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Novice teachers experience numerous challenges on their pathway to becoming highly-qualified teachers. Often times, the transition from student teacher to classroom teacher are filled with obstacles – some transparent, yet many unforeseen (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Alarmingly, more than a third of all new teachers choose to leave the profession within their first five years of entering the profession (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2014). Lack of support, classroom management issues, increased workloads, inadequate preparedness, lack of materials, and more are only a sample of the reported concerns germane to beginning teachers (Leukens, Lyter & Fox, 2004; Stockard & Lehman, 2004). Juxtapose these concerns with ever-increasing parental and community involvement coupled with the demands of working in a high socioeconomic and high-achieving school district can create a challenging environment for many novice teachers.

In response to such concerns, school districts have created induction programs in an effort to assist novice teachers overcome these challenges (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Johnson, 2004; & Wong, 2001). In an effort to understand beginning teacher’s experiences in high-achieving and high socioeconomic school districts, this case study (Yin, 2008) explored beginning teacher’s experiences in an induction program in a high-achieving and high socioeconomic school district in the Northeast.

The major findings from this study included the inconsistencies in the delivery and implementation of the induction program components, the induction program’s focus on school and district issues rather than on pedagogical needs of the novice teachers, and the increased
levels of stress and anxiety experienced by the beginning teachers as a result of participating in the induction program. In short, the findings suggest the induction program that was designed to assist and prepare beginning teachers to work in such an environment inadvertently increased the stress and anxiety it was designed to alleviate.

Accordingly, the findings from this case study support and extend the literature on the need for induction programs for beginning teachers but more importantly, provide a foundation for future investigations into teacher’s perceptions and experiences in induction programs at high achieving and high socioeconomic school districts.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Teacher turnover is a chronic problem confronting the public schools in the United States. The National Center for Educational Statistics estimates that as many as 20% of new teachers will leave the profession within their first three years of employment, and as many as 50% of new teachers in urban school districts leave the profession within five years (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2014). As a result of teacher turnover, each year school officials are faced with the daunting challenge of filling numerous vacancies in our nation’s classrooms. The time and resources expended on filling teacher vacancies as a result of turnover may be better used by concentrating efforts on retaining the present teaching corps. In an effort to stem the tide of teacher turnover, school officials have designed novice teacher induction programs. The purpose of this case study was to describe new teachers’ experiences in an induction program in a suburban, high-achieving school district with strong parental involvement.

Research Problem

Teacher attrition rates are highest among the inexperienced and unprepared teacher pool rather than among traditionally trained teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003; Ingersoll & Perda, 2010; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Moreover, public school teachers with fewer than 10 years of teaching experience are more likely than their more experienced colleagues to move to different schools, further compounding the problem of teacher turnover (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Some of the reasons cited for beginning teachers exiting the profession include among others: job difficulty, job intensity, reality shock, dissatisfaction with support from administrators, increased workloads, classroom management
issues, and poor salaries and benefits (Bogler, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Luekens, Lyter, & Fox, 2004; Smith & Finch, 2010; Stockard & Lehman, 2004).

One response to the issue of teacher turnover is to institute teacher induction programs (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Johnson, 2004; Strong, 2009). Teacher induction programs are broadly defined in the literature as a process of systematically training and supporting new teachers beginning prior to the first day of school and continuing throughout the first three years of teaching. The purposes of an induction program include: (a) easing the transition into teaching; (b) improving teacher effectiveness through training in classroom management and effective teaching techniques; (c) promoting the district’s culture; and (d) increasing the retention rate for high-qualified teachers (Wong, 2001). The literature suggested in order to reduce teacher turnover, a quality induction program must first have as its focus a long-term or multiple-year perspective so that new teachers have the support and resources necessary to succeed in the classroom (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wong, 2001; Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008). Ultimately, the goal of induction programs must not only be to retain teachers but also to improve teaching and learning, afford new teachers the opportunity to learn more about their students, school and community in which they now belong and to assist novice teachers in the understanding of their roles and the culture of the organization (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Moir & Gless, 2001; Strong, 2009; Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008).

Despite the support for induction programs, most of the literature was unclear about the effectiveness of such programs. As a whole, the literature pertaining to teacher induction programs was descriptive in nature, mostly based on essays and advocacy literature that reports promising or exemplary practices. While these studies offered insight into what induction
programs look like, they did not describe how teacher induction programs prepare novice teachers to begin teaching in high-achieving suburban school settings. Further, the literature on induction programs was broad in nature and did not adequately address variables such as socioeconomic status of the community, district size, school size, and geographic location. Two studies (Johnson, 2004 and Smith & Ingersoll, 2004;) showed a link between teacher induction programs and teacher retention suggested that induction programs that span three years or more, provide mentoring, individualized professional development and opportunities for teachers to meet together to discuss ongoing classroom issues, have a positive influence on teacher retention. However, only one of these studies (Johnson, 2004) asked new teachers about their experiences and evaluation of the induction process.

Perhaps more perplexing was the scant research on how induction programs differ across school and district settings. Most discussions of induction focused on teaching and learning and for good reason; however, less examined was how induction programs helped teachers understand other pertinent variables such as school, community, organizational culture, expectations and parents.

This case study explored how an induction program helped prepare teachers to teach in one high-achieving suburban school district marked with a strong organizational culture, in which there are high expectations for staff and student success as well a high degree of parental involvement.

Pilot Study

In partial fulfillment of a qualitative research course, this investigator conducted a small pilot study. The purpose of the pilot qualitative case study was to explore four teachers’ experiences in an induction program in a high-achieving suburban district, how the induction
program prepared these teachers to adapt to teaching in this setting, and how this suburban district structured the induction program. Teachers experiences were examined using interviews, observations and through the collection of documents. After a careful analysis of the data, several key findings were determined to answer the guiding questions.

One of the significant findings of this study was the feeling of stress and anxiety experienced by novice teachers. Both novice teachers and experienced teachers new to the district discussed their perceived and real challenges of teaching in a district with significant parental and community involvement. Further, teachers reported that district expectations also contributed to increased anxiety and pressure. Equally compelling, was the finding that the district induction program increased new teachers’ feelings of stress and being overwhelmed due to activities and discussions pertaining to the parental and community involvement. A third significant finding of this study revealed that the induction program was heavily laden in providing novice teachers with knowledge of students, parents, and community in lieu of more central tasks, such as designing curriculum and instruction. Subsequently, the induction program was geared more toward preparing teachers for parental involvement rather than assisting novice teachers with pedagogical concerns (Struncis, 2009).

A fourth finding of this pilot study did not pertain to the similar experiences of teachers but rather to the different experiences the teachers encountered. Both novice and experienced teachers new to the district reported very different experiences in both the hiring process and within the mentoring program. The hiring experiences ranged from the common interviews and demonstration lessons to lengthy essay requirements for some, but not all, applicants. The inconsistencies in the hiring process for these teachers paralleled the inconsistencies in the mentoring program. Novice teachers’ experiences with the mentoring program ranged from
occasional informal meetings with mentors to structured, scheduled meetings with mentors (Struncis, 2009).

Additional findings of this pilot study included the multiple capacities necessary to design and implement an induction program. In this high socioeconomic district in which resources were readily available, the findings suggest there were multiple challenges in designing and implementing an induction program. Human and social capacities were strained in both the design and implementation of the program. Furthermore, there were program cuts due to limited human capacities that had a significant impact on induction activities, including mentoring (Struncis, 2009). With almost unlimited financial resources, the district’s struggle to sustain other components of the induction program raises concerns not only for this program but for induction programs in general.

Although this pilot study was limited to a small group of four teachers, the findings from this study supported and extended the literature (Ingersoll, R. & Strong, M. 2011; Johnson, S. 2004; Smith, T. & Ingersoll, R. 2004) regarding the need for future investigations into how induction programs prepare novice teachers.

This researcher used a case study methodology and results of the pilot study to more accurately focus the research questions and types of teachers to be investigated in this proposed study. The pilot study also helped the researcher in the types of questions to ask during the interviews and how to process the large amount of data collected. The pilot study provided the framework for this dissertation.
Research Questions

This dissertation examined how one novice teacher induction program prepared beginning teachers to teach in a high-achieving suburban school district. There was one major research question guiding this study and several subquestions. The primary research question was:

How does the induction program in one suburban school district in the Northeast prepare beginning teachers to teach in a high-achieving school setting?

The subquestions were:

(a) What are novice teachers’ experiences in this induction program?

(b) How does this specific suburban school district structure the teacher induction program?

(c) What are the central tasks of induction in this specific program?

For instance, how much does the district focus on teaching and learning versus introducing teachers to the organizational culture and norms? Are some aspects of induction emphasized at the expense of others? To what extent does the induction program appear to address the reported needs of new teachers?

Study Design

The fundamental purposes of this study was to: (a) explore if and how an induction program prepared novice teachers to begin teaching in one high-achieving suburban school district; (b) describe how the induction program was structured; and (c) describe the teachers’ experiences in the induction program. To address these purposes, a case study design was employed. A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context (Yin, 2008).
Figure 1 illustrates how the study was conceptualized:

Figure 1 Conceptual Framework

This case study was explored through two lenses. First, organizational theory served as a lens in exploring how this induction program was created. Specifically, the research of Bolman and Deal (2003) was employed as one method of examining this induction program.

A second lens in this case study was Wong’s (2001) research on central tasks of induction. Wong (2001) suggested that all induction programs include specific tasks or components in order to be effective. According to Wong (2001) these ‘central tasks’ are common hallmarks of successful induction programs. These tasks are discussed below in the literature review.

Limitations

All research studies have limitations and no one study has a perfect design (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). This research study was a qualitative study focusing on one induction program
and as a result does not have the sample size to generalize to larger populations. Hence, this was a limitation of the study.

Second, data collection methods included interviews, observations and document analysis. Yin (2008) suggested that reliance on self-reported data from the participants may also be a limitation of case study research for the researcher relies on the participants’ self-reporting. Last, Yin (2008) also notes that relying on observations may also limit a study as the researcher may not be able to observe all the events.

Significance of the Study

Despite the limitations of this research design, this study was significant because it built and extended the induction literature by looking more deeply at one induction program in a high-performing school district in the Northeast. Specifically, this study aimed to explore how this induction program prepared teachers to adapt to teaching in this high-performing school setting. Exploring novice teachers’ experiences in an induction program in an affluent, high-achieving school district provided insight into developing future induction programs that more adequately respond to the needs of beginning teachers, resulting in greater teacher retention, performance and student achievement. Further, the findings from this study will help assist school administrators and all stakeholders to construct future induction programs that more adequately address the needs of novice teachers teaching in high-achieving school districts.

Summary

A strategy used to prepare beginning teachers for their world of work is to institute teacher induction programs (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Johnson, 2004; Wong, 2001). Teacher induction programs are broadly defined in the literature as a process of systematically training and supporting new teachers beginning prior
to the first day of school and continuing throughout the first three years of teaching (Wong, 2001). Ultimately, the goal of induction programs is to retain teachers, improve teaching and learning, afford new teachers the opportunity to learn more about their students, school and community in which they now belong and to assist novice teachers in the understanding of their role and the culture of the organization (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, Moir & Gless, 2001).

Although the number of studies on induction programs is increasing (Ingersoll, R. & Strong, M., 2011; Johnson, S., 2004; Kardos, M. & Johnson, S., 2008; Martin, E., Andrews, S. & Gilbert, L., 2009; Moir, E. & Gless, J., 2001; Smith, T. & Ingersoll, R., 2004; Strong, M. 2009; Yusko, B. & Feiman-Nemser, S. 2008) there was little qualitative research investigating how induction programs prepare novice teachers to adapt to teaching in high-achieving suburban school settings. Further, the literature on induction programs is broad in nature and does not adequately address variables such as socioeconomic status of the community, district size, school size, and geographic location.

Perhaps more perplexing was the scant research on how induction programs differ across school and district settings. Most discussions of induction focused on teaching and learning and for good reason; however, less examined was how induction programs helped teachers understand other pertinent variables such as school, community, organizational culture, expectations and parental involvement. Consequently, this case study aimed to explore how one induction program helped prepare teachers to address these additional challenges. The findings of this study not only contributed to the literature based on how induction programs prepare novice teachers but also lay the groundwork for future investigators to explore induction programs in varied educational settings. In sum, this study sheds light on ways in which districts
can develop induction programs that will better prepare our novice teachers to enter into our nation’s classrooms.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Inherent in the research questions were issues related to teacher turnover and retention, the organizational structure of induction programs and the central tasks of induction. The concepts that framed this study were drawn from the literature on (1) need for teacher induction, (2) organizational theory, and (3) induction tasks.

The Need for Induction – Teacher Turnover and Retention

One of the many issues plaguing school administrators today is difficulty retaining beginning teachers. In comparison to most other occupations, teaching has one of the highest turnover rates (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). As a result, retaining highly qualified teachers has become a challenge for school administrators. Compounding this problem, the literature suggested that teacher supply may not meet teacher demand over the course of the next decade in both urban and rural areas, in science, math, and special education (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). Furthermore, the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) expects elementary and secondary student enrollment to increase approximately three percent between the years 2014 and 2026 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2014). As a result of teacher turnover, increasing student enrollments, and teacher retirements the number of beginning teachers needed in the next decade is in the millions (Gerald & Hussar, 2004). Further, the literature (Bogler, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003; Gerald & Hussar, 2004; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2001; Howard, 2003; Ingersoll, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2007; Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman, & Liu, 2001; Ng, 2003; Stockard & Lehman, 2004) on teacher turnover suggested retaining teachers will become a tremendous challenge for school officials.
In an attempt to reduce teacher turnover and increase teacher retention, school officials and administrators rely on teacher induction programs (Ingersoll, 2001). Wong (2001) defined induction as the process of systematically training and supporting new teachers beginning before the first day of school and continuing through the first two or three years of teaching with the end goal to increase teacher retention. One study (Ingersoll, 2001) examined the impact of novice teacher induction programs on teacher retention, suggested that induction has a positive impact on retaining novice teachers. Accordingly, understanding the reasons for teacher turnover may offer researchers insight into how to construct future induction programs.

Teacher Turnover

The number of teachers, specifically beginning teachers, leaving the profession is staggering. Between the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years, approximately ten percent of beginning public school teachers chose to leave the teaching profession (Gray & Taie, 2015). Further, these novice public school teachers were more likely than their more experienced colleagues to move to different schools in the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years. Moreover, a combined 27.0 percent of full-time teachers with less than five years teaching experience opted to move from their schools or leave the teaching profession entirely (Gray & Taie, 2015). Consequently, teachers who change or leave schools require school administrators to expend an enormous amount of time and resources filling the void left behind.

