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ABSTRACT

Research studies have concluded that many new teachers abandon their teaching careers shortly after starting them. Part of the reason is their lack of adjustment within the very special social structure of public education. Induction of teachers frequently appears to be inadequate. Research over the past 20 years suggests a correlation between positive induction experiences and the quality of schools.

This causal comparative study entailed a 3 x 2 design with three levels of school effectiveness and two levels of teacher experience. The schools were classified as effective, typical, or ineffective based on a classification scheme produced by the Louisiana Department of Education. In addition, the schools' classifications were further verified by students' actual academic performance. All schools in the effective group scored higher on a criterion-referenced test than those in the typical group, which in turn scored higher than those in the ineffective group. Teachers were classified as experienced or inexperienced based on their prior teaching experience in other schools. Teachers with one year or less of service in their current schools were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to assess their induction experience at their schools. The questionnaire was based on the work
of Rosenholtz described in her 1989 book, *Teachers' Workplace*. Teachers who completed the questionnaire and volunteered to do so were interviewed. The answers from the interviews were grouped into emergent themes that distinguished teachers from each of the three levels of school effectiveness status. These results were compared to the results from the written questions.

The results showed that teachers from effective schools had a more positive view of their induction experience than teachers from ineffective schools. Teachers from typical schools had a view intermediate between that of the effective and ineffective schools. The experienced teachers did not view their induction differently than the inexperienced teachers. The interview results supported the conclusions of the quantitative study.

These results suggest that successful induction of teachers into a school produces a teaching environment that results in higher academic achievement. They support an increased effort to train principals and staff in the key role they play in the induction process.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the professional life span of teachers, few periods compare in impact and importance with the first year of teaching in a school. Some teachers, whether this is their first year of teaching or they have many years of teaching experience, find this experience exciting, challenging and exhilarating. For others, this first year may seem to be confusing, uncontrollable and filled with insoluble problems, and they may feel threatened by personal defeat and failure.

When considering someone in a new social or work environment, one must keep clear the definitions of socialization and induction. These two terms are sometimes used interchangeably and incorrectly. Socialization, as explained in more detail in Chapter Two, is the adjustment of individuals to their environment (Feldman, 1976). Induction is the process by which leadership and peers in a job setting help individuals understand what is expected of them in their new environment (Schlecty, 1985). This research project will center on the induction process for newcomers, both experienced and inexperienced, to a school.

Teachers in a new school are faced with many new experiences and unfamiliar environments. Johnson (1985) states they are challenged to demonstrate their ability as
competent professionals through their assessment of each situation and their handling of matters. These newcomers must also contend with how they are perceived by their students, peers, parents and superiors. They often wonder how they are doing, what is expected of them and if they should keep their questions and ideas to themselves.

These newcomers usually are unfamiliar with the school campus or where the supplies, faculty room, hallways and rooms are located. Johnson further states that they are unfamiliar with the rules and regulations of the school. Unless told, they might not know that fire drills are always on Friday afternoon or that Culture Committee meetings posted on the faculty bulletin board really means to meet at a nearby bar for drinks. These situations could be a problem for the newcomers who aren't aware of the unwritten lore of the school.

A study by Ryan et al. (1980) concluded that many teachers become discouraged and abandon their teaching careers. The turnover rate in the metropolitan system where this research was conducted was 9.5% in 1989-90 and 10.5% in 1990-91 (W. H. Robbins, private communication, April 7, 1992). Nationally, approximately 15% of all new teachers leave after their first year of teaching as compared to the overall annual teacher turnover rate of 6% (Schlechty & Vance, 1983). This means that the first-year teacher is 2 1/2 times more likely to leave the profession than his or her more experienced counterpart (Huling-
Austin, 1986). Schlechty and Vance also state that 15% of beginning teachers will leave after their second year and that an additional 10% leave after their third year of teaching. This attrition does not level out to a 6% rate until the fifth or sixth year. During the first seven years of their careers, 40-50% of beginning teachers will leave teaching.

There has been little systematic effort to help beginning teachers adjust to the site-specific problems they will encounter (Grant & Zeichner, 1981). Many new teachers function in professional isolation, abandoned by the institutions where they received their preservice education and neglected by overburdened school supervisory personnel. Teaching seems to be the only profession where the beginner becomes fully responsible from the first working day to perform the same tasks as a twenty-five year veteran (Lortie, 1975).

Part of the teachers' adjustment relates to their abilities to come to terms with the very special social structure of public education. Basically, schools are conservative places. As Edelfelt (1979) notes, there is a hierarchy, a power structure built into any school system designed to "protect against or resist radical change" (p.365). There appears to be a conflict between public education's basic social structure and the values of individuals who might make important contributions as teachers. Given this conflict, many potentially good
teachers find themselves unable to adjust to the constraints they view as inherent within the educational system (Armstrong, 1983).

Inexperienced and experienced new faculty members have different needs. Unless the principal and staff are aware of these differential needs, newcomers will not be adequately inducted and will have difficulty with their overall socialization process.

Odell's (1986) research finds evidence that first year, inexperienced, teachers need help in classroom management. They must be given guidance and ideas related to discipline, scheduling, planning, and organizing the school day. Houston and Felder (1982) found that inexperienced teachers anticipated that time would be allocated and resources provided to assist them to prepare for the first week of class. On the other hand, experienced teachers asked for more system information support than inexperienced teachers. This system information related to the procedures, guidelines and expectations of the school district.

Due to the difficulty in attracting and retaining good teachers, efforts to ensure successful induction of beginning teachers would seem prudent. The principal and the faculty members must be aware of their roles in making the newcomers a part of their school.

Administrators must be made more aware that their efforts could make a significant difference in teacher
morale and, in turn, decrease the dropout rate of beginning teachers. Current research indicates teachers need positive social induction to aid in their adjustment to their new school (Rosenholtz, 1989). This theoretically driven survey study by Rosenholtz resulted in important insights into the issues that motivate and demotivate teachers.

Further quantitative analysis has been undertaken by Teddlie and several other investigators over the last 10 years in Louisiana (Teddlie, Falkowski, & Falk, 1982). They developed more fully the concept of effective and ineffective schools with regard to a number of issues including effective teacher behaviors and teacher induction. For instance, Teddlie, Kirby and Stringfield (1989) demonstrated that teachers in effective schools demonstrated significantly better teaching techniques than teachers in ineffective schools.

This research was followed by an examination (Kirby, in press) of teachers with less than three years of total teaching experience in historically effective or historically ineffective schools. This study used the Beginning Teacher Questionnaire (BTQ) to collect information related to induction, especially focusing on assistance, monitoring and team building. The results showed teachers from effective schools rated their schools higher on 13 of the 14 items measured by the BTQ than did teachers from ineffective schools. The beginning teachers
in historically effective schools rated their schools' environment as better on assistance, team building and monitoring than those in historically ineffective schools. Kirby concluded that while these studies indicated interesting results for beginning teachers in differentially effective schools, further research was needed in this area.

HYPOTHESES

Studies by Rosenholtz and Teddlie and his associates indicate areas where further research could be done to more fully evaluate and understand the differences between effective and ineffective schools. It appears that the group most susceptible to the influence of effective and ineffective schools are newcomers to the school. Newcomers are either novice teachers in their first year of teaching or teachers with several years of experience but in their first year in this particular school. This study will also examine whether novice teachers have different perceptions of their schools than do experienced teachers in their first year in their schools.

Using a questionnaire developed by Rosenholtz, this study will compare the ability of effective, typical and ineffective schools to socially induct the newcomer teachers. In addition, some teachers selected at random from the sample will be interviewed to further explore their view of the induction process at their schools.
These teachers were randomly selected from those who volunteered to be interviewed. Approximately an equal number of experienced and inexperienced teachers were selected from each school level (effective, typical, ineffective).

Thus, this study will follow up on some aspects of the Rosenholtz work but will concentrate more fully on the induction processes at work in differentially effective schools. This study will also follow up the work of Teddlie and his associates, except that it will be restricted to first year teachers and will add the interview protocol. In addition, it will have a third group of teachers from schools that are considered typical or average.

There are two major hypotheses in this study, with a number of subhypotheses. They are as follows.

Hypothesis One

First year teachers will have a more positive induction experience at effective schools than at typical or ineffective schools.

Subhypothesis 1.A. First year teachers at effective schools will score higher on having Shared Goals than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

Subhypothesis 1.B. First year teachers at effective schools will have more positive perceptions of School Goal Setting than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.
Subhypothesis 1.C. First year teachers at effective schools will have more positive perceptions of Teacher Recruitment than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

Subhypothesis 1.D. First year teachers at effective schools will have more positive perceptions of Teacher Evaluation than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

Subhypothesis 1.E. First year teachers at effective schools have a more positive perception of Teacher Socialization than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

Subhypothesis 1.F. First year teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of Isolation/Cohesiveness than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

Subhypothesis 1.G. First year teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of their schools' success in Managing Student Behavior than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

Hypothesis Two

Experienced newcomers will have a more positive induction experience than inexperienced teachers across all types of schools.

Subhypothesis 2.A. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at Shared Teaching Goals than novice teachers.
Subhypothesis 2.B. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at School Goal Setting than novice teachers.

Subhypothesis 2.C. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at Teacher Recruitment than novice teachers.

Subhypothesis 2.D. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at Teacher Evaluation than novice teachers.

Subhypothesis 2.E. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at Teacher Socialization than novice teachers.

Subhypothesis 2.F. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at Isolation/Cohesiveness than novice teachers.

Subhypothesis 2.G. Experienced teachers will rate their schools as being better at Managing Student Behavior than novice teachers.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research study can contribute to the current base of knowledge on school induction processes by determining if effective schools are more capable than typical or ineffective schools in successfully inducting new teachers into their social structure. It may also stimulate school improvement by the development of themes which could guide principals in creating effective induction practices in
their schools. The results of this research should help principals focus on the needs of inexperienced and experienced newcomer teachers.

While this study will use the Kirby (in press) design comparing effective and ineffective schools, it added a third level of average, or typical schools. This third level replicates the work of Teddlie, Falkowski, Stringfield, Desselle, and Garvue, (1984) which added a typical level due to criticism by Purkey and Smith (1983). These critics felt that comparison between average and the extreme may be more appropriate than comparison between extremes.

This study will use the Rosenholtz questionnaire for the dependent variables rather than the Beginning Teacher Questionnaire developed by Kirby (in press). The Rosenholtz questionnaire touches on more areas of the overall teacher induction experience. This study will also use the interview technique, which should lead to a more comprehensive description of induction experiences. New themes regarding induction experiences may emerge during analysis of the qualitative data.

One of the key distinctions of this study is the division of new teachers in a school into two levels: those who are experienced and those who are not. Odell (1986) suggests that needs of inexperienced teachers are different than those of experienced teachers.
LIMITATIONS

This study utilizes as the independent variable the effectiveness status of schools, as measured by the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE). While these are the best statewide data available, if the regression analyses performed by the LDE do not accurately predict performance, then the independent variable may be erroneously coded.

This is a causal comparative study. While the method, sometimes called ex post facto research, can demonstrate in some cases a statistically significant relationship between two variables, it does not prove that the independent variable caused the change in the dependent variable. However, this limitation is frequently present in educational research where it is usually not possible to experimentally manipulate the independent variable and study its effect on the dependent variable (Borg & Gall, 1989).

This study is conducted in elementary schools only; thus, generalizations to other grade level configurations are inappropriate. Since this is the school level at which most major school effectiveness studies have been conducted, the results of this study can be compared to other research.
Chapter 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The following literature review is composed of three major areas: (1) research and theory related to the induction experience of newcomers to a school; (2) the effective school literature, focusing on the differences that newcomers might experience in different types of schools; and (3) the facets of teachers' experience as newcomers that might be affected by the school, focusing on the theoretical work of Rosenholtz (1989). In section one, the differential need of inexperienced versus experienced newcomers to a school will also be discussed. In section two, effective and ineffective schools will be discussed. This section emphasizes the difference between the effective school and the ineffective school in their ability to socially induct new teachers. The final section reviews the interaction between school administrators and personnel and new teachers.

TEACHER INDUCTION

The frustrations that new faculty members encounter when first coming to a school are understandable. They often find themselves initially assigned to unsuccessful, lower socioeconomic status schools, where high attrition roles produce the greatest availability of teaching positions (Rosenholtz, 1985). At such schools, other
faculty members typically have little time available to mentor or attend to newcomers. The lack of attention given new faculty members in these schools results in great stress, anxiety, frustration, and isolation. There is evidence that this stress leads to increased negativism and rigidity in the attitudes of many newcomers (Hoy, 1968). This in turn leads to high resignation rates as reported by Howey and Bents (1980).

When teachers leave the profession, a large investment of professional time and resources is lost. The National Center for Educational Statistics suggests that there might not be enough qualified teachers to staff the public schools in the future. The center estimates that by the early 1990's the demand for new teachers should reach 197,000 per year (Metropolitan Life, 1990). The number of people entering college to prepare themselves for a career in education has steadily declined (Feistritzer, 1983). By the year 2000 this situation is expected to worsen due to high retirement rates, enhanced curriculum requirements in public schools, shifting urban demographics, expanded career options for educated women, mandated reduction in class size and increasingly rigorous teacher credentialing standards (Hidalgo, 1985). Poor induction experiences for newcomers leading to large resignation rates exacerbate this potential teacher shortage.

