) untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti?

Mohon dicentang salah satu.

- [ ] Ya
- [ ] Tidak

15. Untuk kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru yang tidak terlalu formal yang Bapak/Ibu lakukan selama 18 bulan terakhir, apakah Bapak/Ibu pernah melakukan kegiatan-kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru di bawah ini, dan apakah dampak dari kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut terhadap profesi Bapak/Ibu sebagai seorang guru?

Untuk setiap pernyataan berikut, centanglah satu pilihan pada bagian (A). Jika mencentang ‘Ya’ pada bagian (A), maka Bapak/Ibu diminta mencentang satu pilihan pada bagian (B) untuk mengindikasikan seberapa besar dampak kegiatan yang dimaksud terhadap pengembangan profesi Bapak/Ibu sebagai seorang guru.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keikutsertaan</th>
<th>Dampak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Membaca literature berhubungan dengan profesi keguruan (buku, journal, laporan karya ilmiah)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dialog/diskusi dengan guru sejawat tentang bagaimana meningkatkan pembelajaran/pengajaran ..</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Lainnya (mohon dituliskan):_________________</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_________________
16. Pikirkan tentang pengembangan profesi yang Bapak/Ibu butuhkan, mohon indikasikan sejauh mana Bapak/Ibu membutuhkan peningkatan atau pengembangan diri untuk hal-hal di bawah ini.

*Mohon dicentang salah satu pilihan di setiap pernyataan.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan</th>
<th>Tidak dibutuhkan</th>
<th>Kurang</th>
<th>Sedang</th>
<th>Sangat dibutuhkan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Standar nasional pendidikan</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Penilaian siswa</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Managemen kelas</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Pengetahuan dan pemahaman (kompetensi) mata pelajaran yang saya ajarkan</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Pengetahuan dan pemahaman (kompetensi) pedagogik tentang mata pelajaran yang saya ajarkan</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Keterampilan TIK untuk pengajaran</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Pengajaran untuk siswa bekebutuhan khusus</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Menangani perilaku bermasalah dan kedisiplinan siswa</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Managemen dan administrasi sekolah</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Pengajaran multikultural</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Konseling siswa</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Lainnya (mohon ditulis):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Dalam kurun waktu 18 bulan terakhir, apakah Bapak/Ibu menginginkan atau membutuhkan kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru lebih dari sekedar yang Bapak/Ibu telah ikuti?

☐ 1 Ya
☐ 2 Tidak

18. Jika Bapak/Ibu menjawab ‘Ya’ pada pertanyaan no. 17, dari pernyataan berikut mana yang paling tepat menjelaskan alasan yang menghalangi atau menghambat Bapak/Ibu untuk mengikuti kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru lebih dari sekedar yang Bapak/Ibu sudah ikuti?

*Mohon dicentang pilihan-pilihan (bisa lebih dari satu) yang sesuai dengan kondisi Bapak/Ibu.*

☐ 1 Saya tidak memenuhi persyaratan (kualifikasi, pengalaman, senioritas).
☐ 1 Kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut terlalu mahal/Saya tidak mampu.
☐ 1 Tidak ada dukungan dari sekolah (Kepala sekolah, ketua yayasan).
☐ 1 Kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru tersebut berbenturan/bersamaan dengan jadwal mengajar.
☐ 1 Saya tidak memiliki waktu dikarenakan tanggung jawab keluarga.
☐ 1 Kegiatan pengembangan professional guru yang ditawarkan tidak sesuai dengan yang saya butuhkan/inginkan.
☐ 1 Lainnya (mohon dijelaskan): __________________________________________________________________________
Pada tahap penelitian selanjutnya saya akan melakukan wawancara (sekitar 30 menit) untuk mendapatkan informasi lebih mendalam dan rinci tentang kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru, karakter guru dan kondisi sekolah yang mempengaruhi kegiatan pengembangan profesi guru bagi peningkatan kompetensi/kualitas guru. Wawancara ini dijadwalkan akan dilaksanakan dalam rentang periode:

- Wilayah Kota Makassar : Tanggal 29 Oktober s.d. 2 November 2013
- Wilayah Kota Pare-Pare : Tanggal 5 s.d. 9 November 2013
- Wilayah Kab. Wajo : Tanggal 12 s.d. 16 November 2013

Untuk itu Bapak/Ibu yang berminat/bersedia untuk menjadi peserta wawancara tersebut, dimohon untuk melengkapi isian berikut.

Saya tertarik untuk berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan wawancara dalam tahapan selanjutnya dari penelitian ini.

| Nama | : | ________________________________ |
|-------------------|
| HP | : | ________________________________ |
| Telepon Rumah | : | ________________________________ |
| Preferensi Tanggal/Waktu | : | 1. Tanggal: _______2013/Pukul _______ |
| | | 2. Tanggal: _______2013/Pukul _______ |
Appendix 11a

Interview Protocol for Teachers (English)

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS

Introduction by interviewer:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to document a range of perceptions, thoughts and judgments about teacher professional development (TPD) and factors that support or impede TPD to improve your learning and teaching. Thus, this interview is aimed at giving you opportunity to share with me your personal experiences, perception and thoughts towards your involvement in TPD activities.