The literature suggested that some of the reasons that public school teachers move to new schools are opportunities for better teaching assignments, dissatisfaction with support from administrators, dissatisfaction with workplace conditions, better salaries and benefits, and pursuit of other careers (Bogler, 2001; Luekens, Lyter, & Fox, 2004; Stockard & Lehman, 2004). These
findings were significant because they highlighted several areas administrators can address through the development of teacher induction programs.

Public misperception blames the teacher shortage on supply and demand; whereas, these studies suggest the causes of teacher turnover may largely reside in the working conditions within schools and districts (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Furthermore, the literature (Bogler, 2001; Luekens, Lyter, & Fox, 2004) helps us to understand the nature of teacher turnover and mobility and subsequently, how it might be addressed. Employee dissatisfaction, lack of support, and poor workplace conditions among others, are all areas that can be addressed through quality induction programs. Research on teacher turnover explained why teachers opt to leave the profession, but, more importantly, research on teacher turnover also suggested strategies to remedy the problem. It appears that solving the problem of teacher turnover should not rely on simply adding more teachers to the workforce, but finding methods to retain novice teachers. A number of scholars argue that developing teacher induction programs is one such method (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2001; Johnson, S., 2004).

**Teacher Retention**

The literature on teacher induction programs and their impact on teacher retention is sparse. An initial review of the literature uncovered very few studies linking teacher induction and retention. Smith and Ingersoll (2004) conducted one of the most extensive studies on the impact of teacher induction programs on retention rates. Smith and Ingersoll analyzed data from the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) as well as the 2000-2001 Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) and reported several significant findings. First, participation in induction programs is steadily increasing. In the 1990-1991 school year, about four in ten beginning teachers participated in induction programs. In the 1999-2000 school year, participation rates in induction
programs rose to about eight out of ten. Perhaps the most compelling finding, however, was the discovery that beginning teachers who were provided with mentors and who participated in induction activities, such as collaboration with other teachers, were less likely to move to other schools and less likely to leave the teaching profession after their first year of teaching (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Contrary to most of the previous literature, Smith and Ingersoll’s analysis suggested that mentoring alone appears to have little impact on reducing the likelihood that a teacher changes schools at the end of their first year. Smith and Ingersoll’s (2004) analysis suggested that “mentoring as a stand-alone component has very little impact on teacher retention” (p. 21). However, when mentoring was combined with additional components such as seminars for new teachers, common planning time, participation in a network of other teachers, and supportive communications with the building principal, the probability of turnover decreased. This finding is critical to administrators and educational policymakers for several reasons. First, this finding informs the educational community that mentoring alone is not a panacea for teacher retention. Providing a beginning teacher with a mentor is necessary; however, it is not enough. Second, additional supports and programs are necessary in order for beginning teachers to be successful. As noted above, these support programs should address the needs of all teachers and be tailored to them. Administrators and policymakers should develop and implement induction programs that have multiple components if they hope to retain beginning teachers in their schools (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Smith and Ingersoll’s analysis of SASS and TFS suggested teacher induction programs do have a positive influence on teacher retention. These findings were significant as they provided evidence that teacher induction programs were beneficial in retaining novice teachers.
These data are useful for boards of education, administrators and policymakers who are concerned with retaining novice teachers. Additionally, principals should find the results of this analysis helpful in considering the evaluation or development of induction programs. Future educational researchers interested in exploring induction programs might be able to build on the findings of this study. A few of the questions worthy of future investigations are: what components of induction programs have the greatest impact on beginning teacher’s desire to remain in teaching?; how did the induction program prepare teachers to teach in their districts?; and what are the teacher’s experiences in teacher induction programs? Exploring such areas might yield useful data.

In addition to Smith and Ingersoll’s analysis of SASS and TFS, there are other studies and reports that examined the link between teacher retention and induction programs (Certo & Fox, 2002; Kelley, 2004; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1997; Sargent, 2003). The majority of these efforts focus on state and local initiatives. For example, Ponticell and Zepeda (1997) investigated the induction programs at three Illinois high schools by examining the self-identified problems of 62 first-year teachers. The results of this study suggested that formalized induction programs varied greatly by school. Ponticell and Zepeda (1997) reported that induction programs need to be tailored to the individual needs of the teachers in order to be successful.

Similarly, Certo and Fox’s (2002) study investigated teacher retention in seven Virginia school divisions not only revealed the influences on teacher attrition and retention but also recommended formalized induction programs as a means to retain quality teachers. This study found that school characteristics and organizational influences such as lack of administrative support, lack of planning time, and insufficient salary are the top reasons teachers leave the
profession. Certo and Fox (2002) suggested that administrators at all levels (building and district) must bear this in mind when designing induction programs.

Central Tasks of Induction

Wong (2001) provided the most thorough definition of induction as the process of systematically training and supporting new teachers beginning before the first day of school and continuing through the first two or three years of teaching. The purposes of induction programs include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) easing the transition into teaching; (b) improving teacher effectiveness thought training in classroom management and effective teaching techniques; (c) promoting the district’s culture – its philosophies, missions, policies, procedures, and goals; and (d) increasing the retention rate for highly-qualified teachers (Wong, 2001).

A review of the literature on induction programs identified several common denominators. These common strands included, but are not limited to: (a) a multi-year approach, (b) mentoring, (c) having a clear vision for the program, (d) ongoing professional development and growth for teachers; and (e) administrative and institutional support for induction programs (Johnson, 2004; Kelley, 2004; Kardos & Johnson, 2008; Liu & Kardos, 2002; Marshak & Klatz, 2002; Moir & Gless, 2002; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1997; Smith & Ingersoll, 2001).

According to Marshak and Klatz (2002) quality induction programs must span the course of several years. Induction programs should not be limited to a few orientation activities for beginning teachers at the start of each school year, but include a multi-year perspective. Also, a mentoring component should be included as part of any successful induction program. Mentoring is not a stand-alone process, however, an integral part of a quality induction program (Marshak & Klatz, 2002). Scholars (Kelley, 2004; Liu & Kardos, 2002; Martin, Andrews,
Gilbert, 2008; Moir & Gless, 2002; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1997) were in agreement and their research was consistent. Mentoring was a key component of any quality induction program; however, it was not a panacea.

Once the multi-year approach and mentoring were established as a part of the induction program, Marshak and Klatz (2002) suggested that the building principal and mentors work collaboratively to identify training needs for beginning teachers. Marshak and Klatz identified themes such as: (a) helping the new teacher develop an understanding of the school’s culture, traditions, and rituals; (b) learning more about the nature and goals for education as held by the community; (c) gaining insight into district and school policies and/or procedures; (d) learning how to adjust the teacher’s instructional delivery to better meet the needs and dispositions of individual students; (e) enhancing the skills and abilities of the teachers to engage students in higher level learning experiences; (f) aiding the teacher in gaining skill and insight in how to collect, analyze, and utilize data to make more informed decisions regarding planning instructional opportunities for students; (g) making use of existing technologies available within the school to supplement/improve instructional delivery; (h) understanding the need to insure a systemic approach to instructional delivery, such as between grade levels and/or subject areas; and (i) gaining a knowledge of how district and building efforts must blend with state and national standards as well as curriculum frameworks to insure what is tested is indeed being taught. Incorporating these themes as part of the mentoring component was the hallmark of the Marshak and Klatz (2002) plan for successful induction programs.

Similarly, Moir and Gless (2001) suggested that educational leaders design quality induction programs in order to retain teachers. Induction programs should include a clear vision, have institutional support, provide quality mentoring, establish professional standards, and place
an emphasis on classroom-based teacher-learning. Moir and Gless (2001) suggested that induction programs that include such central tasks may lead to increased teacher retention. Moir and Gless (2001) suggested that quality induction programs include a clear vision and “prepare teachers for the complex and demanding world of today’s schools” (p. 111).

In addition to a clear vision and institutional support, Moir and Gless (2001) noted that the most important feature of any high quality induction program is the new teacher mentor. Moir and Gless suggested, “nothing can substitute for the power of a knowledgeable and skillful veteran…the most effective mentors are those that intimately know the community, school-site, and classroom context of their novice partners” (p. 112).

Moir and Gless (2001) also included the establishment of professional standards as part of a quality induction program. “The enormous impact induction programs have when they are focused on a teacher’s classroom practice cannot be overlooked” (Moir & Gless, 2001, p.112). It is also imperative that new teacher programs recognize the period of induction (defined as two to three years) as an important and essential phase of teacher learning.

Lastly, Moir and Gless (2001) suggested that successful induction programs must embed opportunities for teacher growth into the jobs of beginning teachers based on the unique and diverse needs of each teacher’s classroom. Moir and Gless (2001) argued that effective induction programs help new teachers become on-the-job learners, who are constantly questioning and systematically inquiring into their classroom practice. In short, an investment in teacher quality starts at the earliest stages of a teacher’s career and continues throughout a professional lifetime (Moir & Gless, 2001).

One of most influential individuals responsible for carrying out these induction tasks is the building principal. Research demonstrated that principals’ influence on novice teachers is
significant, if not profound (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004). Principals often recruit novice teachers and represent the first and only person they know in a school (Brock & Grady, 1997). Novice teachers look foremost to principals for guidance and direction on how they should perform in schools (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Johnson, 2004). When novice teachers receive principal support they feel secure in their ability to make the transition from student teaching to teachers, and as a result, successfully complete the induction process (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004). When beginning teachers do not receive principal support and guidance, novice teachers often encounter problems in teaching and/or leave the school or the profession entirely (Brock & Grady, 1997).

In secondary schools, principals often play a tangential role in teacher induction. Frequently, implementing the induction program is the responsibility of a district or site-based coordinator. In secondary schools, particularly in high schools, principals often delegated induction duties to assistant principals or department chairs (Wood, 2005). As discussed above, one study (Wood, 2005) on novice teacher induction programs suggested the principal plays an active role in the induction process. Without principal involvement in new teacher induction, teacher attrition for beginning teachers may be the end result.

Wood’s (2005) study explored principals’ roles and participation in induction programs and suggested that principals are a key component in any successful induction program. Results of this study revealed that principals have five major roles in novice teacher induction programs: (a) school culture builder, (b) instructional leader, (c) coordinator of mentors, (d) novice teacher recruiters, and (e) novice teacher advocates/retainers.

An implication of this research was that the principal was a significant component in the delivery of novice teacher induction programs. “Despite the fact that educators seem to share a
commonly held belief that administrators are key, there are relatively few studies that explore causal or relational aspects of principal and novice teacher interactions” (Wood, 2005, p. 59). With the number of novice teachers needed over the next decade estimated to be in the millions, this was too important an issue to remain unexplored (Wood, 2005). In building a sound research base, principals can develop their professional roles in induction (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004). Wood (2005) suggested:

As more is learned about principals’ roles in the lives of novice teachers, principals will be able to institute supportive activities and build school cultures that are welcoming and user-friendly to novice teachers as they begin and build life-long careers in teaching. Principals who are aware of the roles they need to fulfill in the induction process will succeed in fostering successful, comprehensive induction programs aimed at retaining novice teachers (p. 59).

In sum, the research (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Johnson, S., 2004; Moir & Gless, 2001; Wood, 2005) suggested the central induction tasks such as a multi-year approach, mentoring, a clear vision, ongoing professional development, and administrative and organizational support for induction programs may contribute to the more effective design of induction programs.

Organizational Theory

The literature pertaining to organizational culture provided an additional lens in examining teacher induction programs by suggesting multiple perspectives as to why organizations, such as school districts, create programs such as novice teacher induction
programs. Bolman and Deal’s (2003) research on organizational culture suggested four frames in investigating organizations: structural, human resource, political and symbolic.

The structural frame was based on the belief that in any organization, an appropriate structure can be designed and implemented. These structures ensure that people focus on getting the job done. Specialization permits higher levels of individual expertise and performance. Coordination and control are essential to effectiveness and all organizational problems originate from inappropriate structures and can be resolved through reorganization or restructuring. In short, the structural frame supports efficiency, rules and regulations and the organization exists to accomplish established goals.

The human resource frame was based on the view that organizations exist to serve human needs, and that organizations and people need each other. When the fit between the individual and the organization is poor, both will suffer and conversely when the fit between the individual and the organization is good, both will benefit (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The political frame may be summarized as a struggle between power and conflict. In all organizations, including schools, important decisions involve the allocation of scarce resources. Organizations are composed of coalitions and interest groups. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiating, and jockeying for power. In short, power and conflict are central features of organizational life (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The symbolic frame may best be defined as what matters in an organization is not what happens, but what it means to participants. Events and meanings are loosely coupled and there is no clear connection between events. In short, faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability and provide direction. Organizations have distinct cultures that may be positive or negative, strong or weak. The symbolic frame was
characterized by myths, rituals, ceremonies and sagas which help people find meaning in their organizational experience (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Collectively, these four frames: structural, human resource, political and symbolic provided a lens into exploring how novice teacher induction programs are organized. Additionally, organizational culture tries to show a deeper understanding of cultural issues in organizations, which is necessary not only to decipher what goes on in them but, even more important, to identify what may be the priority issues for leaders and leadership (Schein, 1983, p. 490).

A further study (Schein, 1983) on organizational culture suggested that insufficient attention has been paid to the possibility that groups and organizations, such as schools, also develop cultures that affect how the members think, feel, and act.

Schein (1983) suggested there were several common meanings for organizational culture. For instance, observed behavioral regularities, norms, values, philosophy, rules and the climate all reflect the organization’s culture; however, the basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by the members of an organization ultimately shape and define the organization’s culture.

Schein further suggested that culture is a learned product of group experience and is, therefore, found only where there is a definable group with a significant history (p. 493).

In short, Schein defines culture:

as a pattern of basic assumptions – invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration – that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p.494)
Accordingly, Bolman and Deal (2003) and Schein’s (1983) research on organizational culture provided a lens to explore a school district’s induction program. The research (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Schein, 1983) suggested that the basic assumptions and beliefs of an organization ultimately shape and define the culture. School districts select specific tasks to include in an induction program based on its culture. These tasks emphasize the priorities and values the school district has set for the induction program for beginning teachers.

Research Questions

Beyond initial teacher preparation, scant attention was paid to the induction of teachers. The traditional method of baptism-by-fire, by which beginning teachers relied on their training and preparation, was not sufficient and exerted a high price on new teachers, their students, and the entire school community (Lortie, 2002). Induction programs, virtually unknown two decades ago, carry an enormous responsibility and hope.