While the negative effects of poor induction experiences are detrimental to the overall system, the
impact on individual teachers can be devastating. Houston and Felder (1982) parallel the novice teacher's experience to that of a Western movie where "a cowboy drives a magnificent wild horse into a corral, puts a bit in its mouth, a bridle around its neck, a saddle on its back, and then mounts. With the rider kicking its flanks, the horse, afraid and confused, bucks and kicks until it is exhausted, its spirit broken. Today, of course, horses are seldom broken in this manner; they are nurtured, gently introduced to the bridle and saddle, and rewarded for good behavior." (p.457)

Like the horses in the Western movies, the novice teachers become confused and afraid in their teaching environment. They aren't sure what is expected of them, and they're being watched to see if they're going to make it. In this school "corral" the new teachers are harnessed to students who are more familiar with the nuances of the school than they are. The first year is a lonely and emotionally draining time (Houston & Felder, 1982), which brings varying degrees of tension, doubt, anxiety, conflict and stress. Many have doubts about their abilities and are concerned about how others perceive them (Johnson, 1985).

Feldman (1976) used the term socialization in his research on schools to describe what should occur during the first few years of a teacher's career. He carefully formulated his socialization theory into a multistep process. He stated that in addition to learning the
culture, values and work skills of a new job setting, socialization means adjustment to the whole environment. He described a four-stage theory of socialization: anticipation, accommodation, role management and outcomes. These stages are outlined in Figure 2.1 and discussed more thoroughly below.

At the anticipation stage, individuals formulate expectations that may or may not be congruent with organizational demands. During this preemployment period, socialization consists of individuals' anticipation of their role in the organization.

Realism and congruence are two process variables that indicate progress through this initial stage of socialization. Realism deals with individuals' concepts of the whole picture of the organization. It indicates how successfully they have completed the information sharing and evaluation part of their recruitment. Congruence is the extent to which the organization's resources and the individuals' needs and skills are mutually satisfying. Usually adequate professional training is very important to this variable.

At the accommodation stage, individuals begin to understand what the organization is actually like and attempt to become participating members of it. In this second stage, rules are defined and the new employees engage in four main activities: learning new tasks, establishing new interpersonal relationships with
Anticipatory Socialization → Accommodation → Role Management → Outcomes

- **Realism**
  - Initiation to the task
  - Resolution of outside life conflicts
  - General satisfaction

- **Congruence**
  - Role definition
  - Resolution of conflicting demands at work
  - Mutual influence
  - Internal work motivation

- **Congruence of evaluation**
  - Initiation to the group
  - Job involvement

*Figure 2.1 The Four Stage Theory of Socialization. This theoretical framework was taken from Feldman (1976), page 434.*
coworkers, clarifying their roles in the organization, and evaluating their progress in the organization. Learning new tasks or initiation to the task is the extent to which employees feel competent and accepted as full work partners. It indicates how successfully the employees have learned new tasks at work.

The establishment of new interpersonal relationships is very important to new members of any team. It has been said many times "No man is an island." Clearly this is, as are most of these processes, an area where both the newcomers and the experienced team members play important roles. Clarifying their roles in the organization requires agreement with the work group on tasks to be performed as well as priorities and time allocation. Finally in the accommodation stage, the newcomers must evaluate their progress in the organization. Successful progress will be made only when supervisors and the employees agree on the progress the employee is making in the organization.

In role management, Feldman's third stage of socialization, the newcomers already have some tentative resolution of problems in their own work groups, and now the conflicting demands between the work setting and those of the home or outside life must be resolved. The employees must handle home-life/work-life conflicts and come to some decision rules for dealing with these conflicts. The second variable, resolution of conflict in the workplace, requires the employees to develop skills to
resolve conflicts among groups at work and develop some decision rules for dealing with these conflicts.

The fourth or outcome stage of successful socialization involves several factors: general satisfaction, mutual influence, job involvement and internal high performance motivation and commitment to work. Individuals that complete activities and resolve conflicts at each earlier stage will demonstrate the highest levels on these outcome variables. General satisfaction with work is one outcome noted by Feldman. Vroom (1964) reported that job satisfaction has been found to reflect differences in the specific nature of jobs or work situations that individuals have. For the teacher, therefore, his/her specific school environment is extremely important in determining overall job satisfaction.

A second outcome in Feldman's model concerns mutual influence. Van Maanen (1975) states that individuals have some mutual influence when they feel some control or power over the way work is carried out in their department or work unit. A lack of this type influence indicates ineffective socialization at the school site.

Internal motivation is probably the single area over which the newcomer has the most control. Yet, most social psychologists agree that even internal motivation is frequently promoted by skillful leadership. If people are highly motivated, they perform well on the job, and since good performance is self-rewarding, it provides the
incentive to continue to perform well. When individuals experience low internal motivation, they feel dissatisfied and alienated, and subsequently they engage in work behaviors that only reinforce their failures, including absenteeism from work, low effort expenditure and outright defection (Hackman & Oldman, 1980).

If high internal motivation is necessary, it follows that teachers' commitment can be viewed as the extent of their work investment, performance quality, satisfaction, attendance, and desire to remain in the teaching profession (Rosenholtz, 1989). For work to be motivating, people must have knowledge of the success of their efforts (Kanter, 1977). Knowledge of performance is directly related to the amount of positive feedback one receives from doing work. Feedback can be obtained directly from the work experience itself or from external recognition and approval from others in the organizational setting. Most teachers derive their strongest rewards, and thus internal motivation, from the external recognition they receive from colleagues, parents, and principals (McLaughlin, Pifiefer, Swanson-Owens & Yee, 1985). Of great importance to all teachers, of course, is the feedback they receive from the students. This can be in the form of praise but more often derives from seeing students who have become excited about learning because of what the teacher has done (Pollard, 1982).

Job involvement is the fourth outcome noted in Feldman's theory. Higher performance results when
individuals identify with the services their organization offers. Wiener and Gechman (1977) associate job involvement with the values learned in the induction process and with the degree of internalization of organizational goals.

This extensive discussion of the Feldman socialization model gives insight into the many areas where the socialization process can break down. Educators need to identify areas of challenge and help to solve the newcomers' problems. Principals, in particular, should have an aggressive formalized plan in order to induct newcomers successfully into their system.

This challenge is made more complex by the differing needs of the novice newcomer as opposed to the experienced newcomer. Both find coming onto a school campus for the first time is a combination of the known and the unknown, the anticipated and the unanticipated, the familiar and the unfamiliar (Ryan, 1979). This discovery is true for individuals experiencing their first year of teaching or for those with many years of teaching experience. Etzioni (1961) indicates that learning specific skills and role orientation continue with every change in status and, in particular, with membership in new social units.

Nevertheless, the needs of experienced teachers have some basic differences from those of the novice teachers. New teachers entering education bring with them perceptions developed during their professional education (Ginsburg &
Clift, 1990). These researchers describe this as the hidden education curriculum. Teachers enter education with the views of who they are as an occupational group, how they should teach, and with a belief they will be able to modify the curriculum to their point of view. Experienced teachers on the other hand have had their views modified by their years of teaching experience. Jordell (1987) argues that increased years in the classroom decreases the influence of the formative on the teachers' socialization approach to a new setting. Nias (1986) suggests however that teachers continue to draw on personal experiences as teachers, even after nine years in the teaching profession.

Odell (1986) studied 73 elementary schools focusing on the needs of novice and experienced teachers in a new school. Data were obtained from 86 first-year teachers and 79 teachers who were new to the system but who had an average of 5.6 years of prior teaching experience. Nine veteran classroom teachers served as full-time clinical support teachers under the guidance of a university-based teacher-induction program director. They recorded both the questions asked by the new and experienced teachers and the nature of the assistance actually offered to them. Seven generalized categories of support were offered in this induction program: system information, resources/materials, instructional, emotional, classroom management, environment and demonstration teaching. The average rank order of importance for each category was obtained by averaging the
individual rank orders assigned to each category separately across the 79 experienced teachers and the 86 first-year teachers each semester.

Interestingly, the experienced teachers asked for more system information support than the first-year teachers. The system information that the experienced teachers asked for dealt with information related to procedures, guidelines, or expectations of the school district. The experienced teachers wanted to know more about administrative details which would allow them to do their jobs properly. Issues such as time of arrival at school and attendance at teacher/parent organizational meetings were important to them. The first-year teachers also needed this information, but they were much more concerned about demonstration teaching than about system information.

Odell concluded that although there is variability in the needs of most new teachers on campus, the two primary needs are (a) to obtain fundamental information about the school district and (b) to obtain resources and materials pertinent to the information to be taught. The need for system information is critical to the experienced teacher, but the first-year teachers appear to demand more help involving teaching strategies and the instructional process.

Veenman (1984), on the other hand, suggests that classroom management support is not the single most important need of first year teachers. His studies
conclude that teachers with less than one year of teaching experience are just trying to survive in the classroom and their primary need is emotional support.

This inexperienced teacher's entry into a new school setting could be compared to the "Robinson Crusoe syndrome" (Lortie, 1975). The newcomer comes to his new island faced with the challenge of survival. As with Defoe's hero, the inexperienced teacher may find that prior experience supplies him with some alternatives for action, but his crucial learning comes from his personal errors. He fits together specific solutions and specific problems into a framework consistent with his experience and value system. Working largely alone, he finds his victories are a private affair. He needs others to show him how to manage his little bit of the island. He needs others to show and tell him how things have been done in the years past in his new paradise. He may, like Robinson Crusoe, become ambivalent when the chance for a big change looms on the horizon.

Tabachnick, Zeichner, Densmore, Adler, & Egan (1983) also studied the socialization of individuals in their first year of teaching, focusing on strategies teachers use to survive. This 2-year longitudinal study used the concept of "social strategy" developed by Lacey (1977, 1985). Three distinct social strategies were identified: (a) internalized adjustment, in which the teacher complies and believes that the constraints of the situation are for the best; (b) strategic compliance, in which the teacher
complies with the authority figure's definition of the situation but retains private reservations about the situation; and (c) strategic redefinition of the situation in which change is brought about by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. In the third strategy, the teachers achieve change by causing those with formal power to change their interpretation of what is happening in the situation. This study suggests that newcomers can give some direction to the induction of the teaching process in their schools.

Their study concludes, "The most pervasive and powerful factor in determining the level of institutional constraints in all the schools was technical control exerted through the timing of instruction, the curriculum and curriculum materials, and the architecture of the school." (Tabachnick et al., 1983:72).

These studies all direct the education system, and especially the principal and faculty, to pay greater attention to the many goals of the induction experience for newcomers.

Tisher (1982) summarized four of these goals as follows:

1. to extend the teachers' knowledge about the school and the education system and how both function.
2. to increase the teachers' awareness and comprehension of the complexities of teaching
situations and to suggest alternative ways of coping with these complexities.

3. to acquaint the teachers with support services and resources within the school and the region.

4. to help the teachers (generally through counselling activities) to apply knowledge they already possess, or could obtain for themselves, to the daily tasks or problems which confront them (p. 81).

Several reports suggest that the principal is the key to effective social induction. The principal must arrange affairs at the school to enhance the induction experience. These experiences should allow the newcomer to be involved directly in school processes. In elementary schools identified as having "high success, high involvement," Little (1982) states that it was difficult to find teachers who were not engaged in discussions about classroom practice. Westdale, a "high success, high involvement" elementary school in Little's study, had weekly formal in-service faculty meetings. All the teachers participated in the discussion of research or classroom practices, and worked together in grade level teams to prepare materials and lesson plans.

In successful induction, teachers view the principal as an active endorser and participant in collegial work (Little, 1982). But in many schools today, the principal does not have the time to devote to proper induction of
newcomers. Community pressures, teacher militancy, student activism, and societal problems ranging from drug abuse to racial issues detract from principals' most important role, motivating teachers and students. When she reflects on her job, she spends most of her time dealing with crises. It would be understandable if such a principal, even unconsciously, placed induction of new faculty members as a low priority. The principal needs to be aware that proper social induction experiences for newcomers lead to overall improvement of the educational program of the school. Through a better understanding of the needs of the new teachers on campus, and the design of the plan for meeting these needs, principals can improve the overall quality of their teaching staff and improve learning opportunities in their schools (Gorton, 1973).

Although Gorton concludes that a key factor to any program is the principal, little progress will be made unless the principals actively exert their leadership. Most administrators are concerned about the needs of their new teachers, but that concern must be translated into commitment and action. The professional nurture and development of the newcomers must be one of the highest priorities of the principal.

Thus the induction literature shows that the principal, the faculty and the newcomer all have key roles to play in the process. The proposed research will explore
in more depth the relationship between these participants and their effect upon proper teacher induction.