I will ask you some questions about yourself, your TPD activities and then about your school. Please be assured that anything you say will be treated confidentially and your name will not be associated with the data when it is reported. Is there any question you would like to ask about your participation?

Would you mind if I record your interview to allow me to concentrate on our conversation rather than taking notes as well as for accuracy? [If yes, start recording. If no, take handwriting notes]

I. These questions are about you.
   ▪ Can you tell me how do you see yourself as a learner when you participate in a TPD/learning activity??
   ▪ How do you learn in your TPD activities?
   ▪ How do you know when your are learning something from your TPD activities?
   ▪ How did you decide what to learn or what not to learn?
   ▪ In TPD activity, what were your own personal attributes/characteristics that affect your learning?
      How these personal attributes/characteristics affect your learning?

II. The next group of questions explores your TPD activities.
   ▪ In general, can you tell me about TPD activities that you have participated in?
   ▪ You picked ……………….. (Type of TPD activity the participants chose as having large impact in the questionnaire). Do you have any reasons of choosing this particular type of TPD activity? Can you tell me about it?
   ▪ Do you think that a particular type of TPD activity is more likely to make/help you to learn? How these types/kinds of TPD activities make/help you to learn?
   ▪ What were the features of TPD activities that helped you to learn?
   ▪ Are you well informed of the underlying objectives/purposes or assumptions of the TDP activities you were participated? If yes, did it help you in your learning? In what ways? If not, do you think it is helpful or useful to know the underlying objectives/purposes of the TDP activities you were participated in?

III. The next set of questions seeks to understand your current work/school conditions.
   ▪ How would you describe your school condition in relation to your professional development (participation in, learning from and implementation of your TPD)?
   ▪ Do you communicate ideas/information gained from your TPD with your principal and or colleagues? If yes, How? If not, why?
   ▪ What do you think of your principal’s role in your learning? Can you give examples?
   ▪ What is your colleagues’ role in your learning? Can you give examples?
   ▪ Do you think conditions at your school are conducive to your learning/ development? [If yes] How? [If no] Could you tell me what impedes your learning/ development?

IV. Concluding questions
   ▪ How your personal characteristics, features or characteristics of TPD activities and circumstances of your school affect your participation in, learning from and implementation of your TPD?
   ▪ Do you have any other comments that you would like to make regarding our discussion today?
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Interview Protocol for Teachers (Indonesia)

PERTANYAAN WAWANCARA UNTUK GURU

Pendahuluan oleh pewawancara:


Saya bisa lebih berkonsentrasi dalam wawancara ini jika saya tidak harus mencatat pembicaraan kita, untuk itu apakah Bapak/Ibu tidak keberatan kalau saya merekam wawancara ini? Perekaman ini juga bertujuan untuk akurasi data di kemudian hari. [Jika Tidak, mulai pencatatan. Jika Ya, mulai perekaman]

I. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan diri/pradi Bapak/Ibu.

- Dalam konteks PPG, Bagaimana anda melihat diri anda sebagai seorang pembelajar?
- Bagaimana anda belajar ketika mengikuti/terlibat dalam kegiatan PPG yang anda ikuti?
- Bagaimana anda tahu kalau anda mempelajari atau mendapatkan sesuatu dari kegiatan PPG yang anda ikuti?
- Bagaimana anda menentukan/memutuskan apa yang anda ingin pelajari atau tidak ingin pelajari?
- Berkaitan dengan kegiatan-kegiatan PPG, karakter/sifat pribadi Bapak/Ibu seperti apa yang mempengaruhi pembelajaran Bapak/Ibu? Bagaimana karakter/sifat pribadi tersebut mempengaruhi pembelajaran Bapak/Ibu?

II. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan kegiatan-kegiatan PPG yang telah Bapak/Ibu ikuti/laksanakan.

- Secara umum, bisakah Bapak/Ibu ceritakan mengenai kegiatan-kegiatan PPG yang pernah Bapak/Ibu ikuti?
- Anda memiliki … (Sebutkan jenis kegiatan PPG yang dipilih oleh partisipan dalam kuesioner sebagai kegiatan PPG yang membawa dampak besar terhadap pengembangan profesi nya) Apakah Bapak/Ibu memiliki alasan tertentu memilih kegiatan ini? Bisakah Bapak/Ibu jelaskan alasannya?
- Bagaimana ciri-ciri kegiatan PPG yang membantu/membuat Bapak/Ibu belajar?

III. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan kondisi sekolah/ tempat kerja Bapak/Ibu.

- Bagaimana Bapak/Ibu menggambarkan kondisi/situasi sekolah Bapak/Ibu dikaitkan dengan partisipasi, pembelajaran dan implementasi pengetahuan atau keterampilan yang Bapak/Ibu dapatkan dalam kegiatan PPG?
- Apakah Bapak/Ibu mengkomunikasikan ide-ide/informasi yang Bapak/Ibu dapatkan dalam PPG dengan kepala sekolah dan atau teman sejawat? Jika ya, bagaimana?. Jika tidak, kenapa?
Apa dan bagaimana peran teman sejawat dalam pembelajaran Bapak/Ibu? Bisakah Bapak/Ibu berikan contoh?