Scholars (Billingsley, 2004; Certo & Fox, 2002; Danielson, 2002; Ingersoll, 2001; Kelley, 2004; Liu & Kardos, 2002; Marshak & Klotz, 2002; Mertz, 2004; Meyer, 2002; Mills, Moore, & Keane, 2001; Moir & Gless, 2001; Olebe, 2001; Sargent, 2003; Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2002) began studying induction programs in the 1980’s and 1990’s, when a growing number of induction programs were first offered; however, the majority of these studies were conceptual in outlining individual induction programs and only reported on the various components of successful induction programs. During this span of twenty years, research on induction programs produced numerous studies, yet there were very few case studies that explored the central tasks of induction programs, what districts emphasized in conducting induction programs, and teachers’ experiences in these induction programs. Moreover, the literature on induction programs is scarce pertaining to high-achieving, high socio-economic
school districts. Boards of education, superintendents, and administrators should be interested in the results of such studies.

Educators and policymakers continue to advocate for the need for induction programs; however, the focus of such programs should explore paradigms of induction programs that address the needs of our beginning teachers. Identifying successful components of induction programs that demonstrate a positive link to positive teacher outcomes will enable all stakeholders in the induction process to construct and implement successful induction programs. Research indicates that teachers have an opportunity to become high quality teachers if they can survive the first few years of teaching (Kain & Singleton, 1996). Constructing novice teacher induction programs based on research findings from successful programs may enable schools to increase teacher retention, ultimately improving student achievement.

In short, a review of the literature: (a) suggested why beginning teachers need induction programs; (b) explored the central tasks of induction; (c) discussed how induction programs are organized; and (d) identified how induction programs may support the professional needs of teachers. Further, the literature identified several key findings: (a) teacher turnover is a substantial problem plaguing our schools; (b) there appears to be several central tasks to successful induction programs; (c) research on induction programs shows promise in increasing the retention rates of beginning teachers; and (d) further exploratory research is necessary to uncover the impact teacher induction programs may have on increasing teacher retention. However, the literature exploring teacher’s induction experiences in affluent, high-achieving school districts was scarce. Further, only a handful of studies (Certo & Fox, 2002; Johnson, 2004; Kelley, 2004; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1997; Sargent, 2003; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004) attempted to address the influence teacher induction programs have on beginning teachers. While
these studies are encouraging, further exploratory research is necessary if we are to fully understand the potential benefits of induction programs in high-achieving suburban school settings. Hence, there was one major research question guiding this study and several subquestions. The primary research question was:

How does the induction program in one Northeastern suburban school district prepare beginning teachers to teach in a high-achieving school setting?

The subquestions include:

(a) What are the novice teachers’ experiences in this induction program?

(b) How does this specific suburban school district structure the teacher induction program?

(c) What central tasks of induction does this program emphasize?

For instance, how much does the district focus on teaching and learning versus introducing teachers to the organizational culture and norms? Are some aspects of induction emphasized at the expense of others? To what extent does the induction program appear to address the reported needs of new teachers?

Summary

The literature suggested there was a great need for new teacher induction programs. Research indicated that teacher turnover was highest among the inexperienced and unprepared teacher pool rather than among traditionally trained teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). Overall, 30 percent of new teachers leave the profession within their first five years of teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Moreover, one half of teachers who begin their careers as uncertified/unlicensed teachers leave the profession within five years, while 14 percent of teachers who are certified at the start of their careers leave the profession within this
same period (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). Attrition rates for teachers who did not complete student teaching, are more than doubled those for teachers who did complete student teaching (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). In short, the literature on teacher turnover suggested that adding more teachers to the field is not a solution to the problem of teacher turnover; however, novice teacher induction programs may provide such a solution. While examining teacher turnover, scholars (Certo & Fox, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Ingersoll, 2003; Kelley, 2004; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1997; Sargent, 2003; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004) suggested that quality induction programs may be one strategy in reducing teacher turnover.

The data suggested that the turnover rate for beginning teachers is higher than any other group of teachers. Accordingly, building administrators might want to focus attention on providing quality induction programs for beginning teachers. The literature discussed above examined teacher turnover and cited reasons (employee dissatisfaction, lack of support, and poor workplace conditions) why teachers opt to leave the field. Understanding teacher turnover and retention is necessary because strong evidence exists to suggest that teacher quality rises sharply after the initial few years of teaching (Kain & Singleton, 1996). Perhaps districts that offer quality induction programs may be able to better prepare their novice teachers to adapt to their teaching environments and ultimately retain these beginning teachers. Perhaps school leaders and policymakers may stem the tide of teacher turnover through the creation and implementation of quality induction programs aimed at addressing the needs of beginning teachers.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The population from which the sample was taken was a group of teachers who participated in the novice teacher induction program at the start of the school year. Purposeful sampling (Yin, 2008) was used to select the teachers who were identified as “information rich” in terms of their experience in the program. Six teachers were selected. The administrator in charge of the program as well as the induction program coordinators served as participants in the study.

A convenience sample of six teacher participants was selected for this study. In addition to the teachers selected, the administrator and program coordinators overseeing and involved in the program participated. The administrator and teacher coordinators in charge of the program were selected by default as they are the only individuals who served in these roles.

Setting

The setting for this study was a suburban high school district in the Northeast. The school district served approximately 2,100 students in grades nine through twelve with a staff of more than 100 teachers. The student population was culturally diverse; however, the majority of the student population was Caucasian. Each year the school hired new teachers as a result of turnover, retirement, and program expansion. The site for this study was purposefully chosen since the site matched the criteria of being a high-achieving, suburban school district in the Northeast. For the purpose of this study, high-achieving was defined as a district in which more than 90% of the students continue their education at a four-year institution, 95% of students scored at or above proficiency levels on the state graduation exam and students in the district had
a combined SAT average of more than 1100. The average median household salary in this community in which the district was located was more than $160,000.00 and the average median price of a home in the district was more than $750,000.00 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). Last, I identified “reputationally successful” induction programs to complete the district selection process. In the selected district, the teacher induction program was an ongoing multi-year program that began with a technology camp and summer orientation program for all new teachers prior to the start of the first day of the first school year. New teachers were assigned mentors for the first year and were encouraged to participate in monthly meetings as part of the cohort of new teachers. In years two and three of the induction program, novice teachers were asked to voluntarily participate in professional development.

Participants

Participants were six highly-qualified teachers (See Table 1) who participated in the teacher induction program. The participants were first-year teachers or novice teachers with less than three years teaching experience who were new to the district.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th># Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Traditional or Alternate Route</th>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
<th>School A or B</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African-Amer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

For this study an induction program was defined as the process of systematically training and supporting new teachers beginning before the first day of school and continuing through the first year or more of teaching (Wong, 2001).

Data Collection

Multiple data collection methods were utilized to portray how the induction program prepared novice teachers to teach in a high-achieving, suburban school district. These methods included (a) formal interviews with the selected teachers; (b) informal interviews with program coordinators (administrators) and induction program staff; (c) observations of selected teachers in the induction program; and (d) collection of induction program materials and documents. These methods of data collection afforded me the opportunity to create a rich description and provide a context to the teachers’ experiences.

Following a set of open-ended questions about the teachers’ perceptions of induction programs and expected outcomes, semi-structured interviews were conducted with six teachers. The interview questions were mapped directly back to the research questions.

Interviews

Each teacher participated in a one-on-one interview utilizing a semi-structured approach (Merriam, 1998). This method allowed for set predetermined questions (see Appendix E) to be asked; however, there was flexibility as to how and in what order they were presented. The administrator and program coordinators were also interviewed using an in-depth/open-ended approach (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Siedman, 1998). Field notes during the interviews were recorded on a legal pad reflecting notes, key statements, and/or connections to the literature. The teacher interviews focused on a biographical description of the participant,
or her overall perceptions of teacher induction programs, and his or her experience in the teacher induction program. The interview consisted of the participants’ experiences in the induction program as well as the participants’ evaluations of the induction program. Ultimately, the interview questions lead to a meaningful description of the teachers’ experiences in the teacher induction program, as well as evaluations of the components of the teacher induction program. Interviews were conducted at a time and place to ensure privacy and no interruptions. The interviews also occurred at a time that was convenient to the participants. Interviews lasted approximately 45-60 minutes and allowed time for further exploration. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for emerging themes, categories and assertions. The recordings were provided to the participants to review for accuracy. Member checks were conducted with each participant. Interview consent forms were also included. Noted on the tape and transcription were the names of the interviewee, time, date, and location of the interview, as well as the interview questions, responses, and comments of the investigator. The data was collected and saved. Research documents included audio recordings, interview notes, journals, induction documents, and other data that were dated and placed in a locked file to ensure confidentiality.

Observations

Another primary source of data in qualitative research are observations (Merriam, 1998). Observations provide an encounter with the phenomenon of interest rather than a secondhand account of the world obtained in an interview (Merriam, 1998). Each teacher was observed once during the initial new teacher orientation that traditionally serves as the “unofficial” start to the teacher induction program. Observations were general, yet descriptive. The primary method of data collection during the observations was a running record via Word on a laptop computer. Observational field notes and information pertaining to the setting, participants, interactions of
participants, and other potential events were also recorded (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Field notes, including thoughts and reflections on the events that occurred during the induction program, were also recorded. Also, demographic data were collected on each of the participants using a data collection sheet.

Documents

District-wide induction documents and materials included new teacher orientation booklets, agendas, mission statements, lesson plans and additional shared induction artifacts. Each were collected and reviewed. The merit of this type of data collection and analysis was based on the fact that it was unobtrusive, nonreactive and allowed me to review and analyze the documents with little or no disruption to the setting (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

The use of these data collection methods: interviews, observations and documents enabled me to check the validity of the findings through multiple data collection methods. Interviews gave the teachers a voice regarding their experience in the induction program. Observations provided an example of the teachers’ experiences while participating in the induction activities. Collection of documents also widened the context of the study and aided in the examination process to find common themes. These multiple data collection methods assisted in eliminating biases that may result from relying on one specific data source (Yin, 2008).

Data Analysis

The overall goal of data analysis was for me to sort out and make sense of all the information collected. This was done through consolidation, reduction, and interpretation (Merriam, 2009). Because qualitative research is holistically emergent, data collection and analysis was a process that took place concurrently. That is, as data was collected in the early stages, I began to organize and manage the data as themes began to emerge. However, this does
not mean that when data collection was completed, data analysis ceased as well. Rather, it was quite the opposite in that the date analysis intensified to ensure that every piece of data collected was examined (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016).

When it comes to analyzing qualitative data for case studies, there are some additional features to consider due to its intensive description and bounded nature. Demonstrating a deep understanding of the case is crucial in analyzing that data (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). A case study is all-inclusive in nature. Simplifying, synthesizing, categorization, and finding consistency are key components of good data analysis, which produces thick description. Therefore, I paid close consideration to data management and the organization of all transcripts, interview notes, observation notes, field notes and documents (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). Yin (2008) identified the organization of these materials as the case study database. Through coding, category construction, and naming the categories, I organized and analyzed all the aforementioned documents, allowing me to access relevant bits of information needed throughout the intensive data analysis process (Merriam, 2009).

Since there were multiple participants in this case study, there were two stages of data analysis; that is, a within-case analysis and a cross-case analysis. I began with a within-case analysis detailing each of the participants. A within case-analysis treats each case study as its own comprehensive case. Additionally, this helps the reader “meet” each participant in-depth by writing up each case (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2008).

As I was conducting analysis throughout, I began by making meaning of each piece of data as to inform my ongoing data collection. Once all data was collected, I looked at the totality of the data. Upon reviewing and constantly comparing all the data, I began to make notes, highlight, and code the bits and pieces of data pertinent to the research question (Merriam, 2009;
Yin, 2008). By assigning codes, I began to construct categories and group comments that were similar. The goal was to construct categories that captured recurring themes that became apparent across all the data examined and are exclusive of each other (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). Through theme and category identification, I created the building blocks for the data analysis (Thomas, 2016).

After the initial categories emerged, I began to refine the data. By doing so, I determined which categories needed to be revised and divided them into subcategories (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). It is these final categories that Marshall and Rossman (2006) identified as the “buckets or baskets into which segments of text are placed” (p. 159). Although the process of categorization is initially an inductive process that begins with the clustering of similar units, it ends up being rather deductive. That is, as you analyze more data, you are checking for confirmation to see if your final set of categories hold true (Merriam, 2009).

After finalizing the categories, the next step was to analyze each of the categories and map out how they were interrelated. Thomas (2016) explained that solely identifying categories, while important, does not explain the relationship between each category. This process of mapping out the themes or categories was crucial because it linked the categories in a meaningful way (Merriam, 2009). In addition to detailing the interconnectedness of all the themes, mapping out all the various quotations and data gathered from the interviews, presents a visual representation of some abstract ideas. (Merriam, 2009; Thomas 2016). Once this process was completed, I provided each participant the opportunity to comment on the representation of them and make any adjustments so it would accurately portray each one.

Upon completion of the phase of the data analysis for each participant, I then moved from a within case-analysis to the cross-case analysis (Merriam, 2009). Different from the within case-
analysis that focused on each case individually, Schwandt (2001) pointed out that a cross-case analysis focuses on the comparative nature between cases. However, the data analysis procedure was similar in that it resulted in the identification of common themes and categories that highlighted generalizations regarding teachers’ experiences in the induction program. (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). While I came across some specifics that were different among each participant, the end goal was to develop a general description that fit each (Yin, 2008). Thomas (2016) warned novice researchers not to focus solely on the description of each particular case, but rather on the differences that come from comparing all the cases. As suggested by Yin (2008), this can be accomplished by beginning with a case study that is easy to understand and working “in dialogue” with the literature to help the researcher make meaning of the data.

Establishing trustworthiness and validity throughout the study and analysis is a critical component of qualitative research to ensure the credibility through careful examination of the material being studied (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Researchers and readers must have confidence that the data being presented are reliable and free of any preconceptions (Henriksen, Polonyi, Bornsheuer-Boswell, Greger, & Watts, 2015). Methods such as member checks, prolonged engagement and reflexive journaling aided me in providing truth, accuracy, and validity to the data collected.

Member checking was a strong method to increase internal validity. I performed member checks after each interview was transcribed. Maxwell (2005) wrote, “This is the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what participants say or do and the perspective they have on what is going on, as well as being an important way of identifying your own biases and misunderstanding of what you observed” (p. 111). The key aspect of member checking is to ensure that your interpretation accurately represents the
participant’s experience. If it does not, the participant can suggest some tweaking to ensure that nothing has been missed so there can be a better representation of his/her viewpoint (Merriam, 2009). In this study, member checks were completed. By reporting back to the participant about the ongoing analysis regarding what they told me, I ensured that the interpretation accurately identified what the participant described. In addition, I met with the participants to share ongoing thoughts following each interview, to obtain their perspective on what I was reporting.

Another useful strategy in data collection is prolonged engagement. Morse (2015) stated that the assumption underlying prolonged engagement is “spending more time on data collection in a particular setting provides time for trust to be established with participants. With increased trust (and intimacy), you will get better, richer data. More will be revealed, and therefore, data will be more valid” (p. 1214). Through prolonged engagement, I was able to get as close as possible to the participant’s interpretation of his or her experience (Merriam, 2009).