EFFECTIVE/INEFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

The induction experience of any teacher is determined by the particular school to which that teacher is assigned. Research over the past two decades (e.g. Brookover et al., 1978; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979; Teddlie et al., 1984, 1989; Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis, & Ecob, 1988) has confirmed that these schools vary dramatically with regard to their effectiveness status. Teachers assigned to effective schools can be expected to have quite different experiences than those assigned to average or ineffective schools. If a school is effectively delivering services to its students, then it is more likely that it will be effectively inducting its teachers. On the other hand, a school ineffectively delivering services to its students will probably be ineffective in inducting its new teachers.

Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) give an insightful understanding of how ineffective schools develop. Principals frequently come out of the classroom to avoid teaching. In some cases, principals had performed poorly at a middle SES school. This resulted in transfer to a lower SES school where parents complained less. They tended to view their job as bureaucratic with little vision and possessed little vision about what their school could
accomplish. Ineffective principals typically take little interest in the curriculum and try to avoid stirring up trouble at all costs. They seldom fire teachers and take whatever teachers are sent to the school by the central office, including a large number of "lemons" (Bridges, 1986).

Ineffective teachers like to work for such principals because they leave them alone. However, this leads to a situation where no competent teacher wants to come to the historically ineffective school. Eventually, finger pointing begins, usually involving blaming the students as being unable to learn.

Brookover and Lezotte (1979) reported that leaders are important in the creation and maintenance of effective schools. They identified characteristics or "correlates" thought to distinguish effective schools from ineffective schools. These correlates can be identified as: (1) emphasis on student acquisition of basic skills; (2) high expectations for students; (3) strong administrative leadership; (4) frequent monitoring of student progress; and (5) orderly climate conducive to learning.

Stringfield and Teddlie (1987) also found that teachers are critical to the creation of an effective school. They listed some of the steps in the process of becoming a highly effective school:

Step 1. An instructional leader or leadership group, ideally though not necessarily including the
principal, emerges or, more often, arrives. This person or group has a vision for what the school and its students could become.

Step 2. The principal chooses new teachers with great care ... looking for 'spark' or 'energy' rather than years of teaching experience or advanced degrees.

Step 3. Either alone or with the aid of his staff the instructional leader conducts an accurate audit of the school.

Step 4. In areas where multiple resources are available, effective principals become increasingly active in targeting career development for some, occasionally for all staff. This targeting is due to frequent in-class observations.

Step 5. The level of principal awareness of research on teacher effectiveness varied... from moderate to nonexistent. But all exercised the common sense notion that hard work leads to success (Stringfield & Teddlie, 1987:11-13).

These two studies (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Stringfield & Teddlie, 1987) contain some common themes. First, effective schools, almost by definition, produce excellent students. Second, the workplace environment, especially as described by the induction process, is key to the production of an effective school. Many principals focus on selecting new teachers that are highly qualified,
but the effective schools also ensure that they are properly inducted. One important aspect of effective schools is goal consensus, and one aspect of successful induction is the translation of these goals to new teachers. In schools with a lack of consensual goals, there is an absence of performance guidelines and clear criteria for success for new teachers. Under these conditions, goal dissension among both veteran and new teachers is likely to develop (Natriello, 1983).

In effective schools, the faculty has an awareness of newcomers' needs to know the norms of the school and to discuss situations with older teachers who have been there several years. Rosenholtz described three teachers in the second year of their professional career who made it clear how important it is to talk to their peers. "Mostly we talk about problems we are having with teaching. There are some really great teachers at this school and they have all sorts of ways to handle difficult problems; last year it seemed that all I did was pump these teachers for ideas—but they seemed to enjoy helping me. (In what ways did they communicate that they enjoyed helping you?) They would always ask, 'Did you try this and that?' And, 'What happened?' They really took a real interest in me, and that made me feel good, too." (Rosenholtz, 1989:36).

By such talk, teachers build up a shared language. There is a concreteness, precision and coherence in such a shared language. By contrast, in ineffective schools, the
newcomers report that their interaction with colleagues occurs in formal meetings to discuss administrative business and they consider the faculty lounge off limits to "serious" talk. Also, the avoidance of talk about teaching and the absence of even lending and borrowing of materials lead newcomers to be very cautious about verbally expressing their difficulties and accomplishments (Little, 1982).

In ineffective schools, the newcomers feel a professional isolation. Rosenholtz (1989:37) reports on a conversation with a transfer teacher with little experience. "Teachers here talk about children in a very negative way. They don't really talk to you unless you go along with their ideas. If you talk about how this kid or that kid is a pain, they welcome you with open arms." This teacher found herself in a dilemma: she resented the faculty's belittlement of students and yet recognized that a breach in their tradition carried serious and far-reaching consequences. If newcomers do not accept the norms of the faculty, they may find themselves isolated socially, deprived of any sense of group belonging.

The following description of a transfer teacher with four years of previous experience illustrates this social isolation: "Sometimes we discuss problem students and problem teachers. We have a couple of bad ones (teachers) now; one uses up all her sick leave. She has a poor reputation with the rest of the teachers. She doesn't look
like a teacher. (What do you mean?) Well, she wears tight clothing and lots of makeup. Her attitude is poor. She doesn't fit in with the rest of the teachers. (How well does she perform in the classroom?) Oh, her achievement test scores show that her kids learn a lot. We think maybe she is teaching to the test. But the kids in junior high come back to see her all the time. (How long has she taught in your school?) Four years, I think." (Rosenholtz, 1989:37).

While many school effectiveness studies have considered induction to be critical to teacher success, few have directly compared the induction experiences of teachers in effective and ineffective schools. Three recent studies (Teddlie et al., 1989; Teddlie and Virgilio, 1988; Kirby, in press) have examined specific teacher behaviors within effective and ineffective schools. The third study (Kirby, in press) directly examined the induction experience of new teachers in historically effective or ineffective schools.

The results of Teddlie et al., (1989) focused on case histories of 16 schools. These schools were divided into eight matched pairs of schools: one school in each pair had been classified as effective based on two years of achievement data controlling for socioeconomic status of the student body, while the other school in the pair had been classified as ineffective based on the same criteria. One of the key findings of this study was that teachers in
effective schools showed consistently superior performance compared to teachers in ineffective schools. The effective schools' teachers scored better than teachers in ineffective schools in areas such as presentation of new material, high expectations, positive reinforcement, discipline, and friendly attitude. Additionally, the teachers in effective schools had significantly higher time on task than those in ineffective schools.

Teddlie and Virgilio (1988) replicated these results using a different sample and slightly different design. Their design had three levels of effectiveness (effective, typical, ineffective) crossed by two levels of grades (elementary, junior high school). Results indicated that teachers in effective schools outperformed those from typical schools, who outperformed those from ineffective schools on several teaching dimensions. These results were consistent in both elementary and junior high school.

What contributed to these differences? The research suggests principal leadership. There was very little variability of teaching behaviors within effective schools but great variability within ineffective schools in both studies. The researchers found that effective schools' principals were involved in all aspects of the school. They were in the halls, in the classrooms and knew the children by name. The ineffective principals were seldom seen in the classroom, therefore allowing greater variability between teachers. Research by Kirby (in press)
directly looked at the differential experiences of beginning teachers in those historically effective and ineffective schools previously described by Teddlie et al. (1989). This study concentrated on teachers with less than three years experience in the 16 schools described earlier. The researchers developed the Beginning Teachers Questionnaire (BTQ) which dealt with three areas of teacher induction: assistance, monitoring, and team building. Twenty teachers from the historically ineffective schools and 18 from the historically effective schools responded to items from the BTQ.

The results showed that while all teachers rated their schools as generally supportive, the teachers in the effective schools consistently gave their school a higher rating on support than did those from the ineffective schools. Teachers in the effective schools rated their schools higher on every subscale on the BTQ except the one measuring how the school staff worked together as a team.

Both monitoring and assistance subscale ratings were statistically significantly higher in the effective schools than in the ineffective schools. Monitoring dealt with classroom observation of the teacher by the principal and following up with constructive suggestions and help. Assistance dealt with help concerning issues such as student discipline and classroom management.

It is interesting to note that there was less variability in rating scores for beginning teachers in the
effective schools than for those in the ineffective schools. This research suggests that there are supportive relationships between good teachers and good schools.

These investigators pointed out the need for additional research on the relationship between teachers' effectiveness and induction experiences. While the Kirby (in press) research has begun to quantify the effect of social induction on teacher development, much research remains to be done. These researchers concluded that efforts must continue to enhance our understanding of school effect on teacher socialization (Kirby, in press).

WORKPLACE AND TEACHER VARIABLES

Research on the relationship between effective schools and induction has been underway for over 20 years. However, there have been limited studies on the interaction between the school workplace variables and the teacher variables.

Rosenholtz (1985, 1989) became concerned about this lack of research. She believed that early frustrations encountered as a result of inadequate preservice preparation and a lack of collegial and administrative support result in novices leaving the teaching profession in disproportionately high numbers. There is little doubt that the influence of fellow teachers and administration style must be taken into account to understand teacher's socialization problems. (Nigris, 1988)
Rosenholtz used her theoretical perspectives and results from other research to develop a questionnaire designed to test which of several issues was most important to teachers. Her questionnaire consisted of seven categories: Shared Teaching Goals, School Goal-setting, Teacher Recruitment, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socialization, Isolation/Cohesiveness, and Managing Student Behavior.

She used a statistical approach developed by Joreskog and Sorbom (1978), called LISREL, which differs in several ways from multiple regression. This statistical approach allows one to evaluate the size and direction of the effect of several independent variables on the dependent variable. Several causal paths can be estimated using LISREL.

Rosenholtz (1989) identified several possible critical aspects of the teachers' workplace. She identified teacher effort, commitment and involvement as key to student learning. Rosenholtz concluded that work motivation has less to do with the teacher's training and value system than with the effective management of the school. Effective management, according to Rosenholtz, ensures that the teacher receives verbal awards from other teachers, students and parents.

Rosenholtz also asserted that teachers need substantial freedom to make decisions while having confidence the system will support them if they make a mistake. She points out that having discretion over
critical matters related to the classroom instruction will allow teachers to vary their instructional program depending on student needs.

Another key workplace need is room for professional growth. Teachers need the opportunity to modify their teaching to keep it from becoming monotonous. Principals and the faculty must investigate alternative methods to allow for continued teacher growth.

Goal clarity in the workplace is important in any job setting. It should be clear we cannot do our best if we do not know what is expected of us. Related to goal setting is teacher evaluation. Teachers need evaluation to ensure that they are meeting the school's goals. Low morale results when evaluation is inadequately conducted.

Rosenholtz found a correlation between managing student behavior and teacher isolation. Managing student behavior is a workplace problem that can be especially discouraging if the teachers feel they are not supported by the principal. Rosenholtz noted that "when novices enjoy support and instruction by principals and colleagues in maintaining appropriate student conduct, they accrue greater opportunities for learning" (Rosenholtz, 1989:429).

Rosenholtz also perceived teacher isolation to be a function of teacher behavior, as well as behavior on the part of the school's leadership. Teachers sometimes resist asking for advice in difficult situations. In a workplace conducive to communication, teaching should be viewed as a
collective activity, where difficulties can be shared without fear of judgment by fellow teachers. Leadership, either from the principal or a senior teaching colleague, is needed to foster this collective feeling.

Rosenholtz said that the strongest predictor of shared goals was proper teacher socialization. Teacher evaluation was the second largest contributor to shared goals.

The Rosenholtz questionnaire probes more completely several dimensions of teacher induction than the BTQ utilized by Kirby (in press). While the BTQ only examined three areas of teacher induction, Rosenholtz's questionnaire is designed to measure teachers' perceptions of their schools and their leadership in seven areas. All of these measures are important because of their relationship to teacher induction.
RESEARCH DESIGN

This causal comparative study involved comparing several elementary schools' abilities to socially induct new teachers into their staffs. The schools were divided into three groups. The first consisted of schools that were judged to be effective, the second those judged to be typical, and a third group judged to be ineffective. The schools were selected from a metropolitan school district that included a moderate-sized southern city.

Teachers with one year or less service in these schools were selected to participate in this research project. The study was designed to examine several aspects of a teacher's induction experiences in a new school setting. However, as discussed in the review section, it is likely that teachers with several years of teaching experience may fit into a new school environment more easily than those with less than one year of total teaching experience. To test this hypothesis further, the teachers were subdivided into two groups, those with less than one year of total teaching experience and those with more than one year of total teaching experience. The interviews and questionnaires were given to the teachers near the end of their first year in that school. This was thought to be a
time when new teachers could best judge the induction process they had undergone in the school.

All new teachers were given the questionnaire. A volunteer sample of teachers was also interviewed at a later date. While there are methodological problems with interviewing only volunteer teachers (Borg and Gall, 1989), this was the only procedure that the school system would allow. Teachers could not be interviewed on campus, as this would be too disruptive to the ongoing school process. The effect of the volunteer sample will be discussed in more detail in the Qualitative Results section in Chapter 4.