IV. Pertanyaan penutup.

Bagaimana karakter pribadi Bapak/Ibu, kegiatan PPG dan kondisi sekolah Bapak/Ibu memengaruhi partisipasi dan pembelajaran Bapak/Ibu serta implementasi dari pengetahuan dan keterampilan yang didapatkan dari kegiatan PPG yang Bapak/Ibu ikuti?

Apakah ada hal lain yang ingin Bapak/Ibu tambahkan/sampaikan dari diskusi/wawancara kita hari ini?
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Interview Protocol for Principals (English)

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH PRINCIPALS

Introduction by interviewer:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to document a range of perceptions, thoughts and judgments about teacher professional development (TPD) and factors that support or impede the successfulness of TPD to improve teachers’ instructional or pedagogical practices. Thus, this interview is aimed at giving you opportunity to share with me your personal experiences, perception and thoughts towards your teachers’ professional development and your school conditions with regards to teacher professional development.

I will ask you some questions about yourself, TPD activities of your teachers and then about your school. Please be assured that anything you say will be treated confidentially and your name will not be associated with the data when it is reported. Is there any question you would like to ask about your participation?

Would you mind if I record your interview to allow me to concentrate on our conversation rather than taking notes as well as for accuracy? [if yes, start recording. If no, take handwriting notes]

I. These questions are about you.
   - Can you describe your relation to your teachers in general?
   - How do you communicate and interact with your teachers?
   - How do you see your role in your teachers’ learning and professional development?
   - In what ways do you support and or direct your teachers’ learning and professional development?

II. The next group of questions explores TPD activities of your teachers.
   - How would you generally describe the professional development of your teachers? [their participation in, learning from and implementation of their TPD]
   - What types/kinds of TPD activities that your teachers participated in?
   - Are there any TPD activities conducted in or provided by your school? If yes, what are they and how are they conducted?
   - How do TPD activities allow for your teachers’ learning and professional development?

III. The next set of questions seeks to understand your current work/school conditions.
   - Does your school have [strategic] plans for the professional development of your teachers? If yes, tell me about it.
   - How would you describe the conditions of your school in relation to the professional development of your teachers?

IV. Concluding questions
   - How do you see yourself, your teachers, and TPD activities influence your teachers’ participation in, learning from and implementation of your TPD?
   - Do you have any other comments that you would like to make regarding our discussion today?
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Interview Protocol for Principals (Indonesia)

PERTANYAAN WAWANCARA UNTUK KEPALA SEKOLAH

Pendahuluan oleh pewawancara:


Saya bisa lebih berkonsentrasi dalam wawancara ini jika saya tidak harus mencatat pembicaraan kita, untuk itu apakah Bapak/Ibu tidak keberatan kalau saya merekam wawancara ini? Perekaman ini juga bertujuan untuk akurasi data di kemudian hari. [Jika Tidak, mulai perekaman. Jika Ya, mulai pencatatan]

I. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan diri/pribadi Bapak/Ibu

- Secara umum, bagaimana Bapak/Ibu menggambarkan hubungan Bapak/Ibu dengan guru-guru di sekolah?
- Bagaimana Bapak/Ibu berkomunikasi dan berinteraksi dengan guru-guru di sekolah?
- Bagaimana peran Bapak/Ibu terhadap pembelajaran dan pengembangan profesi guru-guru di sekolah Bapak/Ibu?
- Cara apakah yang Bapak/Ibu tempuh untuk mendukung dan atau mengarahkan pembelajaran dan pengembangan profesi guru-guru di sekolah Bapak/Ibu?

II. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan kegiatan-kegiatan PPG yang telah diikuti/laksanakan oleh guru-guru di sekolah Bapak/Ibu.

- Jenis/bentuk kegiatan PPG seperti apa yang diikuti/laksanakan oleh guru-guru yang ada sekolah Bapak/Ibu?
- Apakah ada kegiatan PPG yang dilaksanakan atau disiapkan oleh sekolah? Jika ya, jenis kegiatannya seperti apa? dan bagaimana pelaksanaannya?
- Bagaimana kegiatan PPG memberikan kesempatan/ peluang bagi guru untuk belajar dan mengembangkan profesiannya?

III. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan berikut berkaitan dengan kondisi sekolah Bapak/Ibu.

- Bagaimana Bapak/Ibu menggambarkan kondisi sekolah Bapak/Ibu kaitannya dengan pengembangan profesi guru-guru yang ada di sekolah Bapak/Ibu?

V. Pertanyaan penutup

- Bagaimana Bapak/Ibu melihat keterkaitan antara peran Bapak/Ibu [sebagai kepala sekolah] guru-guru yang ada di sekolah serta kegiatan PPG memengaruhi partisipasi dan pembelajaran guru-guru serta implementasi dari pengetahuan dan keterampilan yang didapatkan dari kegiatan PPG yang diikuti oleh guru-guru di sekolah Bapak/Ibu?
- Apakah ada hal lain yang ingin Bapak/Ibu tambahkan/sampaikan dari diskusi/wawancara kita hari ini?