Furthermore, prolonged engagement allows for extensive involvement with the participants and promotes a close working relationship throughout the data collection period, that is, it allows the researcher to have sufficient interaction with the participants to the point of saturation; enabling them to hear similar accounts of information presented by all the participants with no new material discussed (Hays, Wood, Dahl, & Kirk-Jenkins, 2016; Merriam, 2009).

Through reflexive journaling, I captured experiences, feelings, opinions, and conversations that occurred throughout the study. Reflexive journaling is a valuable tool that allows the researcher to gather, examine and document human interaction (Mackenzie, Ricker, Christensen, Heller, Kagan, Osano, & Turner, 2013). This reflective process allowed me to track my professional development and improve my researching skills. Additionally, this journaling
allowed me to record thoughts and feelings that emerged about me, as the researcher (Merriam, 2009).

Role of the Researcher

My role in this study was that of a complete observer (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In this role, I observed all aspects of the teacher induction program at the start of the school year and observed all of the planned activities. I also “revealed” myself in this role. I adopted a policy of “full disclosure” to the participants (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). I was introduced to the population during the initial visit to the school campus, specifically at the beginning of the novice teacher induction program. The participants were made aware of my interest in the program as well as the details of the study prior to data collection. I explained to the participants that I am currently serving as an administrator with the goal of building trust with them. Additionally, I remained minimally intrusive while in the research setting.

Entry to the research site was approved by the Superintendent of Schools. Accordingly, I met with the participants and scheduled interviews. I maintained efficiency by adhering to agreed-upon time frames and locations for interviews and focused only on the goals of the study – to explore how the induction program prepared teachers to adapt to teaching in a high-achieving suburban school district and to explore the teachers’ experiences in the novice teacher induction program. The methods and details of the study were provided to all participants, ensuring fully informed participants.

Method of Reporting

This case study was reported objectively within the conventional chapter titles: an introduction, review of the literature, methodology, results, and discussion (Yin, 2008). The data analysis results for each participant were reported, including a description so that the
participants, events, and context may come alive for the reader. The analysis was followed by a cross participant analysis, which noted consistencies and differences in constructs, themes, and patterns across the participant data studied.

Summary

This dissertation was designed to explore beginning teachers’ experiences in an induction program in a specific setting. Therefore, this qualitative study was defined as a case study. The dissertation called for different methods of research. Data collection procedures include individual semi-structured interviews, observations and analysis of school and district documents. Multiple data sources included interviews with multiple people, observations and the review of district documents. The data were collected, and subsequently analyzed during the 2016-2017 academic year from a school district in the Northeast that conducted an induction program. Framed by the literature on the need for induction, organizational theory, and central induction tasks, this dissertation aimed to draw conclusions on how induction programs may not adequately prepare beginning teachers as they purport they do.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Partially in response to the data concerning teacher turnover, new teacher induction programs have been developed in school districts to assist novice teachers make the transition from a student teacher to a regular classroom teacher (Darling-Hammond, 2001). In addition, induction programs also serve to assist new teachers in improving instruction, acclimating them to the district, and to meet state guidelines for certification (Huling-Austin, 1986). However, not all school districts are alike nor are the induction programs. Therefore, this case study was designed to analyze how this induction program prepared beginning teachers to teach in a high-achieving, high socio-economic school district.

This section presents the findings of an analysis of the data received from the program participants who participated in the study. With the purpose of this case study to describe new teachers’ experiences in an induction program in a suburban, high-achieving school district, I conducted both a within case analysis and a cross case analysis. As the researcher, I was the primary instrument for collecting, coding and analyzing data in the case studies. I analyzed emerging themes and categories as described below.

Participants

The participants were six teachers. Two teachers had no teaching experience and four teachers had less than three years teaching experience. Each participant went through a multi-year undergraduate college teaching program to earn their certification. Two of the participants taught English, two participants taught math, one participant taught history, and one participant taught music. Three of the participants were Caucasian females, two were Caucasian males, and
one participant was an African-American female. See Table 2 for a description of each participant’s number of years teaching experience, path to teaching, subject taught, assigned school, gender and race.

Table 2

Participants’ background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th># Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Traditional or Alternate Route</th>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
<th>School A or B</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African-Amer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure that the participants’ identity remains anonymous, I used pseudonyms when reporting their quotes and statements.

The first participant, Steve, was a first-year male teacher in the district’s social studies department in School A. Steve had one-year prior teaching experience in a previous school. Steve was a traditional route candidate meaning he attended an undergraduate school and majored in education. Steve responded to an advertisement in a regional newspaper that advertised for the school vacancy.

The second participant, Cassandra, was a first-year teacher in the math department in school A. Cassandra was a traditional route candidate meaning she attended undergraduate school and majored in education. Cassandra’s only teaching experience was her student teaching. Cassandra responded to an email she received from the district for the teaching position she currently holds. Cassandra stated, “I received an email from the district. They got my name from
my college and I liked the area. I liked the kids. I did my teaching demo here and I really, really liked the atmosphere. The hiring process was fast paced.”

Cassandra also indicated that her own expectations appeared to match the district’s. She observed, “A successful teacher is someone who the students respect…kids need to respect you…and you need to be getting results from them.”

The third participant in the study, Cara, had three years teaching experience prior to starting in the district, where she teaches in the English department in School A. Cara was also a traditional route candidate attending an undergraduate school in which she majored in secondary education/English. Cara found the district on a national website and applied. Cara stated,

Not being from around here, I could not find a school with a good fit. I feel lucky for I feel like it is a great district. I knew from my first interview with the Chair and veteran teachers. They were so honest and happy and the curriculum is challenging. They just seemed passionate about providing the best education possible. So I knew that I would fit, and I knew that I’d be able to do the work I wanted to do. It is exactly what I expected…I expected it to challenge me and it does.

Jamie was the fourth participant in the study and was also a first-year teacher in the English department in School B. Jamie was a traditional route candidate, meaning she attended an undergraduate school and majored in education. Jamie’s only teaching experience at the time of the study had been relegated to her student teaching experience. Jamie responded to a posting on a national website for the teaching position she currently holds. Jamie described her experience.

I checked the school out. I was impressed with the e:learning initiative and the size of the school. I looked at the area and this is the only school I interviewed with. I was attracted
to the high standards and that they expect the absolute best out of everybody that comes through these doors. Regardless of whether it’s you, the students, or the faculty, or the administrators, everybody has to come in and give 100%...and I like that. I like the feeling that nobody is going to be able to slip through the cracks, or coast, or you know, sort of get out of having to really enhance the quality of the school overall.

The fifth participant in the study, Tricia, had three years teaching experience prior to arriving in the district. Tricia taught in the math department in School B. Tricia was also a traditional route candidate and responded to an advertisement in a local newspaper. Tricia described her experience as follows.

I just completed my master’s degree in educational technology and learned how to use all these great different tools in the classroom which lured me to the district for I knew about the 1:1 laptop initiative. I was comfortable where I was but I wanted to continue to grow professionally and the reputation of the school attracted me. Due to the time of year (June) they came to my school to see me teach in my former school with my former students. I was impressed.

The sixth participant in the study, Bryan, a music teacher, was an experienced teacher new to the district. Bryan had two previous years teaching experience in another school district. He was also a traditional route candidate. Bryan learned of the school vacancy via ‘word of mouth.’ That is, one of his former colleagues shared with him there was a vacancy in the school district. Bryan was intrigued as he was aware of its ‘academically successful’ reputation. Bryan described his hiring process as “extensive.” There were multiple interviews, a demo lesson and a meeting with the superintendent.

Each of the six participants’ pathways to the district varied. Steve and Tricia responded to
an advertisement in a newspaper. Cassandra received an email from the district inquiring about her interest. Cara and Jamie found a posting on a national website. Bryan learned of the vacancy via ‘word of mouth’ from a colleague.

The above introductions to the district marked the entry point for each of the participants to the district and ultimately into the induction program. As Wong (2001) noted there are multiple components to an induction program with the hiring process serving as the beginning of the induction process. Table 3 below highlights the structure of this induction program.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of the Induction Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Induction Program Components</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hiring Process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Camp</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Meetings for New Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hiring Process As previously noted, each participant experienced the hiring process somewhat differently. Cassandra received an email from the district asking her to interview and to teach a demonstration lesson. Cara responded to a web posting, interviewed, taught a demonstration lesson, met with the supervisor and in addition she met with the departmental teachers. Similarly, Jamie also responded to a web posting, interviewed with the supervisor and taught a demonstration lesson. Tricia, however, responded to an advertisement in a local newspaper, met with the supervisor and then the supervisor went to her school to observe her teach a lesson. Each candidate, after their successful experiences at the school level then proceeded to meet with the Superintendent of Schools who offered each a contract for employment.

During the hiring process, each candidate had similar (interviewing and teaching a demonstration lesson) yet different (meeting with other department members and being observed in their preset setting) experiences. These differences in experiences were also evident in other components of the induction program as well. Similarly, the inconsistency in the hiring process was also observed in other elements of the induction program as well. While the research suggested (Johnson, 2004; Moir & Gless, 2001) new teachers’ experiences in induction programs begins with the hiring process, the literature (Johnson, 2004; Moir & Gless, 2001) also suggested that consistency in the delivery of induction activities is equally important. Yet, each of the candidates did not experience the hiring process in the same manner and, as a result, this early introduction into the induction program had mixed results.

Technology Camp As part of the district’s induction program, all new staff were required to attend a three-day seminar at the start of the summer called “Tech-camp.” This seminar was designed to provide teachers with an overview of the district’s expectations of how to integrate technology into the classroom. The seminar was taught by in-district teachers. The Assistant
Superintendent of Schools and director of the induction program addressed the new teachers at the start of technology camp by stating, “The goal of the technology camp is to make you aware of our e:learning initiative, provide you with opportunities to see and learn how we implement technology into our classrooms and how technology must be incorporated into your daily lesson planning.”

For several of the new teachers, their experience in the technology camp marked the first time they reported feelings of anxiety, being overwhelmed, and even stressed. Tricia expressed, I sense a successful teacher here must utilize technology everyday in their lesson planning. We have been asked to use technology to post assignments, to do research, to visit websites, communicate with parents and to show how we plan to use technology everyday in our classroom.

Jamie added, I started stressing about, you know, the amount of work that I’m being required to do in terms of coming up with lesson ideas, in terms of coming up with activity ideas, and incorporating technology into all of that.

During this phase of the induction program, two participants, Tricia and Jamie, revealed some of the stress they experienced as new teachers to the district. While the three-day technology camp was designed to introduce beginning teachers to the e:learning initiative and demonstrate how to incorporate technology into lesson-planning, the technology camp also appeared to unknowingly introduce feelings of stress and anxiety for some of the participants.

The literature suggested (Bolman and Deal, 2003) organizations create structures, such as induction programs, in an effort to assist individuals to understand the organizational culture in
which they are affiliated with. In this case study, one clear message that evolved was that
technology played an important role in this district’s culture. Each staff member was expected to
incorporate technology into their daily lesson planning and this initiative created angst for some
members of the new cohort of beginning teachers.

After the technology camp, the next phase of the induction program was the late-summer
orientation program. The summer orientation was a two-and-a-half-day program that was held at
the end of August.

*Summer Orientation* The literature (Ponticell & Zepeda, 1997) suggested induction programs be
tailored to meet the needs of individual teachers. The summer orientation program was one such
component aimed at fulfilling that goal.

At the core of the induction program was the summer orientation, which was a two-and-
a-half day seminar held at the end of the summer just prior to the start of the school year. The
summer orientation was required for all new teachers. According to one of the program
coordinators, “the summer orientation consists of workshops and meetings designed to acclimate
the new teachers to our district’s culture.” At the start of the orientation, the Superintendent of
Schools greeted the new staff:

> Welcome to our district where we have motivated students, dedicated staff, and
> supportive communities. We welcome you in joining us on our mission of providing only
> the highest quality education to our students. I commend you all for we hire only the best
> and will retain the best of the best.

Similar greetings were expressed by other members of the administration. One principal
added, “welcome…this is a wonderful place to work…the students fulfill the expectations of
their parents.”
The president of the local teachers’ association opening remarks included, “We have the highest expectations for you and of ourselves.”

The Assistant Superintendent added, “The first day-and-a-half of this program is to understand how the district works. It is like two years of college/teacher prep wrapped into a 1.5 days…we do not like surprises…our parents are very involved…be prepared for that.”

The underlying message delivered by these collective individuals during the summer orientation was apparent: the expectations for all teachers, including novice teachers and teachers new to the district were that high expectations and strong parental involvement are the norm.

With a distinct message underscoring the district’s high expectations and strong parental involvement delivered to the participants during the summer orientation, the district sent a clear and early message to the novice teachers. The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggested that such “messages” are not unintentional, rather intentional. Organizational culture is prevalent across all institutions and members should be aware of their own culture.

Referring to his experience during the summer orientation, Steve noted, the workshops were especially helpful and learning from our peers who have taught here for a number of years was reassuring and provided me with the encouragement I needed. Yet, after hearing from some members of the administration, including the parent faculty representative, self-doubt began to creep into my thinking.

Steve’s experience during this phase of the induction program was not isolated. Bryan expressed similar feelings.

The two-plus summer orientation days were very helpful in that we had the chance to meet with current staff, some who just a few years ago were new teachers themselves. This was reassuring to learn from both a professional and personal perspective. However,
after hearing from the assistant principal and parent representative regarding the active parents and their involvement in the schools, I quickly realized that I may not be fully prepared to teach here.

Both Steve and Bryan experienced the summer orientation in similar ways. Each found the workshops and meetings to be helpful in preparing to teach in the district’s classrooms. However, each seemed to perceive a message that not only are expectations exceedingly high but also parent involvement in the schools seemed to be a concern for all involved. Their experiences during the summer orientation apparently raised concerns regarding meeting expectations and parental involvement.

As previously noted during the technology camp several of the participants came away with experiences similar to Steve and Bryan’s experiences during the summer orientation. While each of these components of the induction program had value to the participants, each increased levels of anxiety, stress and even produced questions of self-doubt.

*Mentoring* The hallmark of an induction program is the mentoring program (Wong, 2001). The mentoring component of this induction program was a one-year program in which a tenured teacher served as a mentor to the novice teacher. The goal of the mentoring program was designed to allow the new teacher the opportunity to work alongside and receive feedback from the experienced teacher.