Thus, the study entailed a 3 x 2 design with two levels of teacher experience and three levels of school effectiveness. The study will be a causal comparative one (Borg & Gall, 1989) since neither of the independent variables were actually manipulated by the investigator.

Subjects were asked to answer written questions designed to assess their induction experiences at their schools. This questionnaire evaluated seven aspects of teacher induction. This survey was followed by interviews with volunteers. These interviews expanded on the information gained from the teachers' responses to the surveys. The interviews were used to provide a qualitative complement (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to the quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire responses.
The schools were chosen from those evaluated by the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) in its State/District/School Profile Program, which is part of the 1988 Children First Act (Louisiana Department of Education, 1990). Using data from the 1988-1989 and 1989-1990 school years, the LDE classified all state schools by school type, community type and academic performance. This study used only elementary schools from among the major school types (elementary, junior/middle, secondary and combination). This study also involved only metropolitan schools from among the major community types (metropolitan, urban fringe, city/town and rural). The LDE defined metropolitan status as per United States Census Bureau designation.

The elementary and metropolitan categories were chosen for two reasons: (1) they had the greatest spread of defined performance and (2) they had a sufficient number of schools for use in this study. While the school system used in this study is classified as metropolitan, it has a variety of school types ranging from semirural to inner-city. Thus, the results of this study should be generally applicable to other school systems having a variety of geographical sites.

Additionally, most studies of effective schools have been done on elementary programs. Weber (1971) was one of the first investigators to examine school effectiveness in elementary sites, followed by Brookover et al., (1978),
Teddlie et al. (1984, 1989) and Mortimore et al. (1987). Since the present study is also being conducted in elementary schools, its results can be directly compared to these earlier studies of school effects.

The LDE does not test every grade statewide, nor does it test every grade with the same mode of testing (Roeber, 1989). The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) tests the fourth, sixth, and ninth grades with norm-referenced instruments (NRTs), while the third, fifth, and seventh grades are tested with criterion-referenced instruments (CRTs).

The LDE (1990) rated schools using regression models in which student background variables were used to predict scores on the aforementioned tests. The rationale behind this type of analysis is that academic performance of a student body is known to be related to its members' socioeconomic status (Coleman et al., 1966; Brookover et al., 1978; Teddlie et al., 1984). Regression analysis controlling for the students' socioeconomic status (SES) yields residual values that indicate whether schools are scoring above or below expected values based on their SES levels.

Schools were evaluated by the state according to their actual academic performance on the LEAP tests compared to their predicted performance based on the percent of students receiving free lunch, the percent of the students receiving reduced-price lunch, and total number of
students. The LDE used these three factors in a regression analysis to predict the state CRT score for each school. These predicted scores were then compared to the actual test scores reported for each school by LEAP, and the difference score between the two (the residual value) was used to classify each school into categories.

The Louisiana Progress Profile Technical Manual (LDE, 1990) illustrates the procedure as follows on Table 3.1. Based on the percentage of students receiving free lunches, the percentage receiving reduced-priced lunches, and the student membership, the predicted mean score for hypothetical school #1 on the CRT was 90. However, the actual attained mean score for that school was found to be 96, or six points above the predicted score. Thus, that school was found to have a difference between the predicted and actual test score of +6 points.

This procedure was employed for schools within each combination (or cell) generated by school type and community type. For the purposes of this study, as noted above, the elementary, metropolitan school combination was used. The schools within each cell were then grouped on the basis of the difference between predicted and actual test scores. Table 3.1 presents an example of how the process worked for five of the approximately 180 schools contained in the elementary/metropolitan cell.

From this example, three categories emerged based on the difference between predicted and actual state CRT
Table 3.1
An Example of the Method to Determine Category Placement on Louisiana School Progress Profile System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
<th>School 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Test Scores</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Test Scores</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Test Scores</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This example was taken from the Louisiana Progress Profile Technical Manual (LDE, 1990)
scores. Schools one and three with scores of +6 and +5 respectively, scored well above prediction and composed one group. School five was in a second group, scoring about as predicted. Schools two and four, scoring minus five and minus four respectively, were in a third group of schools scoring below prediction.

Applying these procedures for all the schools resulted in eight groups of what the LDE called "similar" metropolitan elementary schools. In this case, "similar" means that schools in one category had similar deviations from their expected LEAP scores based on the regression analysis. The LDE designated the schools that scored the most below their predicted values as being category one. The schools that scored the most above their predicted score were placed in category eight (LDE, 1990). Thus there were eight categories of schools ranging from those with the most negative residuals (category one) to those with the most positive residuals (category eight).

For this research study, schools were designated as effective if they had positive residuals, typical if they had close to zero residual values, and ineffective if they had negative residuals. Each effectiveness group was to consist of 10 schools. To ensure a sufficient number of schools from the school district used in this research study, the schools designated by the LDE in categories one and two were classified as being the ineffective group. There were 11 schools in this group, from which 10 were
chosen for this study. Only 9 were used for the sample as one school had only one first-year teacher.

Similarly, schools in categories seven and eight were combined to yield 11 schools in the effective group, of which 10 were in the original sample. Categories four and five were combined to give 17 schools in the typical group, of which 10 were included in the original sample. These 29 schools then composed the population of effective, typical and ineffective schools from which the study sample was drawn.

This definition of effectiveness is related to all students in a school. Some authors (e.g., Levine and Lezotte, 1990) have argued that a school can be differentially effective for subgroups of students, such as the economically disadvantaged. While this is true, the most common definition of school effectiveness, based on performance by all students, will be used in this study.

The initial study sample consisted of 29 schools, 10 effective, 10 typical and 9 ineffective. Table 3.2 contains a graphic representation of the initial sampling design. The procedure used by the LDE should result in each of the study groups (effective, typical, ineffective) having schools with similar SES student bodies. That is, the average SES level of the effective schools should approximately be equal to that of the typical schools and the ineffective schools. This feature of the study is critical, since the research is designed to evaluate
Table 3.2
Characteristics of Sampling Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Number of Teachers Per School</th>
<th>Number of Schools in Sample</th>
<th>Number of Schools in Population</th>
<th>LDE Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
induction processes while holding the SES level of the student bodies constant.

All teachers with less than one year experience at each of these schools were employed in the study. These teachers were then divided into those with less than one year teaching experience and those with more than one year. This was done to determine if teachers with more experience were more easily inducted into a new school setting than those with no teaching experience.

The initial study sample was to consist of 29 schools and approximately 180 teachers. These numbers of schools and teachers should allow statistical analysis at both the school and teacher level, as has been recommended by several authors (Hanson, Gardner, & McNamara, 1986; Sirotnik & Burstein, 1985).

Chapter 4 contains a description of the final sample utilized for this study. Due to unforeseen methodological errors in the LDE sample, a more complicated procedure was used to generate the final sample used in this study.

MEASURES

Each teacher was given a cover sheet stating the purpose of this research (Appendix A). Each was asked to complete an information sheet ascertaining the name of the school, the teacher's gender, the teacher's years of teaching experience, and additional information concerning the follow-up interview (Appendix B).
Next, the teachers completed a questionnaire developed by Rosenholtz (1989) measuring teacher perceptions of their schools and the schools' leadership. Rosenholtz developed a theoretical framework concerning the social organization of schools that centered on goal consensus among faculty members. She tested her theory through the use of a forty-item questionnaire focusing on seven areas of teachers' perceptions: Shared Teaching Goals, School Goal Setting, Teacher Recruitment, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socialization, Teacher Isolation/Cohesiveness, and Managing Student Behavior. Appendix C contains the Rosenholtz questionnaire.

Rosenholtz (1989) measured the internal consistency of her instrument and computed item-to-scale correlations. The results of these analyses are found in Table 3.3. She also computed correlation coefficients among the seven scales and these results are summarized in Table 3.4. These data indicate that her instrument has adequate psychometric properties to be utilized in the current study.

The first set of questions deals with Shared Teaching Goals. The questions focus on the common commitment of the teachers and principal to the goals and values of the school. This set also contains two questions asking whether the teachers put pressure on one another to improve.
Table 3.3
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients and Item-to-Scale Correlations for the Rosenholtz Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Item-to-Scale Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Teaching Goals</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.19 to .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Goal-setting</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.27 to .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Recruitment</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.30 to .44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.21 to .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Socialization</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.26 to .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation/Cohesiveness</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.20 to .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Student Behavior</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.43 to .65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These data were taken from Rosenholtz (1989), pages 21-23.
Table 3.4
Correlation Coefficient Among Subscales of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goal-setting</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recruitment</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managing student behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Isolation/cohesiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shared goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Undergraduate status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These data were taken from Rosenholtz (1989), page 25.
The second set deals with Goal Setting. The questions probe both the exact guidelines for expected teacher performance and faculty discussion of goals. These questions also probe the importance of goal setting in teachers' everyday school conversations.

The third set deals with Teacher Recruitment. Good induction might include confidence that the best teachers are recruited and that the teachers had input into the recruitment.

The next set of questions deals with Teacher Evaluation. Two key aspects of this process are the principal's involvement in evaluation and the fairness of evaluations. Both aspects are probed in this set of questions.

The next set deals with specific aspects of Teacher Socialization. The questions probe faculty goals and the acceptance felt by the new teacher from both the principal and faculty.

The next set of questions deals with Isolation/Cohesiveness. The questions ask the teacher how she feels about the sense of family in the school. It includes items about sharing responsibilities and of being part of the group.

The last set of questions deals with Managing Student Behavior. These questions probe the teachers' opinions regarding the support available from the faculty and principal in managing student behavior. They also ask whether the same rules apply equally to all.
The Rosenholtz questionnaire was utilized to allow the teachers to respond to each question with an answer numbered from one to five on a Likert Scale. If teachers agreed strongly with the statement, they marked a five. If they disagreed strongly, they marked a one. Since some questions are negatively worded to avoid response bias, those items were recoded during data analysis. The questions were not given in blocks associated with each Rosenholtz scale, but were mixed randomly to discourage systemic answers to any one set of questions. Appendix D contains the questions in the order they were given to the teachers.

In addition, a volunteer sample of teachers was interviewed by the primary investigator. Interview questions were designed to probe further the phenomenon of teacher induction in the school. The interview questions consisted of modified questions from each of the seven categories of the Rosenholtz model for the social organization of schools. They were designed to encourage teachers to explicate more fully the reasons for answers given to the survey. Appendix E contains these questions.

Data from these open-ended interview items were analyzed using the constant comparative technique of Lincoln and Guba (1985). Themes that emerge from each of the seven general areas will be presented together, and then broken down by those that emerge most commonly from effective, typical, or ineffective schools. A section in
Chapter 4 describes the methodology for the qualitative study in more detail.

RESTATEMENT OF THE HYPOTHESES AND ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

Hypothesis One

First year teachers will have a more positive induction experience at effective schools than at typical or ineffective schools.

Hypothesis Two

Experienced newcomers will have a more positive induction experience than inexperienced teachers across all types of schools.

The results of the surveys were analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), looking at three effects on the seven sets of questions described in the previous section: (1) the main effect for type of school; (2) the main effect for teaching experience; and (3) the interaction between the two variables. The hypotheses stated in Chapter 1 indicate that significant main effects for the two independent variables were expected.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter will be divided into four parts. The first part will deal with the characteristics of the final sample and will address the relative merits of dividing the schools by two different selection criteria. It will examine the results of statistical analyses using two different criteria to separate schools into effective, typical and ineffective categories.

The second part of this chapter concerns the quantitative testing of the research hypotheses. It will examine the effect of the two independent variables (effectiveness level of school and experience level of new teachers) on items from the Rosenholtz (1989) questionnaire.

The third part of the chapter will deal with considerations of psychometric characteristics of the Rosenholtz questionnaire. It will describe the use of factor analysis as a means to determine the underlying dimensions of the Rosenholtz questionnaire. It will compare the conclusions of Rosenholtz' work regarding the psychometric properties of her scale with those results found in this study. Since examination of the psychometric properties of the questionnaire was not an a' priori consideration of this dissertation, these results are
discussed under a section entitled ancillary quantitative analyses.

Finally this chapter will discuss the results of the qualitative portion of this research. This involved interviewing selected teachers from each of the three categories of schools (effective, typical, ineffective). This interviewing was designed to further investigate the attitude of teachers toward the induction process in their schools. This discussion will highlight the themes that arose from the several teachers questioned and examine the similarity of these themes between experienced and inexperienced teachers. The discussion will also examine the consistency of these themes across the three different categories of schools.

SELECTION OF STUDY SAMPLES

As explained in detail in Chapter 3, the schools in this study were chosen from those evaluated by the Louisiana Department of Education in its State/District/School Profile Program. The Louisiana Department of Education (1990) classified all schools by school type, community type and academic performance. This study dealt with elementary schools in a metropolitan area and based academic performance on the regression analysis described in detail in Chapter 3. Briefly, this method predicts scores on the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program on the basis of student background variables, mainly those
associated with students' socioeconomic status. The schools were determined to be effective, typical or ineffective based on how well they scored compared to what was expected, as determined by regression analysis.