Similar to the hiring experience, each of the teacher’s experiences varied greatly. For instance, the two novice teachers (Cassandra and Jamie) were assigned a mentor, whereas, the four teachers with only a few years teaching experience each but new to the district were not assigned a mentor. The program director indicated this was intentional stating, “the law only requires first-year teachers to have a mentor. Moreover, providing a mentor comes with a
financial cost and we are always looking at ways to contain costs.” The literature provided a lens into such organizational decisions and notes decisions are rooted by costs (Bolman and Deal, 2003). Yet, such decisions may not benefit those they are trying to support. For instance, Jamie was assigned a mentor.

My mentor is in my department. I work with her on my lesson plan ideas, observing my classroom, giving me classroom management tips, that sort of thing. She sort of looks out for me, you know, giving me a heads up, that sort of thing. We have this mentor protégé program. We only had two formal meetings in which the mentors worked with the new teachers on activities. Informally we meet every other Friday. It’s been pretty good. Cassandra echoed similar experiences.

My mentor has really done a lot with like helping me know what to expect, how to interact. I meet with my mentor on almost a daily basis. She helps guide me, in the sense, if I have a problem. She, in essence is a resource for me.

Conversely, the experienced teachers new to the district had different experiences with their appointed mentors. First, these mentors and mentees did not have to take part in the formal mentoring program. Instead, these teachers were assigned an experienced teacher who “acted” as a mentor. This is how Cara described her experience with her mentor.

She’s been very clear with me. She is not an evaluator but merely a supporter…we meet every week where we talk about questions, problems, anything that comes up, or you know, emotional support, and then I ask her non-stop questions.

Conversely, a second experienced teacher (Tricia) new to the district was not assigned a mentor.
I haven’t been given a mentor with that label, but there have been certain teachers that teach the same courses that I do that are really acting as a mentor in some cases. They’re just spending extra time with me. We discuss specific content.

Similar to experiences in the hiring process, technology camp and summer orientation, teachers’ experiences varied greatly in the mentoring program. Whereas some teachers were provided formal mentors or assigned a mentor, others were not. Four of the participants were assigned what can best be described as a ‘buddy.’ Further, the quality and amount of assistance varied greatly as did the scope of the assistance. Some mentor-mentee relationships attended to the high expectations and parental involvement whereas other mentor-mentee relationships rarely addressed these issues. The inconsistency in the mentoring component in this induction program is in contrast to the literature (Johnson, 2001; Kajs, 2002; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). The literature suggested mentoring programs should be implemented for all teachers with zero to three years’ experience. Further, the literature (Feiman-Nemser, 2001) suggested that program delivery must be consistent and beginning teachers must be given constant feedback and opportunities to discuss and reflect their teaching experiences with colleagues who provide the support. In this induction program, this did not occur as the mentoring experience varied greatly for each of the participants.

The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggests that organizations structure programs to serve their members. This induction program has a defined structure that not only includes the hiring process, technology camp, summer orientation and the mentoring program for novice teachers, but also monthly cohort meetings with members of the administration.

*Monthly Meetings* The purpose of the monthly meetings was to allow the cohort of new teachers to meet once a month for a span of three years to discuss a variety of items germane to them.
However, the structure of each meeting prevented that from occurring as each monthly meeting
was headed by an administrator, which appeared to be a concern for members of the new staff.
Tricia observed, “My peers are afraid to raise any issues. They do not want to appear as being in
need.”

When asked why the monthly meetings are run by the administration, the program
director stated, “We do not want any misinformation being reported to our new staff, hence I run
or appoint the facilitator for each meeting.” Cassandra shared her experiences in the monthly
meetings,

I rarely get to see my new peers and when we are together we do not have
the time to address the concerns that we are all experiencing. It is frustrating. I know we
would all benefit if we could have a common meeting time where we can talk to one
another.

Jamie expressed similar frustration regarding the planned monthly cohort meetings.

I never get to see my peers. This sucks, because it’s like we got to really bond over our
time in orientation, and once the school year started, it’s like I don’t even see those
people. It’s tough on me; I am the only new teacher in my department at my school. The
monthly meetings would be great but we do not have time at those meetings. It’s sad
really, I haven’t had the opportunity to get to know many people. These meetings would
help but they always have an agenda.

Perhaps, Cara summarized the beginning teachers’ experiences best when she shared,

Teaching here is filled with many challenges. We are expected to do so much, so soon. It
would be nice to be able to share ideas with our new peers in a manner in which we felt
security. These meetings have the potential but we just don’t get the chance to do so.
The district’s culminating phase of the induction program was a teacher-generated portfolio. The portfolio was designed to recognize the yearly growth of the new teacher. Bolman and Deal (2003) suggested that symbols, such as the portfolio, are designed to convey what matters to the members and to provide direction to them. The teacher-generated portfolios are further discussed below.

**Portfolio** Each novice teacher was required to design a portfolio annually for three consecutive years. Each teacher had the autonomy to construct his/her portfolio as he/she deems fit. The only requirement was that the portfolio must include and demonstrate how the teacher has grown professionally over the span of the specified school year. The portfolio is submitted for review by the end of March of each of the three years, and serves as a tool used in the evaluation process. At the time this study was conducted, the teachers had not yet had compiled the second and third year portfolio. However, the program director, noted during the summer orientation that the “portfolio was a key piece in the evaluation process and should be taken very seriously.”

According to the program director, each of the various components of the induction program: the hiring process, the technology camp, the summer orientation, mentoring, the monthly teacher meetings and the portfolio are all designed to:

- provide new teachers with the ability to remain in teaching, both in the first year and in many years to come….to provide the support and guidance necessary for them to achieve, and to give them those skills that they need to continue to be effective in the classroom that they may or may not have had prior to.

In exploring the various elements of the induction program, the data suggested the goals of this district’s induction program may not have been fully recognized. While the multiple components of the induction program (hiring process, technology camp, summer orientation,
mentoring, monthly cohort meetings and the portfolio) appeared to be well planned and congruent with the literature (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, Wong, 2001), the data suggested there were inconsistencies in the implementation and outcomes of the individual components of the induction program. Perhaps most alarming, were the increased levels of stress and anxiety reported by the teachers who participated in this induction program. These increased levels of stress and anxiety were better understood by examining the findings of what was emphasized in the novice teacher induction program.

Central Induction Tasks

The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003 & Schein, 1983) suggested organizations design programs for a myriad of reasons including to meet the needs of their members, enculturate members, to establish protocols, and identify priorities. What the district emphasized as a priority in this novice teacher induction program was a focus on local conditions rather than on pedagogical issues. For example, the induction program emphasized acclimating the teachers to the district’s culture, communicating with parents and integrating technology into the classroom and procedural activities (grading policies, observations, attendance). Each of these are addressed below.

*District Culture* When asked what are the main goals of the induction program, the director responded,

> To give teachers the ability to remain in teaching both in the first year and in many years to come…to provide support and guidance…and to give them the skills they need to continue to be effective in the classroom…and we try to accomplish this through our induction program by focusing on our district’s culture and high expectations. This is as
important, if not more important, as having the instructional aspect in an induction program.

Bolman and Deal (2003) suggested organizations develop programs to insure people “get the job done.” By creating structured induction programs that emphasize district culture and high expectations, the school district is stating what it values as important. However, these district values may not necessarily be congruent with the needs of the teachers in the induction programs.

An excerpt from the Superintendent’s opening remarks at the start of the new teacher induction program further highlighted this message, “Welcome to our district where we hire only the best and retain the best.”

This emphasis on a district culture of high expectations emerged as one of the most dominant themes throughout the induction program. In each phase (hiring process, tech camp, summer orientation, mentoring, monthly meetings, portfolio) of the induction program, the teachers reported and I observed the purposeful emphasis on acculturating the new teachers into the district’s culture. Cara reported:

I knew during the question and answer session with the veteran teachers and then again with the assistant principals that this district had high expectations. Everyone we met reiterated a commitment to high expectations, strong parental involvement, and good, hard-working and achieving students. At every turn we were told the importance of having high expectations, the importance of communicating with our parents and that our students are focused on achievement. It is a great environment to be a part of, yet very challenging. The district wants things done a certain way. They want us to interact with parents often and before a problem arises. This was made very clear at orientation.
Cara’s experience was not limited to a singular event; but was a recurring theme throughout the entire year-long process. Moreover, her colleagues had equally similar perceptions.

A second teacher, Cassandra spoke about the emphasis on the district’s culture throughout the induction program:

Having grown up around here I knew what the community was like. I knew the district was a good one, a strong one. The majority of students go on to college. The parents are involved. I knew this coming in but what I did not expect was all the time they spent on teacher and student expectations and communicating with parents.

Tricia further elaborated:

The administration made it very clear how they expected things to be done. From the repeated emphasis on the high expectations for teachers and students to the importance of communicating with parents I learned what was important here. The discussions with experienced teachers, administrators and the PTO moms made a strong impression on how things work here. Especially enlightening was the student’s perspective, they (the students) are very driven, motivated and are very grade conscious. I know that all the kids go to college here and that is the expectation.

Accordingly, Jamie shared that this emphasis on high standards is what attracted her to the district. Jamie said, “there is a standard here that we expect the absolute best out of everybody that comes trough these doors. Regardless of whether it’s you, the students, faculty, administration or the parents, everybody has to come in and give 100%.” Perhaps, Tricia summarized best when she stated:
The entire orientation made us aware of what it is like to teach here, how to work with the staff, students and parents and how we do things here. That was the message that was communicated to me.

I heard a lot about what was expected of teachers, some of what was expected of administrators, and oh, yeah, we hear all the time about how we want teachers to communicate and interact with parents.

As the literature suggested (Bolman & Deal, 2003) organizations have distinct cultures that may be positive or negative, strong or weak. The teachers’ reported hearing a consistently clear message about the district’s culture of high expectations, pursuing excellence, and being the best. Moreover, Schein (1983) suggested an organization’s carefully planned beliefs and assumptions and what an organization values ultimately shapes and defines its culture.

Throughout the induction program, teachers repeatedly heard this message about the district’s high expectations. This message resonated with many as several teachers perceived this is “how it is here.” Accordingly, the strength of this district’s culture was only one of several messages teachers took away from the induction program.

*Communicating with Parents* Another dominant theme that emerged from the findings was the importance of communicating with parents. When asked what is one of the quintessential goals of the induction program, the coordinator responded:

I think the issue of how different our school is compared to wherever the teacher came from. In terms of how kids interact with teachers, how administrators behave, how to be covert in a culture that you can’t really explain, it’s all really important but the most important is getting your way through the politics of the parents. We have a demanding set of parents with a high degree of involvement so it is important that people
(teachers) understand what is involved with communicating with parents. This may not be the same in every school district. So, the culture and expectations of the school district is as important, if not more important, as having the instructional aspect….and communication is a very important aspect of our district culture and is emphasized in our induction program.

According to Cassandra, communicating with parents was an underlying message that was delivered throughout the induction experience. “The most emphasized and perhaps beneficial information they gave us was about talking to parents. That was really helpful because I’ve never had a lot of contact with parents, because in student teaching they do not give you a lot of contact with parents.” Accordingly, Tricia shared similar perceptions as well. Tricia noted:

They made it clear. Communicating with parents, whether by phone or email, both good and bad, is expected. It is hard though with all the work that we have to do. I am so busy and do not always get the chance to send an email or make a phone call. So e-mailing is my mode of communication. Plus, if they ever ask for me to demonstrate how I communicated with parents I can just show them my email. I have it on record.

Each of the teachers experienced a similar message. Whether hearing directly from the program coordinator, an administrator, or member of the teaching staff, each of the teachers reported how important communicating with parents was, particularly communicating with parents in a timely fashion. Similar to the induction program’s emphasis on setting high expectations, the message of communicating with parents was intentional. In not only emphasizing the importance of communication but also designing the induction program to deliver this message, the district was letting teachers know what it values most. The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggested what matters most to an organization is not what happens, but
what it means to its participants. The participants in this induction program clearly saw the meaning of the program was to communicate with parents and communicate often.

Perhaps Jamie’s perspective on communicating with parents summarizes the teachers’ experiences best when asked how does the district want teachers to interact with parents. Jamie responded:

We heard about that all the time in the orientation program. Communication is important. Keep the parents involved in both the good and the bad. For example, progress reports went out recently. I had students with D’s and F’s. My supervisor said that was a good thing because it demonstrated I was not simply sending out easy grades. Yet, she encouraged me to call the parents and let them know. So I called and for some parents this was my first contact with them since Back-to-School night. I spent a week getting in touch with these parents and every phone call was like 20 minutes and I would hear why did I not hear about this sooner. What can he or she do to make this up?

What came down from the administration, the department and even the teachers were you have to cater to these parents, get them on your side. So, it has been a bit frustrating.

While the findings suggested the induction program may have adequately informed the teachers to embrace constant communication with parents, the induction program did not provide the novice teachers with the resources and skills necessary to successfully communicate with parents. The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggested that the basic assumptions and beliefs of an organization ultimately shape and define the culture. This induction program with its focus on high expectations and communicating with parents contributed to a district culture that may also unknowingly create additional stress and anxiety on the beginning teachers it aims to serve.
In addition to the district’s emphasis on both high expectations and communications with parents, a third theme that arose during the induction process was the integration of technology into the teaching and learning process. 

*Integrating Technology* In this district, incorporating technology was central to the teaching and learning process. The district made a commitment to infuse technology into the daily fabric of the school day by issuing personal laptops to each student and staff member. This 1:1 laptop initiative was in place for several years and according to the Superintendent of Schools was “one of the most significant initiatives our school district has undertaken.”

In response to the district’s commitment to infusing technology into the teaching and learning process, the district created a mandatory, three-day technology camp for all new teachers. The technology camp was part of the induction program and according to the program director, ensures that all new staff members are familiar with district expectations that technology is an integral part of their teaching. The program director stated,

> We set aside several days during the summer to provide technology training for our new teachers so each can learn how to integrate technology into their lesson planning. More so, this is a multi-million dollar initiative that we believe will transform teaching and learning and we want our teachers to embrace and use this technology.

The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggested that all organizations, including schools, make important decisions involving the allocation of resources. This school district’s commitment to a 1:1 initiative, which cost millions of dollars and dedicated three days of a technology camp into the induction program to insure beginning teachers are implementing technology into their teaching sent a powerful message to the group.
According to the teachers, technology camp was one of the early indications of how much of a priority technology is in the district. Jamie indicated that her expectations of technology camp was much different than what she experienced.

I thought we would receive our laptops and instructions on how to use the different features (gradebook, attendance, creating our webpage, examples of different lessons using technology, that sort of thing). However, I did not anticipate that we would be required to indicate how we planned to incorporate technology into our daily lessons. The emphasis on technology was greater than I ever imagined and may be prepared for. But then I got a sample lesson plan format that required how I will use technology in this lesson and what programs are you going to use to enhance this lesson. I could have used more professional development than a three-day crash course.