Teachers were chosen who were in their first year of teaching at a particular school. These teachers were subdivided into two groups, those in their first year of teaching and those with more than one year of teaching.

The total sample consisted of 182 subjects from 29 schools. There were 60 teachers in both the effective and typical schools and 62 teachers in the ineffective schools. Of the total of 182 teachers, 57 were inexperienced and 125 experienced.

A key question in this research is the validity of the school selection process. The school "report cards" published for school year 1989-90 contained numerous errors as reported in the local newspaper (Myers, 1990 a, 1990 b, 1991 a, 1991 b, 1992). These errors included inaccurate suspension rates, wrong scores on ACT exams, inaccurate percentages on the number of not properly certified teachers, and incorrect student dropout rates.

While the procedure for assigning schools to different effectiveness levels was not questioned in the newspaper articles, it seemed logical to devise another strategy for determining effectiveness status. If the two methods agreed on the effectiveness status of certain schools, there would be greater evidence for the consistency of the
school performance classification. As Lang (1991) pointed out, there are numerous threats to the consistency of classification using regression analyses. These include: (1) choosing appropriate input variables such as SES; (2) deciding whether to study a given grade, a group of students, or the whole school; (3) computing residuals; (4) appropriate treatment of outliers; and (5) appropriate aggregation of the data.

A recent research study (Virgilio, Teddlie, and Oescher, 1991) utilized two criteria for assignment of schools to effectiveness status: (1) looking at residual scores from a regression analysis; and (2) checking to be sure that the actual mean scores of effective schools exceeded those of typical schools, which exceeded those of ineffective schools. The second criterion assures that the absolute level of performance of a school in a certain effectiveness level was greater than that of a school classified in a lower effectiveness level.

In comparing absolute level of performance, a procedure similar to that recently employed by Crone (1991) was used. Actual raw scores were taken from the 1989-90 Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP), a criterion-referenced test (CRT). The grades three and five raw scores for both language arts and mathematics were utilized. For each student, the math score and the reading score were converted to Z-scores, using the statewide means and standard deviations for each subject area and grade.
level. An average Z-score for language arts and mathematics was then computed for each student. The Z-scores were used because they are standardized scores which can be added to give an overall score for each student.

From these student-level averaged scores, a school mean was computed for grade three and grade five. These two mean scores for each school were then averaged to get one overall mean CRT Z-score.

From the 29 schools in the original sample, Z-scores were computed for 23 schools. These were divided into three groups with the Z-scores +.2189 to +.5340 assigned to effective schools. Z-scores of -.0866 to +.2115 were assigned to be typical schools. Schools were considered ineffective if their scores ranged between -.1430 and -.8863.

The purpose of this Z-score analysis was to provide an alternative classification of effectiveness status based on actual performance data. It was decided to include in the final sample only those schools that were consistently classified using both the residual scores from the regression analyses performed by the LDE and the average Z-scores that were obtained using the Crone (1991) technique. That is, further analyses used only those schools where both approaches indicated a school was effective, typical or ineffective. This reduced the sample size to 92 teachers and 16 schools (five effective, five typical, and six ineffective). A comparison of sample size
between the two approaches to choosing the study population is shown in Table 4.1. Demographic characteristics (race and sex) of the teachers and principals in the final sample and the interview sample are shown in Table 4.2.

QUANTITATIVE TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES

There were two general hypotheses for this study and each had seven subparts. The first general hypotheses stated that first-year teachers will have a more positive induction experience at effective schools than at typical or ineffective schools. This hypothesis was restated in the form of seven subhypotheses, one for each of the theoretical subscales contained in the Rosenholtz (1989) questionnaire.

The second general hypothesis stated that experienced teachers will have a more positive socialization experience than inexperienced teachers across all types of schools. This hypothesis was also restated in subhypothesis form for each of the seven Rosenholtz subscales.

The two overall hypotheses were tested using a 3 x 2 ANOVA statistical design with total score on the Rosenholtz questionnaire as the dependent variable. The two independent variables were effectiveness level of school (effective, typical, ineffective) and experience status of new teachers at the school (experienced, inexperienced).

The subhypotheses for the two general hypotheses were also tested using the 3 x 2 ANOVA design. In each case,
Table 4.1
Schools and Teachers in Two Study Samples
Based on Different Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Total No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Schools by Effective Classification</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Based on LDE Criterion only</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9 Ineffective</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Based on Multiple Criteria</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6 Ineffective</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2
Demographics by Race and Sex of Teachers and Principals in the Quantitative and Qualitative Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Method</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>35 Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Principals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>5 Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>5 Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>32 Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>6 Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the subhypothesis was first tested using a combined score for all items on the appropriate subscale. Then a $3 \times 2$ MANOVA was run, examining the results for individual items on the subscale. Results for individual items were reported only if the overall MANOVA value was significant.

Statistical analysis using the total sample of 182 teachers from 29 schools yielded no statistically significant results for the two general hypotheses and only a few significant results on the subhypotheses. The original sample, based solely on the LDE (1990) selection process, did not yield groups of effective, typical, and ineffective schools that were differentiable in terms of teachers' socialization experiences.

On the other hand, statistical analysis using the second sample of 92 teachers from 16 schools yielded significant results for the school effectiveness independent variable. Results from this sample will be used in the following section, which describes the quantitative testing of the hypotheses. The multiple criteria used to classify school effectiveness status for the second sample yielded a group of schools that were more clearly effective, typical, or ineffective, at least in terms of teachers' perceptions.

Hypothesis One

First year teachers will have a more positive overall induction experience at effective schools than at typical or ineffective schools.
This overall hypothesis was tested using total score on the Rosenholtz Questionnaire as the dependent variable. The school effectiveness independent variable had a significant effect on teachers' overall perception of their socialization experience \( F (2,86) = 4.33, \ p < .05 \). As indicated in Table 4.2, teachers in effective schools had a combined score of 169.6 on this scale, while teachers in typical schools scored 154.1 and those in ineffective schools scored 147.2. On all data reported in this section, higher numbers indicate more positive perceptions. Thus, teachers in effective schools perceived their experiences to be more positive than those in typical schools, who perceived their experiences to be more positive than those in ineffective schools.

Table 4.3 presents the means for total scores on each of the seven Rosenholtz subscales broken down by effectiveness level of the schools. In all cases, effective schools had higher scores than typical schools, which in turn had higher levels than ineffective schools. Some of the differences were statistically significant, while others were not. These differences will be discussed below under appropriate subhypothesis subsections.

**Subhypothesis 1.A.** First-year teachers at effective schools will score higher on having Shared Teaching Goals than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.
Table 4.2
Means and Standard Deviations for Total Scores on the Rosenholtz Questionnaire by Levels of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th>Inexperienced Teachers</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>143.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>149.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>160.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>171.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>160.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The range of scores for the total score is from 40 to 200. Higher scores indicate more positive perception.
Table 4.3
Means for Total Scores on the Seven Rosenholtz Subscales by Levels of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared Teaching Goals</th>
<th>School Goal Setting</th>
<th>Teacher Recruitment</th>
<th>Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Teacher Socialization</th>
<th>Isolation Cohesiveness</th>
<th>Managing Student Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This hypothesis was tested first by examining the total score for the six items in the Shared Teaching Goals section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness independent variable had a significant effect on teachers' overall perception of Shared Teaching Goals at their schools \[F (2,86) = 6.37, p < .01\]. As indicated in Table 4.4, teachers in effective schools had a combined score of 25.4 on this scale, while teachers in typical schools scored 23.4 and those in ineffective schools scored 21.7. Thus, teachers in effective schools perceived their schools to have more Shared Teaching goals than those from typical or ineffective schools.

Similarly, the results of the MANOVA analysis indicated a significant effect overall on individual items measuring shared goals \[F (12,160) = 1.81, p = .05\]. For all six questions in this group, the teachers rated the effective schools higher than the typical schools which were, in turn, rated higher than the ineffective schools. There were significant differences on two items: question 27, which assessed similarity of values and philosophy of education between teachers and their peers \[F (2,86) = 3.25, p < .05\]; and question 39, which assessed the teachers' shared level of commitment to student learning \[F (2,86) = 7.71, p < .001\]. Table 4.5 summarizes these results.
Table 4.4

Means and Standard Deviations for Scores on Shared Teaching Goals by Levels of Effectiveness and Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th>Inexperienced Teachers</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total scores can range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating more positive response.
Table 4.5
Means and Standard Deviations for Scores on Individual Items Assessing Shared Teaching Goals by Levels of School Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores on each item can range from 1 to 5, with the higher scores indicating more positive perception. Negatively worded items were recoded so that 5 was the most positive response.
Subhypothesis 1.B. First-year teachers at effective schools will have more positive perceptions of School Goal Setting than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

This hypothesis was tested first by examining the total score for the six items in the School Goal Setting section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness independent variable did not have a significant effect on the teachers' overall perception of School Goal Setting at their schools \([F (2,86) = 2.29, p = \text{n.s.}]\). While the results were not statistically significant, the pattern of means was in the predicted direction, as indicated in Table 4.3.

MANOVA analysis indicated a significant effect overall across individual items measuring School Goal Setting \([F (12,160) = 2.12, p < 0.05]\). For all six questions in this group, the teachers rated effective schools more positively than the ineffective or typical schools. Table 4.6 presents a summary of these results.

There were significant differences on two items: question 28, which assessed the degree of irrelevant side conversations at faculty meetings \([F (2,86) = 4.49, p < .05]\); and question 37 which assessed if there were explicit goals for student achievement in the school \([F (2,86) = 5.29, p < .01]\). Teachers at effective schools perceived fewer irrelevant side conversations and more explicit goals at their schools than did teachers at typical or ineffective schools.
Table 4.6
Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Scores on Individual Items Assessing School Goal Setting by Levels of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2 1.0</td>
<td>4.0 0.8</td>
<td>4.3 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2 1.0</td>
<td>4.1 0.8</td>
<td>4.5 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0 1.1</td>
<td>4.2 0.9</td>
<td>4.5 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.9 1.2</td>
<td>3.7 1.3</td>
<td>4.3 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.1 1.4</td>
<td>3.6 1.4</td>
<td>4.1 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0 0.9</td>
<td>4.2 0.8</td>
<td>4.7 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores on each item can range from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating more positive perceptions. Negatively worded items were recoded so that 5 was the most positive response.
Subhypothesis 1.C. First-year teachers at effective schools will have more positive perceptions of Teacher Recruitment than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

This hypothesis was first tested by examining the total score for the three items in the Teacher Recruitment section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness independent variable did not have a statistically significant effect on the teachers' overall perception of Teacher Recruitment at their schools \( F (2,86) = 1.25, p = n.s. \). As indicated in Table 4.3, the pattern of means was in the predicted direction even though it was not statistically significant.

Similarly MANOVA analysis indicated no significant effect overall on the individual items measuring Teacher Recruitment \( F (6,166) = 0.45, p = n.s. \).

Subhypothesis 1.D. First-year teachers at effective schools will have more positive perceptions of Teacher Evaluation than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

This hypothesis was first tested by examining the total score for the nine items in the Teacher Evaluation section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness variable did not have a statistically significant effect on the teachers' overall perception of Teacher Evaluation at their schools \( F (2,86) = 1.82, p = n.s. \). While the results were not statistically
significant, the pattern of means was in the predicted direction, as indicated in Table 4.3.

Similarly, MANOVA analysis indicated no statistically significant effect overall on the individual items measuring Teacher Evaluation [$F (18,154) = 1.38, p = n.s.$].

Subhypothesis 1.E. First-year teachers at effective schools have a more positive perception of Teacher Socialization than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

This hypothesis was first tested by examining the total score for the four items on the Teacher Socialization section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness independent variable did not have a statistically significant effect on the teachers' overall perception of socialization at their schools [$F (2,86) = 1.80, p = n.s.$]. As indicated in Table 4.3, the pattern of means were in the predicted direction, though not statistically significant.

Similarly, MANOVA analysis indicated no significant effect overall on individual items on Teacher Socialization [$F (8,164) = 1.35, p = n.s.$].

Subhypothesis 1.F. First-year teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of Isolation/Cohesiveness than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

This hypothesis was first tested by examining the total score for the seven items in the Isolation/
Cohesiveness section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness independent variable had a significant effect on teacher's perception of Isolation/Cohesiveness \([F (2,86) = 3.04, p = .05]\). As shown in Table 4.7, teachers in effective schools had a total score of 29.8 while teachers in typical and ineffective schools had a total score of 26.6 and 25.5 respectively. Teachers in effective schools perceived their schools to be more cohesive than those from typical or ineffective schools.

MANOVA analysis indicated no significant effect overall on individual items measuring Isolation/Cohesiveness \([F (14,158) = 1.39, p = n.s.]\).

**Subhypothesis 1.G.** First-year teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of their schools' success in Managing Student Behavior than teachers at typical or ineffective schools.