Another beginning teacher also discussed the district’s emphasis on technology during the induction program. “Technology is everywhere here. From technology camp to summer orientation to our meetings with the principals and supervisors we are constantly reminded of it.” Tricia added:

I knew all about the laptop program and that excited me about the district. The tech camp was extremely helpful and made me aware of just how much of an emphasis technology is here in the district. It became very clear that a successful teacher was a teacher that utilized and integrated technology. I also gained this sense just by observing and being around my colleagues.

Technology use emerged as a dominant theme throughout all phases of the induction program. From the heavily-focused technology camp to individual meetings with mentors, technology was a vital part of the induction experience. Cassandra shared, “As a result of the
orientation, I quickly learned that the district promoted technology as a teaching approach – if that is one.”

Steve added, “technology camp was huge. I never taught in a district that emphasized technology so much. Understanding what’s available will take forever. It was very overwhelming, but then to get home (over the summer) and be able to explore those things before school started was so important.”

Teachers explained not only was technology camp a main point of emphasis but integrating technology into their daily lesson plans was “driven home” to teachers throughout the summer orientation as well as their work with their mentors. Additionally, several of the monthly cohort meetings also centered around teachers showcasing how each were using technology in their daily planning. However, linked to the district’s expectation of the use of technology was the increased pressure and anxiety novice teachers experienced as to how they successfully incorporated technology into their lesson planning.

*Procedural Activities* Another emergent theme from the findings pertained to procedural activities. One coordinator, when asked to discuss the goals of the induction program responded, “one of the goals is to help new teachers understand how we do things …from the simplest to the most difficult…how to find a piece of paper to integrating technology. We try to cover it all.”

Similarly, the second program coordinator offered this.

The amount of information we have to convey to the new teachers during the induction program is overwhelming. It is a challenge trying to keep it all straight. We have so much to cover in such a short amount of time. Sometimes it overwhelms me. We address procedural issues, attendance issues, grading, how to get supplies, things like that… but we could probably do a better job.
Noteworthy was the acknowledgement by one of the induction program coordinators that the district’s induction program may not adequately address the needs of the beginning teachers. While the intention of the induction program had always been to support beginning teachers, this acknowledgment by the program coordinator suggested the district was aware it may not be fully reaching that goal. Bolman and Deal (2003) suggested that organizations set priorities and these priorities may not always be in the best interest of all members. Each participant discussed their concerns regarding their preparedness regarding the daily school routines. Cassandra noted:

The induction program was a positive experience in many ways. It helped me with some of the daily responsibilities we have as teachers. I learned how to use the electronic grade book, assign and input grades and lessons, create and maintain my website and things like that. However, I needed more. I had so many questions.

Cassandra’s experience was similar to that of her peers. Each of the teachers suggested that the induction program’s focus on procedural activities was evident but not sufficient to the level of their needs. Cara noted:

The orientation helped me better understand some of the procedural things such as handling discipline, grading and attendance issues, but we could have all used more time in this session.

See Figure 2 below for a visual representation of the central induction tasks.
In short, the central induction tasks consisted of acclimating the teachers to the district’s culture, communicating with parents, integrating technology into the classroom and highlighting procedural activities (grading policies, observations, attendance). By choosing to design an induction program that focused more on local conditions rather than on pedagogical issues had an impact on the teachers’ experiences which also yielded several additional findings.

Teachers’ Experiences

The novice teachers’ experiences in the induction program in this high-achieving district yielded several additional significant findings. First, teachers discussed their perceived and real challenges. Second, the teachers had both similar (stress and anxiety) and vastly different (hiring, mentors, summer orientation) experiences throughout the different phases of the induction
program. Third, the teachers found several (pedagogical issues, daily operations) elements lacking in the induction program.

*Expectations vs. reality* As referenced in the literature, what matters in an organization is not necessarily what happens, but what it means to participants (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Schein, 1983). Each of the participants held similar perceptions of what teaching in the district would be like. Collectively, the teachers anticipated working with motivated students, involved parents and in a collegial environment where each would receive the support and resources necessary to succeed. However, not all of their expectations were realized when they began teaching and moreover many new challenges presented themselves that they did not expect. For instance, Cassandra shared:

> I had some knowledge of the past success of the district, the affluent communities that comprised the district and the success of the students and that attracted me to teach in the school. I knew I would be working hard and be challenged; however, I did not feel prepared for the amount of work and the amount of parental involvement. It has been a shock to me.

Similarly, Cara echoed:

> Initially, I knew I was joining a great staff and school. Everyone was passionate about teaching and learning. I work long and hard preparing my lessons. Often times, in schools with strong students and high levels of involvement from parents you experience greater levels of stress and place higher expectations on yourself. That is what I have done and that is what we’ve been told to expect. I have to admit that some parents think that…. they know better than you, and who are you? That has been the most difficult thing thus far, having the parents question me.
The literature suggests there is often strong parental involvement in communities where expectations are high (Bauch & Goldring, 1995). Both Cassandra and Cara expected some parental involvement; however, not at the high level in which they experienced. These high levels of parental involvement gave them pause, questioned their preparedness to teach in the community and heightened their levels of anxiety.

Similarly, Tricia reported the reputation of the district shaped her expectations about teaching in the district.

I heard such great things about the district. Initially, I was anxious about the way things ran on a daily basis, so my impression was that it was going to be something that I would be stressing out about, but you quickly get into a routine and stop thinking about those things. What I am most concerned about now is creating lessons that infuse technology, meeting all my responsibilities and maintaining constant contact with the students and parents.

Perhaps Jamie summarized the perceived and real challenges best:

It’s a lot more than I expected it to be. I am killing myself with work….I’m not enjoying myself. I feel like the district is saying you should be doing more. I’m just stressed out about the amount of work I’m being required to do. Incorporating technology, meeting the needs of parents, communicating with all, what happened with focusing on the students? I definitely felt overwhelmed at orientation and still to this point I am stressed about the amount of work that is required.

Entering into the induction program, each of the novice teachers held expectations of what teaching in the district would be like. Expectations ranged from implementing a rigorous curriculum, working alongside a team of veteran teachers, managing students, preparing lessons,
and being supported by mentors and the administration. While many of these expectations were realized, these beginning teachers experienced other realities they did not expect. Realities such as the large amount of work teaching requires on a daily basis, incorporating technology into lessons, understanding department, school and district practices, as well as the strong parental involvement and increased levels of stress and anxiety were reported as unanticipated realities of participating in the induction program and teaching in the district.

The research (Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, & Brissie, 1987; McGrath & Kuriloff, 1996) findings supported how strong parental involvement in high socioeconomic schools has an impact on teacher efficacy. The teachers in this study each questioned their preparedness to teach in the district’s schools and one of the factors that contributed to their self-doubt was the strong involvement of parents. Throughout various points of the induction program, each of the teachers reported similar, yet different experiences. These experiences are further discussed below.

**Similarities and differences** The literature on novice teacher’s experiences throughout the induction process suggested that beginning teachers’ experiences may not always be equal (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Moir & Gless, 2001).

Teachers described similar and varying experiences at different points throughout the induction process. Each reported similar levels of increased stress and anxiety as a result of their experiences in the induction program. Several factors that led to increased feelings of anxiety and stress were district culture, extremely involved parents, having to continuously incorporate technology into daily lesson planning, a lack of clarity regarding procedural tasks, and responsibilities of teaching were all common denominators that reportedly led to teachers increased feelings on anxiety and stress. Teachers also described very different experiences throughout the induction period. These different experiences occurred in all elements of the
induction process (hiring, tech camp, summer orientation, mentoring, monthly meetings and in their portfolios). The data suggested these differences and variations in experiences were in some part responsible for the increased levels of stress and anxiety.

One example of these differences of experience was in the hiring process. Some teachers reported having multiple interviews over a span of time whereas others interviewed in a single day. Some teachers were offered the position the same day of the interview while others went through a sequence of interviews. Liu and Kardos (2002) suggested the hiring process may not only be the first experience a beginning teacher has with a school district but that process may vary from individual to individual. The findings in this study suggested that was the case as the hiring experience varied from teacher to teacher.

A second difference experienced by the teachers throughout the induction process occurred during the technology camp. Teachers were grouped according to their self-reported ability and received different levels of training. As a result, this division did not afford the novice teachers to work and learn collaboratively thus creating a sense of division among the novice teachers. Conversely, the literature (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011) suggested novice teachers gain more from their induction experiences when teachers have shared experiences, not different experiences as was experienced during the tech camp.

Another significant difference was the teachers’ experiences with their mentors. For example, one teacher reported that her mentoring experience had been relegated to “some informal conversations” about the classes she was teaching, whereas another teacher and her mentor had previously scheduled formal meetings to discuss curriculum and pedagogy. These differences had an impact on the beginning teachers. The teachers, in their conversations with
one another, discussed some of their experiences and as a result learned that their induction experience have not been parallel. Tricia noted,

> It was not until we had the time to sit down with one another prior to our first monthly meeting as new teachers did I realize that my peers had vastly different induction experiences. The more we discussed our experiences the more we realized how different they were. While comforting to know my peers have similar feelings of being overwhelmed and stressed this insight is concerning for we are not having the same opportunities (mentoring).

The research (Baker & Stevenson, 1986; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Kajs, 2002; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wong, 2001) suggested mentoring is a key component in any induction program and is one of the most important variables in ensuring beginning teachers’ success. While the induction program in this study included a mentoring component, only the first-year teachers were assigned a mentor. In those instances, the teachers’ experiences varied widely from daily meetings to a couple of times throughout the year.

As suggested above, these discrepancies in teachers’ experiences contributed to the teacher’s feelings of anxiety. When the teachers had the opportunity to sit and discuss their experiences, the teachers soon realized that their induction experiences varied greatly and they questioned why. Cassandra asked, “do you think I should be concerned that my mentor requires a weekly meeting?

Jamie asked, “I’ve been observed twice already. Has anyone else? What does this mean?” Perhaps more insightful was Cassandra who noted,
We have all been introduced to the district, its culture and mores. Now we have to work with our peers, supervisors and administrators. It is up to us to succeed here. They don’t really prepare you for seeing the scope of teaching here. It is a great challenge.

As all the beginning teachers moved through each phase of the induction program their experiences within each phase varied greatly. As such, these different experiences created more uncertainty and doubt leaving the teachers trying to make meaning of their individual and collective experiences ultimately leading to increased stress. The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggested when individuals have uncertainties within organizations, people try to make meaning from events (induction activities) and, when faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, they may have a negative impact on the organization’s culture. For this cohort of beginning teachers this was their lived experience.

Moreover, teachers not only experienced differences in their induction experience, they also shared what they perceived to be overlooked throughout the induction program.

*What was missing?* The findings suggested teachers did not have the opportunity to work as closely with their building principals as they anticipated nor did they benefit as greatly from their induction experiences as a whole. This experience was in contrast to the literature (Brock & Grady, 1997; Wood, 2005) which suggested novice teachers who have the opportunity to work closely with their building principals are more likely to have a positive first-year teaching experience.

Additional findings suggested teachers may have benefited more had they had the opportunity to work more closely with their building principals and had there been more focus on pedagogy and operational tasks. Bryan noted that he had very little opportunity to meet with his building principal.
We spent several days at the start of the summer in tech camp and again at the end of the summer (in orientation) being exposed to so much and hearing from many different people, yet we never really spent any time with the building principals.

Steve shared:

The induction program was filled with so much information that I became overwhelmed by the amount of work. Based on my personal situation, I would have benefited by spending more time on the curriculum and meeting with my supervisor and principal to discuss the curriculum rather than spending so much time hearing about the demanding parents.

Similarly, Bryan noted:

The induction program was helpful to a point. Technology camp was great and learning how to deal with the parents and students was helpful albeit somewhat alarming; however, it must have been at the expense of working with my supervisor and building principal.

As the literature suggested (Moir & Gless, 2001) one of the most influential individuals responsible for carrying out induction tasks is the building principal. Moreover, the literature suggested that principals’ influence on novice teachers was significant (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004). In this case study, the findings suggested this cohort of novice teachers did not experience that opportunity. While some areas of the induction program met some of the teachers needs, there were notable voids in the program as a whole. Teachers reported wanting more time focused on pedagogical matters, reviewing the district’s instructional model, and understanding simple, yet necessary day-to-day procedures such as grading, attendance and even learning how to get involved in school activities. Yet, these areas appeared
to be glossed over in lieu of a focus on district culture, incorporating technology, increasing parent/teacher communication and understanding the school and community in which these novice teachers were now members. The literature (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Huling-Austin, 1996; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Johnson, 2004) suggested induction programs should be designed to meet the needs of beginning teachers, provide support, and aim to increase efficacy in teachers. The findings from this study were not always consistent with findings on the induction literature.

School and Community Active parent involvement in the schools and community has been documented throughout the literature (McGrath & Kuriloff, 1996; Moles, 1987, and Useem, 1992). Perhaps the greatest emphasis of the district’s induction program was providing new teachers with information and knowledge about the local community, students and parents. Throughout many phases of the induction program (hiring, technology camp, summer orientation and the monthly meetings) there appeared to be a deliberate emphasis on providing new teachers with local knowledge of community, parent and student expectations.

Accordingly, the findings suggested the new teachers found this information to be helpful, yet excessive. Cassandra noted, “the most useful information they gave us was how to talk to the parents and what to expect from the parents.” Cara added, “the information they gave us about the community…understanding the community, the parents that was most beneficial to me.”

Similarly, Tricia suggested, “meeting with the vice principals in which we heard about the parents and the community expectations….and having the PFA parents talk to us provided a great deal of insight into the district.” Jamie added, “At all times during the induction program we seemed to be discussing parents, expectations and the community. The district must have
wanted to ensure that we were aware of how much parental involvement there is in the district and how we should respond to parents. If this was the intent, they were successful, to a point.”

As the findings suggested, there was a strong emphasis throughout the induction program on how much time was devoted to informing the novice teachers about the active community presence within the local schools. The literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) suggested that organizations design structures, like this induction program, to ensure their members are aware of organizational priorities and to increase effectiveness. Each of the novice teachers expressed their understanding of the district’s emphasis in making certain they were aware of the active community presence. This emphasis on school and community was not only a priority but also a strength of this induction program.

*District expectations and mores* Perhaps no other individual throughout the induction process was more clear than the Superintendent of Schools when he addressed the new teachers with his opening remarks regarding the district’s expectations:

> Welcome to the district and congratulations on your appointment. As you are aware our district and community have the highest expectations for your success. You should be proud of your accomplishments and for joining our staff where we hire only the best and retain the best.

The superintendent’s message resonated with the new teachers. Several of the teachers referred to the superintendent’s message when describing how the district induction program prepared them for teaching in this district. Cara described her preparation as:

> I knew coming into the district that the expectations were high but when the Superintendent began his opening remarks by sharing with us that they only retain the best of the best was awakening. To say my anxiety levels increased that morning would
be an understatement. I needed to start thinking about the entire year – not just getting off to a good start.

Steve recalled his reaction to the superintendent’s welcome message.

In a district like this, I expected the high expectations. What caught my attention, however, was throughout the induction program they kept on focusing on these expectations, the community’s expectations, the parents. We all got the message and making us aware was helpful.

Equally compelling was how Jamie interpreted the district’s message. Jamie shared:

We were told that we had to interact more with parents. I think it’s more of a function of this district rather than in other schools but there was too much emphasis on the parents and responding to them and the students. I would have thought that given the fact that this community is so concerned with student’s excelling and going on to good colleges that the emphasis would be on learning not on how to work with parents, students and the community.

Beginning with the superintendent’s opening remarks and continuing throughout each phase of the induction program, the novice teachers received numerous and repeated messages regarding the district’s expectations, influential parents and strong community involvement. These findings suggested and the literature supported that organizations purposefully design structures, such as induction programs, in an effort to emphasize what the organization values (Bolman & Deal, 2003). This district’s induction program placed an emphasis on ensuring the novice teachers understood the culture of high expectations. Accordingly, while each of the teachers acknowledged they gained a sense of the school and district culture, there were also
unintended consequences. Specifically, there were increased levels of stress and anxiety teachers experienced throughout the induction process that carried into the school year.

**Stress and Anxiety** The literature suggested that induction programs can have a positive impact on novice teacher’s experiences (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Huling-Austin, 1986; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Johnson, 2004; Smith & Finch, 2010; Wong, 2001). Conversely, one of the findings in this study suggested that teachers’ experiences in this induction program while helpful at some levels, may have also unintentionally increased their levels of stress and anxiety. For example, Cassandra shared:

> I was anxious to get into my classroom and prepare for the opening of the year and I would have liked to been able to at least get into my classroom prior to the start of the year. They (the administration) told all of us the Friday afternoon before the Labor Day weekend that we could finally access our rooms. To think we spent days and weeks over the summer at orientation preparing for the start of school, yet we had no access to our classrooms.

Similarly, Cara shared:

> Throughout the orientation experience, I became increasingly aware of my environment. I was being challenged in many ways – professionally and personally. As such, my stress level increased. I knew I was working in a demanding environment and it has been challenging. I mean they told us they obtain the best and retain the best…nobody wants to leave if they’ve been elsewhere, they know that this is as good as it gets; however, it is not easy and I know and feel that pressure.

Tricia shared her similar experiences.
In the beginning I was just anxious about a lot of things – a new school, procedures, daily routines, and all that. However, during my orientation I became more anxious about what I kept hearing. As much as the induction was helpful it also increased my anxieties about being a good teacher here. It’s hard to find the time to do all of what is expected of us. Jamie also reported similar feelings as a result of the new teacher orientation program. It’s a lot more work than I expected it to be. I’m stressing about the amount of work. It’s definitely like, I’m reaching that point where it’s starting to hit me and I don’t know about this. I definitely felt overwhelmed at orientation and I have not received much guidance. Unless I ask, I don’t get any information.

The literature suggested (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011) that induction programs should be tailored to support the needs of teachers and should aim to ease the transition into teaching. Each of the novice teachers expressed how the induction program achieved that goal in part; however, in doing so, missed opportunities to provide the novice teachers with experiences that would be helpful to them during their transition into the classroom. As a result, the teachers reported an increase in unanticipated stress and anxiety. See Figure 3 below for a visual representation of the teachers’ experiences.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine how an induction program prepared six novice teachers to begin teaching in a high-achieving, high SES suburban school district in the Northeast. Results from interviews, observations and district documents revealed the induction program focused on the district’s culture of high expectations, strong community involvement, integrating technology into the classroom and the academic success of the students.

The results also revealed the consequences of the district’s focus. By continuously emphasizing the district’s expectations, strong parental involvement, high socioeconomic status of the community, the high student acceptance rate at four-year colleges, and the requirement to infuse technology into all classroom lessons significantly raised the stress and anxiety novice teachers experienced. Accordingly, the district’s decision to prioritize these areas in lieu of focusing on more central tasks such as designing curriculum, implementing instruction,
understanding daily procedures, working with the building principals and allowing teachers to gain access to their classrooms further increased the teachers’ feelings of not being adequately prepared to teach in the district’s schools. A further discussion on the aforementioned topics, implications for practice, as well as future research is discussed in the next chapter.
Novice teachers face many hurdles on their way to becoming master teachers. The transition from student teacher to classroom teacher is challenging and filled with many obstacles (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Alarmingly, more than a third of new teachers leave the profession within five years (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2007). Lack of support, classroom management, increased workloads, and low pay are only a few of the reported concerns germane to beginning teachers. Couple these concerns with increasing parental and community involvement along with the demands of working in a high socioeconomic and high achieving school district can create an overwhelming and stressful environment for the novice teacher.

In response to these concerns, school districts have created induction programs in an effort to assist novice teachers overcome these obstacles. In an effort to understand beginning teachers’ experiences in high-achieving and high-SES schools, this case study explored six beginning teachers’ experiences in a high-achieving and high-SES school district’s induction program. Ultimately, the research question guiding this study was: How does the induction program in one suburban school district in the Northeast prepare beginning teachers to teach in a high-achieving school setting?

The study was conducted over the course of one school year and included interviews, observations and document analysis. A total of nine individuals were interviewed. The director, two teacher coordinators and six novice teachers were interviewed. Data collection and analysis took place concurrently and themes emerged from the data (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016).
I paid close attention to data management and the organization of all transcripts, interview notes, observation notes, field notes and documents (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). Yin (2008) identified the organization of these materials as the case study database. Through coding, category construction, and naming the categories, I organized and analyzed all the aforementioned documents, allowing me to access relevant information needed throughout the intensive data analysis process (Merriam, 2009).

Since there were multiple participants in this case study, there were two stages of data analysis; that is, a within-case analysis and a cross-case analysis. I began with a within-case analysis detailing each of the participants. A within case-analysis treats each case study as its own comprehensive case. Additionally, this helps the reader “meet” each participant in-depth by writing up each case (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2008).

Once I collected my data, I looked at the totality of the data. Upon reviewing and constantly comparing all the data, I made notes, highlighted, and coded the bits and pieces of data that I found pertinent to the research question (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2008). By assigning codes, I constructed categories and grouped comments that were similar. The goal was to construct categories that captured recurring themes that became apparent across all the data examined and were exclusive of each other (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). Through theme and category identification, I created the building blocks of my data analysis (Thomas, 2016).

After the initial categories emerged, I determined which categories needed to be revised and divided them into subcategories (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). Although the process of categorization was initially an inductive process that began with the clustering of similar units, it ended up being rather deductive. That is, as I analyzed more data, I was checking for confirmation to see if the final set of categories held true (Merriam, 2009).
After finalizing my categories, I analyzed each of the categories and mapped out how they were interrelated. Thomas (2016) explained that solely identifying categories, while important, does not explain the relationship between each category. In addition to detailing the interconnectedness of all the themes, mapping out all the various quotations and data gathered from the interviews, presents a visual representation of some abstract ideas. (Merriam, 2009; Thomas 2016). Once this was completed, I provided each participant the opportunity to comment on my representation of them.

After this phase of data analysis for each participant, I then moved from a within case-analysis to the cross-case analysis (Merriam, 2009). The data analysis procedure for this process was similar in that it resulted in the identification of common themes and categories that highlighted generalizations regarding teacher’s experiences in the induction program. (Merriam, 2009; Thomas, 2016). While I came across some specifics that were different among each participant, the end goal was to develop a general description that fit each (Yin, 2008). Thomas (2016) warned novice researchers not to focus solely on the description of each particular case, but rather on the differences that come from comparing all the cases.

Several themes resulted from this data analysis. These themes were: a) gaining local knowledge of students, curriculum, and school context; b) developing a professional identity; c) high expectations; d) stress/anxiety; e) mentoring; f) hiring; and g) technology.

One of the significant findings from this study was the increasing and often times overwhelming stress and anxiety experienced by the novice teachers. Both first-year teachers and novice teachers new to the district discussed the perceived and real challenges of teaching in a district with significant parental and community involvement. Further, teachers reported that district expectations and mores also contributed to increased anxiety and pressure. Equally
compelling, was the second finding that the district induction program increased new teachers’ feelings of stress and being overwhelmed due to activities and discussions pertaining to the parental and community involvement. A third significant finding from this study was that the induction program was heavily laden in providing novice teachers with knowledge of students, parents, and community in lieu of more central tasks (designing curriculum and instruction). This finding suggests that parental and community involvement had a significant role in the induction program. Subsequently, the induction program was geared more toward preparing teachers for this parental involvement rather than assisting novice teachers with pedagogical concerns.

A fourth finding from this study pertained to the hiring experiences of the novice teachers. Both first-year teachers and novice teachers new to the district reported very different experiences in the hiring process. These experiences ranged from individual interviews for some to group interviews for others and demonstration lessons to the lengthy essay requirements for some but not all applicants. The inconsistencies in the hiring process for these teachers paralleled the inconsistencies in the mentoring program.

A fifth finding was that some teachers were assigned a mentor while others were assigned no more than a “buddy.” Moreover, within the mentoring component of the induction program, the teachers’ experiences varied further. While some teachers met regularly with their assigned mentors and received support other teacher’s experiences fell far short of such an opportunity.

Additional findings from this study included the multiple capacities necessary to design and implement an induction program (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Human and social capacities were strained in both the design and implementation of the program. The program director and teacher coordinators each expressed concern over the amount of time and planning required to carry out the induction program. Similarly, the organizational literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003) provided
the best framework in shedding light on the results of this study. In short, while the participants each expressed individual components of the induction program were helpful to an extent, the collective experiences of the participants yielded mixed results. These mixed results may be directly linked to the design of the induction program. With the district’s emphasis on culture, infusing technology, and understanding the strong parental involvement and high expectations of the community, officials made the decision to structure the induction program to address the needs of the district rather than focusing on the needs of the novice teachers. Moreover, the district’s message of “hiring the best and retaining the best” was also symbolic of the district’s priorities. Both the structural and human resource frames of the organizational literature shed light on why this school district, designed and prioritized programs such as this induction program (Bolman and Deal, 2003).

Limitations

All research studies have limitations and no one study has a perfect design (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). This research study was a qualitative study focusing on one induction program and as a result does not have the sample size to generalize to larger populations. Further, the study was limited to six participants. While the participants’ backgrounds varied, all were candidates who were first-year teachers or teachers with less than three years teaching experience. Moreover, the induction program in this case study was atypical. The setting was in a high-achieving, high socioeconomic suburban school district in the Northeast.

Additionally, data collection methods included interviews, observations and document analysis. Yin (2008) suggested that reliance on self-reported data from the participants may also be a limitation of case study research for the researcher relies on the participants’ self-reporting. Yin (2008) also noted that relying on observations may also limit a study as the researcher may
not be able to observe all the events. Moreover, there may have been documents that were not made available or accessible to me. Accordingly, a revisit of the data might reveal other aspects of the induction program that are as interesting and important as those I chose to analyze. For example, in reviewing the inconsistencies in the mentoring component, why was one participant’s (Jamie) mentor more involved than another mentor (Cassandra)? Moreover, why were the mentors not interviewed? For a combination of reasons there are a number of limitations to this study. Yet, the findings from this case study are rich with implications for future research. These implications are discussed below.

Implications

Implications for teachers: At present, the contributions from this case study reveal that novice teachers in high-achieving and high socioeconomic school districts in which parental and community involvement are extensive appear to experience increased stress and anxiety. More specifically, the induction program in which these teachers participated also increased the stress and anxiety for these beginning teachers. By focusing more on local conditions rather than on pedagogical issues in the induction program, beginning teachers’ perceptions and experiences with the community further heightened the pressure they experienced. Accordingly, the findings from this case study support the need for induction programs for beginning teachers and more importantly, extend the literature and provide a foundation for future investigations into teachers’ perceptions and experiences in induction programs at high achieving and high socioeconomic districts. Equally important, the induction experiences of teachers in all settings, including those in urban and rural districts, should further be investigated. Potential findings from such investigations may yield compelling results as well.
Implications for administrators: The contributions from this case study reveal the importance of administrators to construct induction programs that focus on the novice teachers’ needs and prepare them to begin their teaching careers. An induction program that finds balance between teacher needs and district needs may serve all stakeholders well.

Another contribution from this case study is that it is important for administrators to consider designing induction programs that afford all novice teachers access to quality mentors. Whether the teacher is a true novice teacher just starting their career or a novice teacher with a year or two of experience, all teachers involved in an induction program would benefit from having a peer to work and collaborate alongside. Moreover, the contributions from this study imply the importance of the mentoring program being consistent for all novice teachers.

Another implication from this study is for administrators to consider the importance of the role of the building principal in the induction program. The participants in this case study expressed a desire to access and work with the building principal on instruction and lesson planning. In constructing future induction programs, administrators should consider building time into induction programs in order to allow novice teachers to work with the building principal.

Among all contributions, this case study not only supports and extends the current literature on the critical need for novice teacher induction programs but also implies well-constructed induction programs have the potential to provide the necessary support novice teachers need in order to meet the inherent challenges they are about to encounter.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a result of this exploratory case study, I hypothesize that novice teachers working in high achieving and high socioeconomic school districts in which there is high parental and
community involvement may be presented with challenges unlike other school settings. The additional stress and anxiety brought on by teaching in high achieving and high socioeconomic districts may contribute to increased teacher turnover. Moreover, the induction programs designed to assist and prepare these beginning teachers to work in this environment may inadvertently be increasing the stress and anxiety they were designed to lessen. Hopefully, the findings from this case study will spur future studies that will further investigate this phenomenon.

A second hypothesis is that induction programs may not adequately meet the needs of first-year teachers as well as those novice teachers with limited classroom teaching experience who are new to a school district. The findings suggested there are differences in the perceptions of first-year and novice teachers in terms of the effectiveness of the program. Both of these hypotheses may warrant further consideration and future investigation. Additional considerations for future research is to build on the current study by exploring teachers’ experiences in induction programs in similar high-achieving and high socioeconomic school districts throughout the region and throughout the nation. Similarly, future studies, in different settings, including rural and urban settings, may also yield significant findings that could build on and extend the induction literature. Yet, another possible area for future study may be the impact of the mentor in the induction process. Such a study would further extend the literature on novice teacher induction. Ultimately, for the thousands of novice teachers who will enter our nation’s classrooms each school year, there is no time like the present to continue the research on induction.
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Appendix A

Interview Consent Form

I am a doctoral candidate in the department of Educational Theory, Policy & Administration in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University, and I am conducting interviews for a study on new teacher’s experiences in an induction program. The purpose of the interview is to collect information on your experiences as a participant in an induction program.