As with the other six subhypotheses, this one was first tested by examining the total score for the five items from the Managing Student Behavior section of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The school effectiveness independent variable had a significant effect on teachers' perception of Managing Student Behavior at their schools \([F (2,86) = 4.62, p < 0.01]\). As shown in Table 4.8, teachers in effective schools had a total score of 22.9 while teachers in typical and ineffective schools had total scores of 20.0 and 18.9 respectively. Teachers in effective schools had a more positive perception of their
Table 4.7
Means and Standard Deviations for Total Scores on Isolation/Cohesiveness by Levels of School Effectiveness and Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th>Inexperienced Teachers</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total scores can range from 7 to 35, with higher scores indicating more positive perceptions.
Table 4.8
Means and Standard Deviations for Total Scores on Managing Student Behavior by Levels of School Effectiveness and Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th>Inexperienced Teachers</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total score values can range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating more positive perceptions.
schools' success in Managing Student Behavior than did teachers in typical or ineffective schools.

MANOVA analysis indicated that the school effectiveness independent variable did not have a significant effect \[ F (10,162) = 1.70, \ p < .09 \] overall on individual items assessing Management of Student Behavior. Nevertheless, for all five questions in this group, the teachers rated effective schools more positively than typical schools, which were rated more positively than ineffective schools. There were significant differences on two items: question 19 which assessed the consistency with which rules for student conduct are enforced \[ F (2,86) = 6.36, \ p < .01 \]; and question 20, which assessed the degree to which rules for student conduct change at the school \[ F (2,86) = 4.37, \ p < .05 \]. Teachers at effective schools perceived greater consistency in rule enforcement and fewer rule changes at their schools than did teachers at typical or ineffective schools. Table 4.9 summarizes these results.

**Hypothesis Two**

Experienced newcomers will have a more positive induction experience than inexperienced teachers across all types of schools.

The overall hypothesis was tested using total scores on the Rosenholtz questionnaire as the dependent variable. The teacher experience variable did not have a statistically significant effect on teachers' overall
Table 4.9
Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Scores on Individual Items Assessing Managing Student Behavior by Level of School Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>School Type Ineffective</th>
<th>School Type Typical</th>
<th>School Type Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores on each item can range from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating more positive perception. Negatively worded items were recoded so that 5 was the most positive response.
perception of their induction experience \( F (1, 86) = 0.14, \ p = n.s. \). Experienced teachers gave a higher total rating for their schools (158.8) than did the inexperienced teachers (152.6). While the results were not statistically significant, they were in the hypothesized direction.

**Subhypotheses 2.A. through 2.G.**

The subhypotheses for Hypothesis Two considered whether or not experienced teachers have more positive induction experiences than do inexperienced teachers as measured by the seven subscales of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire. The teacher experience independent variable did not have a significant effect on any of the seven combined scores from these seven subscales.

The effect of the teacher experience independent variable was also tested using separate MANOVA analyses for each of the seven subscales. Results for the individual items were to be reported only if the overall MANOVA value across all items on the subscale was significant. The teacher experience independent variable did not have a significant multivariate effect on any of the seven MANOVA analyses; therefore, results from individual items cannot be reported.

**Interaction of Teacher Experience and School Effectiveness**

While none of the a priori hypotheses predicted a significant interaction between the two independent variables, it was appropriate to look at the statistics associated with the interaction to see if any significant
relationships occurred. Several statistical texts (e.g. Hays, 1973) conclude that significant interactions should be considered before looking at significant main effects.

The interaction between teacher experience and school effectiveness did not have a significant effect on the teachers' overall ratings of the schools. While not significant, the pattern of means for the experienced and inexperienced teachers presented in Table 4.2 is interesting. Experienced teachers rated ineffective and typical schools about the same, while they rated effective schools much higher. Inexperienced teachers gave a low rating to ineffective schools, but rated typical and effective schools about the same. While the experienced teachers rated the effective schools higher than did the inexperienced teachers, the difference was not statistically significant.

The interaction effect was not statistically significant for any of seven combined scores that included all items associated with particular subscales. The interaction effect was significant on only one of the MANOVAs that included individual items on the subscales. MANOVA results indicated that the interaction had a significant effect ($F (14.162) = 1.92, p < .05$) overall on individual items assessing Isolation/Cohesiveness. There were two significant univariate effects: one for item 21, which assessed the sharing of responsibility for the school's success and failures, and one for item 33, which
ascertained whether faculty members went for several days without talking to anyone about teaching. (This item's coding was reversed, so that larger numbers indicated that faculty members did not go for days without talking about teaching.)

The pattern of means for items 21 and 33 are found in Tables 4.10 and 4.11. For both ineffective and effective schools, the experienced teachers gave more positive responses than did the inexperienced teachers. For typical schools, the inexperienced teachers gave more positive responses than did the experienced teachers.

ANCILLARY QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES

Validation of Rosenholtz Questionnaire

While the overall totals from the Rosenholtz Questionnaire showed that new teachers in a school gave effective schools a higher score on teacher induction, the division of the questions into the respective categories is not strongly supported by this work. Some of the subhypotheses based on Rosenholtz' theoretical categories were significant, while others were not.

Table 4.12 contains a factor analysis of the 40 questions in the Rosenholtz Questionnaire based on responses from the total sample of 182 teachers in 29 schools. Values greater than 0.40 have an asterisk placed beside them, indicating that they are highly loaded on that
Table 4.10
Pattern of Means for Item Assessing Sharing of Responsibility for School's Success and Failure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective Schools</th>
<th>Typical Schools</th>
<th>Effective Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced Teachers</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Teachers</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Higher scores indicate more positive perceptions.
Table 4.11

Pattern of Means for Item Assessing Whether Faculty Members Went for Several Days Without Talking to Anyone About Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective Schools</th>
<th>Typical Schools</th>
<th>Effective Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced Teachers</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Teachers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Higher scores indicate more positive perceptions.
Table 4.12

Factor Pattern For Rosenholtz Questionnaire
Based On Varimax Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosenholtz Subscales</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Goals</td>
<td>*0.46240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.20846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Goals</td>
<td>*0.46598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.35515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setters</td>
<td>*0.60695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>*0.56134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>*0.48076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>*0.40472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.23486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Recruitment</td>
<td>*0.60606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>0.13175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.46760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.16349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.60606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.33726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.28330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.64763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.60398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>*0.65573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.66809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.28298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation/Socialization</td>
<td>0.13100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.15395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.23794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.13032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Student Behavior</td>
<td>0.31487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior</td>
<td>0.07604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Student</td>
<td>0.23298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.10775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.44878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirical Subscales: Overall Student Faculty Teacher
School Behavior Cohesiveness Emphasizing Evaluation, Student Achievement
Social & Goals Organization
factor (Cureton and D'Agostino, 1983). The 17 items under factor one are best described as teachers' understanding the goals and values of the principal and fellow teachers. Also included in this factor are teacher evaluation items, which concern a comparison of performance to goals. Factor 1 also contains teacher recruitment items which are associated with the new teachers' understanding of why the school chooses a teacher.

Factor 2 contains items strongly associated with the student. Most of the questions that are highly loaded in this group deal with student behavior and how the principal and teachers manage it. Also in this group is teacher commitment to student achievement.

Factor 3 contains items associated with faculty cohesiveness. While questions 13, 27 and 39 are grouped by Rosenholtz into shared teaching goals, they can easily be considered as a measure of how much the teacher agrees with the faculty, and thus maybe considered part of the faculty cohesiveness group. Question 28 is similarly related to cohesiveness. Question 36, which concerns teacher evaluation, actually addresses the question of whether the teachers show lack of support for their fellow teachers, again a cohesiveness issue.

Factor 4 contains high loadings for two of the questions under teacher evaluation. Interestingly, three of the questions under teacher evaluation show a negative value for this factor. Examination of these three
questions shows them only loosely related to evaluation and more closely related to the first three factors.

These factor loadings indicate that Rosenholtz (1989) may have arbitrarily placed certain items within theoretical subscales for which they are inappropriate. A closer examination of Rosenholtz's work (See Tables 3.3 and 3.4) also indicates that certain subsets of questions were divided on a somewhat arbitrary basis. The item to subscale correlation of the questions in each subscale was as low as 0.2. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each subset was about 0.7, with subscale three being only 0.56. There are, of course, overlapping items between each of these sets of questions. However, the current research suggests that if several of the questions were regrouped and perhaps only four subgroups were employed instead of seven, the relationships within subgroups would be stronger.

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Methodology For The Qualitative Study

Administration and evaluation of the Rosenholtz questionnaire yielded quantitative results on the perception of new teachers in effective and ineffective schools. To support and amplify these quantitative results, experienced and inexperienced teachers from effective, typical and ineffective schools were interviewed. These teachers were in their first year of teaching at
their schools. Probing into the teachers' perceptions of their schools gives further insights on effective and ineffective induction.

Sergiovanni (1984) states that in excellent schools things tend to "hang together." Blase and Kirby (1992) state that one of the goals of a good principal should be to foster this team spirit. They advocate that principals encourage involvement by teachers in as many of the decisions of the schools as possible. A sense of purpose rallies people to a common cause. Work has a meaning and life is significant. The teachers work together with spirit, and their accomplishments are readily recognized. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) also state that "meaning" is of essential concern in educational studies and that qualitative research techniques are generally necessary to produce results that have "meaning."

Virgilio, et al. (1991) called for more research on the differential induction and socialization processes that are ongoing at effective and ineffective schools. Interviewing is an excellent methodology for exploring induction processes as teachers see them. Thus, this researcher is interested in determining through interviewing, "What differential meanings do induction experiences in their schools have for teachers?"

When there is a limited time to conduct interviews, it is desirable to gather the same information from each person (Patton, 1990). Standardized open-ended questions
give teachers the opportunity to express their feelings in a limited period of time. Therefore, a standardized open-ended format was used in this study through which each person was asked essentially the same questions in the same order.

The interview questions were written in advance exactly the way they were to be asked during the interview. Careful consideration was given to the wording of each question before the interview. Any clarifications or elaborations that were to be used were written into the interview itself. Patton states that the basic purpose of standardized open-ended interviews is to minimize interviewer effects and bias by asking the same questions of each respondent. Moreover, since the interview was systematically administered, the necessity for interviewer judgment during the interview was reduced. Patton feels that the standardized open-ended questions can provide teachers a framework within which they can express their understandings, meanings and concerns in their own terms.

Those teachers selected for the qualitative study were from each of the three categories of schools (effective, typical, ineffective). They were interviewed to further investigate their attitudes towards the induction process that occurred in their schools. Teachers were selected from the set of 92 teachers from 16 schools (five effective, five typical, and six ineffective). In all, 16 teachers were interviewed (refer to Table 4.13). From each
Table 4.13
Number of Teachers Selected for Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th>Inexperienced Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of these schools, the selected teachers were divided into experienced and inexperienced groups.

Information from the questionnaire's participant information sheet (Appendix B) indicated whether teachers would be willing to be interviewed. This information also indicated the best times to conduct the telephone interviews. The researcher respected the teachers' requests and telephoned at the preferred times. None of the teachers declined the invitation to be interviewed. The telephone conversations ranged in length from a half hour to an hour.

Interview questions were designed to investigate specific organizational features of schools that inspire or give meaning to life within them. The questions were contained within the same seven categories (Shared Teaching Goals, School Goal-Setting, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socialization, Isolation/Cohesiveness, Managing Student Behavior) that were used for the Rosenholtz questionnaire. The interview protocol is contained in Appendix E.

The interviews were conducted in such a way as to encourage free expression. The researcher identified herself and reassured the teacher that everything that would be discussed would be in strictest confidence. Some teachers proved more open to the task than others, offering far more commentary than solicited. Teachers were told that no more than an hour of their time would be taken. This meant that for a few particularly loquacious teachers,
it was a difficult task to complete the interview within the hour time limit. Moreover, some teachers evaded certain questions, others just answered "don't know," while still others seemed to have in mind their own interview questions despite persistent attempts to keep them on task.

The unitizing and categorizing procedures advocated by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were followed to analyze the interview data. These authors suggested that pieces of information gathered from interviews should be able to stand on their own and should be interpretable in the absence of any additional information. These pieces of information are organized in a process called unitizing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Following the unitizing process is the categorizing procedure. Utilizing Lincoln and Guba's methodology, categories emerged that related to the same content, described the same properties and were internally consistent.

RESULTS FROM THE QUALITATIVE STUDY

The results will be discussed in terms of Rosenholtz's categories and will be divided into responses from teachers in effective schools, typical schools and ineffective schools. Spradley (1979) used "cover" term to designate the grouping of common thoughts or related items. For instance, in this research stand-offish was used as a "cover" term for reserved manner, small cliques, and
unfriendly behavior. This research will use themes to describe these common relationships. Themes that emerged from each group will be discussed and illustrative quotations from teachers will be reproduced verbatim.

The qualitative data were gathered to help in understanding the quantitative results. This is consistent with Patton's (1990) suggestion to use triangulation techniques to evaluate experimental data. In this case, method triangulation was used: reconciling quantitative and qualitative data. As Patton points out, the researcher should expect some conflict between findings generated by different methods. However, he further notes, it is worthwhile to bring a variety of data and methods to bear on the same problem so that commonalities can be discerned.