During this study, you will be asked to answer some questions as to your experiences in the induction program. This interview was designed to be approximately one hour in length. However, please feel free to expand on the topic or talk about related ideas. Also, if there are any questions you would rather not answer or that you do not feel comfortable answering, please say so and we will stop the interview or move on to the next question, whichever you prefer.

This research is confidential. Confidential means that the research records will include some information about you and this information will be stored in such a manner that some linkage between your identity and the response in the research exists. Some of the information collected about you includes your experience in the recruitment, hiring and orientation process as well as your current assignment. Please note that we will keep this information confidential by limiting individual’s access to the research data and keeping it in a secure location in a locked fireproof filing cabinet in the researcher’s private home office. The data gathered in this study are confidential with respect to your personal identity unless you specify otherwise.

The research team and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated. All study data will be kept for three years from the completion of the study after which time the study data will be destroyed.

You are aware that your participation in this interview is voluntary. You understand the intent and purpose of this research. If, for any reason, at any time, you wish to stop the interview, you may do so without having to give an explanation.

There are no foreseeable risks of participation in this study. You have been told that the benefits of taking part in this study may be to advance the understanding of new teachers experiences in induction programs and to increase awareness of new teacher experiences in induction programs. However, you may receive no direct benefit from taking part in this study.

The audio recording(s) will be used for analysis by the research team. The recording(s) will not include personal identifiable information nor will videotaping be used. If you say anything that you believe at a later point may be hurtful and/or damage your reputation, then you can ask the interviewer to rewind the recording and record over such information OR you can ask that certain text be removed from the dataset/transcripts.

The recording(s) will be stored in a locked fireproof filing cabinet in the researcher’s private home office with no link to your identity. The recordings will be kept for three years from the completion of the study after which time they will be destroyed.

If you have any questions about the study or study procedures, you may contact myself at Sean Struncis, 36 Riker Hill Road Livingston, NJ 07039. My email address is sstruncis@gmail.com and my phone number is 973.768.9288. You may also contact my faculty advisor Dr. Catherine Lugg, Graduate School of Education, 10 Seminary Place,
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. The email address is catherine.lugg@gse.rutgers.edu and the phone is 848.932.0721.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers (which is a committee that reviews research studies in order to protect research participants).

Institutional Review Board
Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey
Liberty Plaza / Suite 3200
335 George Street, 3rd Floor
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Phone: 732-235-9806
Email: humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu

You will be offered a copy of this consent form that you may keep for your own reference.

Once you have read the above form and, with the understanding that you can withdraw at any time and for whatever reason, you need to let me know your decision to participate in today's interview.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record you as described above during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) for any other reason than that/those stated in the consent form without your written permission.

Subject (Print) ____________________________________________

Subject Signature ___________________________ Date ______________________

Principal Investigator Signature ______________________ Date ______________________
Appendix B

Background/Information Sheet for New Teachers

Name: ______________________________________________

School: _____________________________________________

Assignment (Grade/Subject): ___________________________

School Address: ______________________________________

School Phone Number: _________________________________

Voicemail Extension: __________________________________

Work Email Address: __________________________________

Home Address: _______________________________________

Home Phone Number: __________________________________

Home Email Address: __________________________________

Best method to contact you: _____________________________

Best time to contact you: _______________________________

Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date Earned</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Certification(s) held: _____________________________

State Granting Certification: _____________________________

Alternate Route: Yes or No (Please circle one)

Teaching Experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of years teaching: ________

List additional assignments on the back.
Appendix C

Background/Information Sheet for Program Coordinators

Name: ______________________________________________
School: ____________________________________________________________________________
Assignment (Grade/Subject): __________________________________________________________

School Address: _____________________________________________________________________
School Phone Number: __________________________________________________________________
Voicemail Extension: ___________________________________________________________________
Work Email Address: ____________________________________________________________________

Home Address: _______________________________________________________________________
Home Phone Number: __________________________________________________________________
Home Email Address: ___________________________________________________________________

Best method to contact you: __________________________________________________________________
Best time to contact you: ___________________________________________________________________

Education:
Please list degree(s) held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date Earned</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Certification(s) held: ____________________________________________
State Granting Certification: ____________________________________________
Alternate Route: Yes or No (Please circle one)
Teaching Experience:
Please list any teaching assignments (grade level/subject) including student teaching, that you have held and dates for each assignment (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of years teaching: ________ Number of years in present district: ________
List additional assignments on the back.
Appendix D
Background/Information Sheet for Program Director

Name: ___________________  District: _________________  Title: ___________________

School Address: ______________________________________
School Phone Number: _________________________________
Voicemail Extension: __________________________________
Work Email Address: __________________________________

**Education:**
Please list degree(s) held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date Earned</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Experience:**
Please list all teaching assignments that you have held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of years of teaching experience: _____

**Administrative Experience:**
Please list all administrative assignments that you have held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of years of administrative experience: _____

**Related Experience:**
Please list any additional educational assignments that you have held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of years of related experience: _____

Total number of years in education: ________  Number of years in present district: _____
Appendix E

Interview Protocol for Beginning Teachers

Introduction

1. How is it going so far?

2. How did you come to teach at ______?

3. What attracted you to the district?

4. Have any of your impressions changed after the orientation? If so, in what ways?

5. Has teaching at ____________ been what you expected? In what ways?

   What if anything has been surprising about teaching at ____________?

6. How does teaching at ____ compare with your previous district?

7. Could you describe to me your experience with the hiring process in the district?

8. How did you learn about the position?

District Orientation

9. How many interviews did you have with the district?

   Who was involved in those interviews?

   Did you have to teach a sample lesson?

   Which school officer extended the invitation of employment?

10. You just participated in the district orientation and I would like to find out

    what you found most useful?

11. Are there specific things you learned that have been particularly useful in preparing

    for the start of the school year?

12. Did the summer orientation provide you with any useful information about your

    school, the curriculum, the students, the parents, or the community? Explain.
13. Overall, what was most helpful about the summer orientation?

14. Was there anything that you wished the orientation covered but did not?

15. Did you get a sense of the district’s approach to your discipline? Please explain.

*Job Assignment*

*I want to turn now to your job assignment...*

16. When did you learn your specific course assignments?

17. When did you learn the number of “preps” and how many students you would be teaching?

18. When did you learn about the ability level of your students?

19. So far, what is your sense of what a successful teacher looks like in this district?

   Where did you get this sense?

   Did you gain a sense of what the district expects of students?

   How does the district want teachers to interact with parents?

   Who or what has helped you get a sense of these expectations?

20. Do you feel that the district promotes a particular teaching approach or style? Explain.

21. Did the orientation change, in anyway, the expectations you have of yourself, your students, or their parents?

*School Orientation*

*Thus far, we talked about the district orientation program. Did your school have an orientation or special program for new teachers prior to the start of the school year?*

22. Have you been assigned a mentor?

23. What do you perceive to be your mentor’s role?

24. Have you had opportunities to meet formally or informally with your mentor?

   If yes, how often?
Tell me about those meetings? What goes on in them? What sorts of things do you do or discuss with your mentor?

25. Besides your mentor, are there any other supports or resources in your school that you have access to?

Have you utilized these resources? In what ways?

26. Have you had opportunities to meet formally or informally with other beginning teachers?

If yes, how often?

Tell me about those meetings?

What was discussed?

Where were they held?

How do you feel toward your “new” colleagues?

27. How much guidance have you received on what or how to teach?

28. When did you receive curriculum materials?

Who helped you with these materials?

29. Do you share or discuss curricular issues with anyone in the building? Explain.

30. Do you share or discuss lesson planning or student assessment with anyone in the building? Explain.

31. When needed, do you know where to go for help? Explain.
Appendix F

Interview Protocol for Program Director

Goals and Program Description

1. What would you say are the main goals of the induction program?
2. In your mind, how would you define a successful teacher in the district?

What do teachers need to know to succeed here?

What do they need to be able to do to succeed here?

3. What are the teacher induction programs or practices currently in place in the district which support beginning teachers?

Could you briefly describe the main components of the district’s induction program, and how you see them supporting new teachers?

What is the main goal for each component of the program?

4. How much time do participants spend in teacher induction activities? Do the activities occur during regular school hours, after school, on the weekends, or a combination of these times? If so, please specify.

5. My understanding is that both novice and experienced teachers new to ___ are required to participate in the district’s induction program. Is that correct?

Has this always been the case?

Do they participate in all of the same program components?

6. Has there ever been any discussion about running separate programs for the two groups of
do teacher or not requiring experienced teachers to participate?

*Planning and Organization of the Induction Program*

7. What aspects of the induction program are run at the district level and what aspects are run at the school level?

   How do the district central office and the schools work together to implement the induction program?

8. What is your role in the induction program?

   How much do you plan?

   How is it delegated?

9. What role do the building principals play in the induction program?

10. What role do the teacher/induction coordinators play in the induction program?

    How are the teacher/induction coordinators chosen?

    Who do they report to?

11. What role do the supervisors have in the induction program?

12. How do you all coordinate your work?

*Mentoring*

13. What is the role of the mentor in the induction program?

14. Who provides the mentoring or guidance to new teachers?
15. What are the expectations of mentors and what do they provide or do with new teachers?

16. What is the selection process for choosing an individual or team to mentor or guide beginning teachers?

   Are they in the same subject or grade level as the beginning teacher?

   Do they need a minimum number of years of teaching experience?

17. Is there a training system in place for mentors? Describe briefly this training system.

18. What incentives exist for individuals to become mentors?

   History/Feedback Loops/Changes

19. What are the known or perceived outcomes of your teacher induction programs?

20. Are there plans in place to change the current teacher induction program? In what way do you expect the induction program(s) currently implemented in this district to evolve over the next 5 years?

21. What would you say are your biggest challenges in developing and administering the induction program?

22. Are there teacher induction programs or practices in the district that have been discontinued? Please describe briefly the reasons why the programs or practices no longer exist.

23. Are beginning teachers provided opportunities, as part of the induction process, to observe and/or participate in teaching and learning activities in exemplary classrooms? If yes, how often do teachers participate?
24. What is the relationship between the teacher induction program for new teachers and the evaluation system of new teachers?

How, if at all, does the role of evaluation come into play in the induction program?

25. What, if any, tensions exist between support and evaluation of teachers?

How is this addressed?

26. Do you get feedback from evaluations?

27. Does this feedback get shared? With whom? Does the teacher know this?

28. Novice teachers often make mistakes as they try out new things and learn on the job. I wonder how you strike a balance between having high expectations for all teachers and yet also accounting for the unique situation new teachers face. Is there a mechanism in place in which teachers can seek assistance?

29. What feedback do you get about new teachers and how they are doing?

How do you learn this?

30. In a typical year, what is the budget to run an induction program or otherwise provide support, guidance and training for beginning teachers?

What amount is provided to each typical school?

31. What are the major expenditures to run a teacher induction program? For example, is the money spent on mentors, workshops, or extra teachers?
Appendix G

Interview Protocol for Program Coordinators

1. How long have you been affiliated with the district?
   In what capacity?
   In addition to serving as a program coordinator, what other responsibilities do you have in the district?

2. What is/are the goal(s) of the induction program?

3. Could you describe to me your role in the novice teacher induction program?
   a. How long have you served as a program coordinator in the induction program?
   b. How did you come to serve as a coordinator of the induction program?
   c. Planning the program? Running the program?
   d. What training, if any, have you received to serve as program coordinator?
   e. What are the district level components of the induction program?
   f. What are the school-based components of the induction program?
   g. Who helps you run/make the program work at the school?

4. What resources/supports do you have at your disposal?

5. What are the challenges of serving as a program coordinator?

6. Are your colleagues supportive of your role as coordinator? Are there any tensions?

7. What is the role of the principal in the induction program?

8. Do you interact with the supervisors in your role? In what ways?

9. What is the mentor’s relationship with the supervisors and induction coordinators?

10. What do you find that new teachers at either school struggle the most with?

11. In what ways have the teacher coordinators tried to address these struggles or areas?
12. If you see a teacher struggling in any particular way, what do you do?
13. What do you do with the information you learn from teachers participating in the program?
   Do you share this information?
   Are your conversations with them or your observations of their teaching confidential?
   Explain.
14. In your role as coordinator, are you there for support or evaluation? Explain.
15. In your mind, how would you define a successful teacher in the district?
16. Do you think the induction program as a whole does a good job helping new teachers?
17. What are the strongest parts of the induction program?
18. What needs work in the induction program?
19. Do you have specific changes in mind for the induction program at either the district or school level? Explain.
20. What is missing from the teacher induction program?
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IRB Approval

Office of Research and Regulatory Affairs
Arts and Sciences IRB
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
335 George Street / Liberty Plaza / Suite 2000
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

P.I. Name: Struncis
Protocol #: 16-005M

August 23, 2016

Sean Struncis
36 Riker Hill Road
Livingston NJ 07039

Dear Sean Struncis:

Protocol Title: “New Teacher’s Induction Experiences”

This is to advise you that the above-referenced study has been presented to the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, and the following action was taken subject to the conditions and explanations provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Date:</th>
<th>5/3/2016</th>
<th>Expiration Date:</th>
<th>5/2/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expedited Category(s):</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>Approved # of Subject(s):</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This approval is based on the assumption that the materials you submitted to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) contain a complete and accurate description of the ways in which human subjects are involved in your research. The following conditions apply:

- **This Approval**—The research will be conducted according to the most recent version of the protocol that was submitted. **This approval is valid ONLY for the dates listed above**;
- **Reporting**—ORSP must be immediately informed of any injuries to subjects that occur and/or problems that arise, in the course of your research;
- **Modifications**—Any proposed changes MUST be submitted to the IRB as an amendment for review and approval prior to implementation;
- **Consent Form(s)**—Each person who signs a consent document will be given a copy of that document. If you are using such documents in your research, the Principal Investigator must retain all signed documents for at least three years after the conclusion of the research;
- **Continuing Review**—You should receive a courtesy e-mail renewal notice for a Request for Continuing Review before the expiration of this project’s approval. However, it is your responsibility to ensure that an application for continuing review has been submitted to the IRB for review and approval prior to the expiration date to extend the approval period.

Failure to comply with these conditions will result in withdrawal of this approval.

Please note that the IRB has the authority to observe, or have a third party observe, the consent process or the research itself. The Federal-wide Assurance (FWA) number for the Rutgers University IRB is FWA0003913; this number may be requested on funding applications or by collaborators.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

cc: Dr. Catherine A. Lagg