In this work the qualitative and quantitative results point in the same direction, that is that teachers in effective schools perceive they were inducted more successfully than were teachers in typical or ineffective schools. The qualitative data tend to show this more strongly on some of the seven Rosenholtz categories than did the quantitative data. The qualitative results focused more strongly on the role of the principal in each category. One reason for this may be that the Rosenholtz questionnaire had only a few questions in each subset on the principal, while the rest dealt with the general feelings about the school culture. On the other hand, teachers in
interview situations tended to hold the principal responsible for the culture of the school.

This difference may also be due to the fact that several of the constructs that the Rosenholtz questionnaire was intended to measure were not measured very well, as shown by the factor analysis presented earlier. As Cook and Campbell (1979) point out, there are several potential threats to construct validity. In this case, items on the Rosenholtz questionnaire may have underrepresented the role of peers in the induction process and overrepresented the importance of such factors as teacher recruitment.

Shared Teaching Goals

Responses to questions regarding Shared Teaching Goals indicated which school personnel are included in planning the objectives for the school. These responses also indicated how teachers teach at the school and who puts pressure on those teachers who aren't doing a good job. Other issues discussed in this part of the interview were the congruence between the educational values and philosophies of the principal and teachers, and how teachers show their commitment to students' learning.

Responses of teachers in the effective schools

Themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis of the teacher interviews from effective schools regarding Shared Teaching Goals were:

1. All personnel planned school goals
2. Principal exerted pressure
3. Parents exerted pressure
4. Shared educational values and philosophy
5. Various methods of teaching
6. Teachers' total commitment to student learning

In effective schools, the teachers indicated that all personnel were included in planning the objectives for the school. These personnel included the principal, advisory committee made up of teachers, parents and community leaders, and the school staff, including custodians.

Principals and parents exerted pressure on teachers who weren't doing a good job of teaching in the effective schools. One inexperienced teacher stated that the parents felt that she did not have good discipline and the children were wild:

I felt a lot of pressure by my parents. This was my first teaching assignment and I did not have good classroom management. The first week I sent 17 kids to the office. My principal was very helpful and worked with me to develop a discipline plan. The next week I only sent 3 to the office.

Teachers in the effective schools had various methods of teaching. There was team teaching, combined classes, peer tutoring, and hands-on activities. At the effective schools, the educational values and philosophy of hard work, responsibility and productivity of the teachers appeared to blend in harmony with peers and the principals:

My parents each taught 40 years and the principal is old-fashioned like they are. Maybe that is
why I agree with her values. But she is still up on the latest educational issues. She also travels a lot. She is in both worlds. Some hard core knuckleheads here, though, just don't respond to her way of thinking.

The teachers showed their commitment to students' learning by being at school before and after school hours, asking advice from peers, spending their own monies and constantly upgrading their educational skills:

We're here all the time. Many are here at 6:30 a.m. and some don't go home until 8:00 at night. Some of us are even here on Saturdays. Sometimes there's a problem with a student and we go back a grade to ask the former teacher for advice. We are always looking for new ideas and new ways to help the kids learn. Many of us spend a lot of money from our own pocket on buying new materials for the students. We also go to educational workshops and have guest speakers in.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in ineffective schools regarding Shared Teaching Goals were:

1. Limited personnel planning school's goals
2. Principal badgered teachers
3. Pessimistic outlook
4. Difficulty getting parents involved

The teachers in the ineffective schools experienced a different view of Shared Teaching Goals. The personnel included in planning the objectives for the school were typically the principal and other unknown staff members.

The principals badgered teachers who weren't performing their jobs well:
As far as I could tell, the principal stayed on the bad teachers. She just kept badgering them all the time. She kept telling them she didn't like what they did. When she started on me, I didn't allow her to treat me that way. She is an alcoholic. My mother was an alcoholic.

Our principal screams and hollers all the time. She keeps riding and riding some people. There have been three guidance counselors in the past three years. The previous counselor would throw up every morning. The principal thinks that somehow the guidance counselors are a threat to her authority.

The educational values and goals of the teachers in the ineffective schools were not often shared with peers and the principal. The overall theme was one of pessimism:

So many of them were so pessimistic. I was excited about starting at a different school and doing everything right. But they (teachers) were so discouraged that I began to be discouraged too.

Many of the teachers were concerned and involved with helping individual students but felt it was difficult to get the parents involved.

Responses of teachers in the typical schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding Shared Teaching Goals were:

1. Many personnel included in school planning
2. Students exerted pressure on teachers
3. Agreed upon values and philosophy
4. Teachers committed to helping students

The personnel included in planning the objectives for the typical schools were the teachers, principal and the advisory committee. Pressure to do a good job was put on
the teachers by the students. Teachers in both the effective schools and typical schools agreed upon educational values and philosophy with their principals and peers. Teachers in the typical schools used incentives and encouragement in working with their students.

School Goal Setting

School Goal Setting is a purposive, reiterative activity that orients teachers and principals engaged in this process to the school as a collective enterprise. A strategic issue facing most teachers in their first year at a school is developing a communication system through which they can gain a sense of their work. The amount and type of information teachers gather in the schools, the degree to which that information is consistent, and the ease with which teachers can interpret and integrate that information will affect their consensus about schools' goals.

The quantitative analyses tested the hypothesis that teachers in their first year at effective schools will score higher on School Goal Setting than teachers at ineffective schools. As discussed earlier, there was not a statistically significant effect for the schools' effectiveness status on the perception of School Goal Setting as measured by combined ratings on the scale. The MANOVA analysis indicated a significant effect overall on individual items measuring School Goal Setting.
Responses of teachers in the effective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in effective schools regarding School Goal Setting were:

1. Use of state curriculum guides
2. Valuable faculty meetings
3. Explicit goals for student achievement
4. Principal observations

Qualitative results indicated that both experienced and inexperienced teachers in the effective schools agreed that the information for their school's established guidelines for teaching were found in the state curriculum guides. These guides were given to them by the principal.

One statistically significant item from the quantitative analysis of the Rosenholtz Questionnaire concerned irrelevant side conversations that go on at faculty meetings. Teachers in effective schools indicated that fewer such irrelevant conversations occurred in their schools than did teachers from ineffective schools. When asked in the telephone conversations, "How is the time spent during the faculty meetings?" teachers in the effective schools indicated that there were no irrelevant side conversations going on at the faculty meetings and that the time was spent wisely. The faculty meetings were set up by the principals. There was a great deal of verbal interactions which consisted of role playing, grade level
discussions and problem solving. One inexperienced teacher stated:

   We had a variety of faculty meetings. The time
   was used very wisely. We got right down to the
   business at hand. There was no socializing. The
   principal ran it.

Another statistically significant finding concerned question 37, which dealt with explicit goals for student achievement in this school. In the effective schools, weekly grade level meetings were held, according to interviewed teachers. At these meetings the teachers discussed the students' goals for that particular week. The principals also encouraged teachers in effective schools to attend workshops. The teachers stated that they were observed both formally and informally by the principal. One inexperienced teacher was formally observed four times.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in ineffective schools regarding School Goal Setting were:

1. No curriculum guides
2. Ineffective faculty meetings
3. Limited teacher interaction
4. No teacher evaluations

Teachers in the ineffective schools typically did not receive either the school's or the state's established guidelines for teaching:
I can't tell you about any of the school's established guidelines for teaching. Nothing was given to me. I think there were some curriculum guides in the file cabinet.

The principal was sick. I got no information. I saw a curriculum guide once. I never met with the principal, didn't know the expectations, or didn't know if I ever met the expectations.

Yeah, the guidelines were written down. It was like that all needs of children, mental and physical, the whole child must be met. To help them behave in school etc. The teachers didn't care...it was just a bunch of words.

The faculty meetings were usually unscheduled and so many were so unnecessary. The time spent during these meetings was monopolized by the principal just talking about anything that crossed her mind.

The faculty meetings were very informal. We could go out and get a coke, etc. Lots of the faculty meetings didn't pertain to everyone. There were so many graphs and charts that no one could read. We kept turning this way and that. They usually went on after five o'clock and teachers with small kids just got up and left. On faculty meeting days a lot of teachers were absent.

When asked, "How does the principal encourage verbal interaction between teachers to discuss instructional objectives?" one experienced teacher related:

We were required to have grade level meetings, but my third grade never met.

However, one inexperienced teacher in an ineffective school said she did have grade level meetings and even observed teachers at different grade levels. None of the experienced or inexperienced teachers in the ineffective schools ever mentioned being observed or evaluated by the principal.
Responses of teachers in the typical schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding School Goal Settings were:

1. School action plan
2. Variety of faculty meetings
3. Mandated verbal interactions

When asked, "What are some of your school's established guidelines for teaching?" teachers stated they had to "go by" the curriculum guides and that every teacher must do the same thing. They also had action plans that they worked on collectively, which helped establish the guidelines for teaching.

An experienced teacher felt that most of the faculty meetings didn't apply to her. She stated, "I kept asking myself, why was I wasting my time sitting here when I could be doing something else." But a couple of inexperienced teachers felt that everyone paid attention at faculty meetings, because there were a variety of speakers, and they learned about cooperative teaching, grant writing and other topics of interest. They also did role playing.

A teacher said the principal mandated verbal interaction between teachers to discuss instructional objectives by scheduling monthly grade level meetings:

But, we didn't do it because two of the teachers were very progressive in their teaching and the other two were very traditional.
Clearly teachers see a need for School Goal Setting and are frustrated when it does not occur. Researchers also conclude that shared school goals are of great importance. Peters and Waterman (1982) stated that the hallmark of any successful organization is a shared sense among its members about what they are trying to accomplish. Agreed-upon goals and ways to attain them enhance the organization's capacity for rational planning and action. There should be a programmatic basis for directing behavior, for motivating behavior, for justifying behavior, and for evaluating behavior (Scott, 1981).

Teacher Recruitment

Another way to increase goal consensus is to recruit like-minded staff. In most effective schools, principals, and sometimes consulting faculty, recruit new teachers that share the prevailing standards and values at the school. These standards and values serve an important symbolic function. They also underscore how teachers and the principal collectively view their school's goals—what they stand for, what they care about, and what they ultimately aspire to become.

Kerr (1983) stated that if principals fail to hire and keep good teachers, they become increasingly mired in an endless array of difficulties that they alone are expected to solve. Some additional problems associated with poor teacher recruitment concern how to insure the quality of instruction given frequent staff changes and how to
continually socialize new teachers to the goals of the school (Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 1987).

Responses of teachers in the effective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in effective schools regarding Teacher Recruitment were:

1. Teacher Job Fair recruitment
2. Other personnel helped interview

When the teachers were asked how they came to teach at their schools, one said that it was court ordered and another said by word of mouth from a friend:

I had taken several classes with this one teacher. When an opening came up in her school she told me about it. I called the principal about the job. The principal called the school board and asked them if she could hire me. The school board said that I had to go to the Job Fair. I did and the principal set up an appointment and hired me. I believe that most teachers are hired through the Job Fair.

In several effective schools, the principal asked other teachers to help in the hiring of a prospective new faculty member. In some instances it would be a teacher from the same grade level or the assistant principal.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interview of teachers in ineffective schools regarding Teacher Recruitment were:

1. Were initially placed as substitutes
2. No teachers played a role in hiring other teachers
The teachers that came to the ineffective schools were often placed there initially on a substitute basis. One took the place of a woman on maternity leave, while another took the place of a teacher on sabbatical leave. One new teacher was placed in the school after the semester had begun. She discovered that five individuals before her had been offered the job, and all had turned it down:

The principal told me that I was the sixth that she had offered the job too. She said that she got her teachers from off the street...that's how they made their money. From the looks of them ...I believe it was true. One strange guy was from California and she loved him. He could do no wrong.

Based on the interviews with teachers in ineffective schools, apparently there were no teachers or assistant principals consulted in hiring new teachers in their schools.

Responses of teachers in the typical schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding Teacher Recruitment were:

1. Teacher Job Fair and central office recruitment
2. Other personnel aided in hiring

Most of the teachers hired in the typical schools went to the Teacher Job Fair and met the principals. Two teachers had been student teachers in the schools and went through the Human Resource Department at the central office.
At one typical school the principal wrote comments about a prospective teacher on a paper and then passed it around to other teachers on that same grade level. They responded and sent the papers back without ever seeing the prospective teacher. In one instance, the Supervisor of Student Teaching was called to give her comments in hiring one of the teachers.

Teacher Evaluation

In schools, performance evaluations function as a yardstick where principals monitor both students' mastery of skills and teachers' classroom performance. An absence of performance guidelines about what teachers are to emphasize in their work, an absence of clear criteria of how they are to be evaluated, and infrequent classroom evaluations are conditions that allow teachers the leeway to define their own performance standards and also to gauge their own success. These conditions in a school often lead to controversy (Natriello, 1983).

At the opposite end of the spectrum, in situations where principals set evaluation criteria, consistently monitor students' basic skill mastery and teachers' classroom efforts, and give teachers clear performance feedback, there should be greater faculty agreement about teaching goals, beliefs and values. That is, if evaluation criteria are well organized and applied around dimensions that teachers help shape, internalization of goals should take place (Rosenholtz, 1985).
Responses of teachers in the effective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in effective schools regarding Teacher Evaluation were:

1. Frequent formal and informal evaluations
2. The use of central office evaluation forms
3. The provision of feedback

Teachers in the effective schools were formally and informally evaluated often by their principals:

She was in and out of my classroom all the time. She knew what was happening by just listening and looking around.

The principal or assistant principal used the evaluation forms given to them by the central office. The teachers received formal written evaluations and verbal feedback from the principals. In one case, a teacher also received written feedback from the parents. In all cases, the feedback was communicated privately to the teachers in the principal's office and not in front of the students:

I was so happy that the principal called me into her office and in a very relaxed way went over my evaluation. She told me my strengths and weaknesses. She gave me some good suggestions and I didn't feel threatened at all. I have a friend teaching in another school. Her principal told her her evaluation, which wasn't that good, in front of her students. My friend was so upset and embarrassed that she just cried.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in ineffective schools regarding Teacher Evaluation were:
1. No formal evaluation
2. No specified criteria for evaluation
3. No feedback

In most cases, the teachers in the ineffective schools did not receive a formal evaluation. None of the teachers knew the criteria under which they were evaluated:

I wanted to have some input. I wanted to know if I was doing a good job or if I needed to change some things. She came in a couple of times to see what was happening but I never received any feedback.

We were all evaluated a lot. I was observed three times in one month. I didn't take it as badly as some others did. They really got upset. You're suppose to be notified afterwards I think. We all feared the principal. She was supposed to grade us, wasn't she? She didn't.

One teacher was evaluated by her principal and given immediate feedback. However, none of the teachers knew what forms were to be used in evaluations at their schools. They felt that the methods of evaluations were very inadequate.

Responses of teachers in the typical schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding Teacher Evaluation were:

1. Presence of formal and informal evaluations
2. Immediate feedback

The teachers in the typical schools received both formal and informal evaluations. These evaluations included several types: LaTip/LaTep evaluations (the statewide evaluation process), formal one-hour principal
observations, two-hour supervisor observations, and informal short (five to ten minute) principal observations:

This evaluation thing is a bone of contention for me. I had a supervisor that came into my room and stayed for two hours. The principal only stayed five minutes. I feel that this is inadequate. I would like to see a sign up sheet so I could sign up when I wanted to be observed. We have a sign up sheet when we want a mini-conference with the principal. I think we should have the same thing for evaluations.

In most cases there was immediate feedback. The evaluation was in written form and the principal discussed both strengths and weaknesses with the teacher. In one case, the written evaluation was just left on the teacher's desk.

Teacher Socialization

Attracting and selecting teachers is one issue, but working to ensure that they fit in quite another. These new teachers arrive ready to embrace school goals and values, but their ultimate commitment is determined by how successfully they are socialized. Organizational socialization refers to the process by which new teachers come to acquire the goals, values and beliefs of the organization (Rosenholtz, 1989). The information that these newcomers collect comes directly from colleagues and principals, who communicate the "correct" ways of thinking and behaving. It has been noted elsewhere that different "ethics" of behavior exist for both the administration and teachers at effective versus ineffective schools (Stringfield & Teddlie, 1989; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1989).
In effective schools, the principals and teachers socialize new recruits in the schools' traditions of challenge and change. Newcomers are more likely to accept these goals as realistic in schools that are succeeding. Most schools offer newcomers little direction, and they must rely, in Lortie's (1975) terms, on "sink or swim socialization"—becoming a human litmus absorbing school culture.

Responses of teachers in the effective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in effective schools regarding Teacher Socialization were:

1. Principals specifically told school goals to newcomers

2. Newcomers felt welcome

The newcomers in the effective schools felt that the principals explained the goals to them. They promised support, gave them a teaching partner and showed them around the school:

My new principal told me that children come first and that a happy teacher made happy children. It was assumed, though, that I knew all about the school.

Most of the principals were friendly. Two methods that principals utilized to make newcomers feel welcome were having an open door policy and telling the newcomer a little information about themselves.
The faculty at effective schools was cordial and gave the newcomers help with getting their rooms set up. In one instance, the faculty gave the new teacher a baby shower.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in ineffective schools regarding Teacher Socialization were:

1. School goals not discussed
2. Principals were aloof
3. Teachers were friendly

The principals in the ineffective schools usually did not mention the school goals to newcomers. In only one case among these interviewed did one principal tell a newcomer the philosophy of the school.

The principals had a variety of ways to welcome the newcomers in ineffective schools. One just came into the room and said "hello" and left. Another newcomer related:

My principal was nice but cool. But one thing she didn't do was introduce me to the other faculty members. I still don't know who some of them are.

Another newcomer had a more dramatic beginning:

I had my first conference with a parent, who had been my sub. She kept causing confusion in my class and I resented it. This parent said I had pushed her kid. The principal came into the room, didn't say "Good morning" or anything. She just said, "Show me the corner where you pushed the kid." She never asked me what happened or anything. That's how I was made to feel welcome.

On the other hand, most of the teachers attempted to make the newcomers feel welcome. One teacher said they
helped her with her lesson plans and gave her lots of reinforcement.

**Responses of teachers in the typical schools**

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding Teacher Socialization were:

1. Newcomers wrote own goals
2. Principal showed interest in newcomers

The newcomers were welcomed into the typical schools in several different ways. Two principals asked the teachers to write their own goals for the school year. These teachers gave their goals to the principals, but never found out what the goals of the school were. In those same schools, the newcomers had no parental involvement or room mothers. Other principals told the newcomers about their school's redesign program, and still another principal said, "I'll be watching you."

Many of the principals knew the newcomers from previous schools or had them as student teachers. They took time to introduce them to the faculty.

Most of the newcomers felt welcome at their schools by the other faculty members, except in one school where an experienced teacher related:

The teachers weren't very friendly to me. Some of them got into a knock-down-and-drag-out fight about using the phone. One teacher told me, "Listen, this is the way it is". It ended up in a power struggle. Another teacher came in at 9:00 A.M. went out for lunch and left early.
Teacher Isolation/Cohesiveness

The more isolated the faculty, the more inevitable their pedagogical pluralism. When teachers perform their work independently, they show little concern for the professional needs of colleagues, and informal conversation rarely centers around a codified base of technical knowledge (Glidewell, Tucker, Todt, & Cox, 1983).

At the same time, the less teachers talk professionally, the lower the faculty cohesiveness. Cohesiveness is relationship oriented. It involves people's attachment to the organizational community, with fulfillment derived directly from membership involvement. Interaction with organizational members is intrinsically rewarding, so that failing to conform to the group means a loss of relationships that may be important in the individual's life (Little, 1982).

Lack of cohesiveness is also a threat to self-esteem. Whether or not new teachers at a school seek or offer help depends on how they perceive the consequences of that aid. If seeking help is potentially embarrassing or stigmatizing to teachers, it may prove threatening to their sense of self-worth, and they will avoid self-disclosure in order to maintain their sense of control (Amato & Saunders, 1985). If these teachers offer advice and that advice is found to be wrong, rather than suffer embarrassment, they will not give additional aid in order to protect their self-esteem.
and to maintain their sense of control (Aderman & Berkowitz, 1985).

To forestall negative consequences that might arise by seeking or offering help, teachers may simply avoid that behavior. Some teachers might refuse to participate in group activities, while others might keep to themselves and avoid self-disclosure (Snyder & Wickland, 1981).

Thus, Isolation/Cohesiveness relates to how teachers interact with each other, what they talk about, and how they share the responsibilities for their school's successes and failures.

**Responses of teachers in the effective schools**

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in effective schools regarding Isolation/Cohesiveness were:

1. Family atmosphere
2. Everyone pulling together
3. Colleagues are friendly and talkative
4. Every teacher is a part of the whole
5. A special spirit

The teachers at the effective schools interacted positively with each other both on campus and off campus:

I could explode on my partner. We'd read each others' face and say, "We're going to hit the hard stuff...let's get a Dr. Pepper." It was like a family.

We were forever pulling jokes on one another. We'd go to T. J. Ribs together, out for lunch, and even take trips together.
The teachers in the effective schools took the responsibility of the schools' successes very seriously. One teacher's class put on a play and it was attended by the rest of the teachers and their students. This made her feel very important. There was a high level of professionalism cited by many teachers. Therefore, cohesiveness among faculty in effective schools acts as the social cement that strengthens the system of positive feedback and presses teachers to internalize school goals.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in ineffective schools regarding Isolation/Cohesiveness were:

1. Stand-offish colleagues
2. Conversations about non-related school affairs
3. Cliquish groups

The teachers in the ineffective schools interacted with each other in a reserved manner. Many teachers stated that there were small cliques of teachers that would not include others in their conversations or activities. One principal had her own clique that met in her office behind closed doors:

The teachers were stand-offish. I was afraid of being friendly. I became stand-offish too. I know about school messes and I didn't want to be associated with school complainers. It took 2-3 months for them to even say "Good morning" to me.

When the teachers talked to each other, the conversations usually centered around shopping, travel, and
eating out. Seldom did the conversations center on the academic matters of the school.

One teacher said she felt very alone. In the beginning, other teachers left the room when she entered. Slowly one or two came around, but they all remained very cool toward her. Many other teachers expressed the feeling that they didn't have a sense of belonging at the schools.

Responses of teachers in the typical schools

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding Isolation/Cohesiveness were:

1. Friendly, but not close-knit faculty
2. Interacted on grade and committee levels
3. Colleagues were helpful and pleasant

The teachers in the typical schools were friendly with each other and usually congregated in the lounge. One group of teachers gave the principal a 50th birthday party. Even though they were friendly, the teachers did not interact together outside the school campus. The faculties at typical schools weren't close-knit. They did not have Christmas parties or last day of the school year parties. One teacher said that she felt the other teachers at her school resented the faculty member who taught gifted students.

The teachers interacted primarily within grade levels. Some grade teachers helped each other out and pulled together when there was a need. When they observed teacher
weaknesses, they formed a new committee and worked together to improve or solve the problem.

Along with the interaction came a shared view of responsibility for the school's success and failure:

When my school was ranked in the newspaper, I took it personally.

The guidance counselor and principal met with me concerning some of my students who were failing. They were hateful. That really made me angry and hurt me. I felt like a failure.

Isolation and cohesiveness form a continuum that describes professional estrangement on the one end and professional involvement on the other.

Managing Student Behavior


Disruptive students interfere with the teaching process and upset the functioning of the school. Teachers must battle to maintain both their classroom authority and their schools' reputations. Many times their own schoolwide reputations are based primarily on their ability to maintain proper classroom control. Teachers tend not to involve themselves in incidents of student misconduct outside of their own classroom (Denscombe, 1985).

Students aren't always willing partners in classroom learning endeavors, and principals and faculty in better
schools set goals to overcome these student obstacles. In effective schools, the faculty synchronize disciplinary policies and practices. Student behavior standards are shared school-wide as common goals, and colleagues readily assist each other in enforcing them. When these rules are enforced in a synchronized fashion, then the issues of the school's instruction can take priority.

**Responses of teachers in the effective schools**

Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in effective schools regarding Managing Student Behavior were:

1. School-wide discipline plan
2. Grade-level discipline plans

The rules for student conduct in the effective schools were based on school-wide discipline plans. In one effective school there was no respect for authority, so the teachers formed a committee and made school-wide discipline policy and procedures. Most of the schools followed an assertive discipline plan that even covered the playground area.

Basically the rules for student behavior were enforced on grade level rather than having individualized classroom plans. Each grade had four or five points regarding student conduct that were posted along with the consequences and rewards:

Every grade level had the same classroom rules. Basically the whole school had about the same rules because we followed Lee Canter's Assertive Discipline Plan.
We all followed the same assertive discipline plan. It was school-wide...it even covered the rules for the playground.

Responses of teachers in the ineffective schools
Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in ineffective schools regarding Managing Student Behavior were:
1. Vague discipline rules
2. Varied individual classroom rules

In the ineffective schools the rules for student conduct were found in the student handbooks, but the rules were not followed or enforced:

The rules were vague. When I had duty I didn't know what to do.

At the beginning of the year we sent home the conduct rules and the parents signed them but that was the end of it. The kids didn't follow the rules, the teachers didn't enforce them, and we got no backing from the principal.

Each classroom teacher made up her own rules and tried to enforce them the best way she could.

Responses of teachers in the typical schools
Themes that emerged from a qualitative analysis of the interviews of teachers in typical schools regarding Managing Student Behavior were:
1. No school-wide discipline rules
2. Individual conduct rules

In the typical schools the conduct rules were varied. Two schools had stores, and if the students obeyed all the rules for a week, they were permitted to shop at the school store for prizes. Another school had behavior clinic cards
for minor offenses and detention cards for more serious offenses.

Each of the teachers had her own set of classroom rules. In some schools there were rules, but the teachers didn't choose to follow them:

My room was right next to the faculty bathroom. We could actually hear them going to the bathroom. We had a school rule that no student could use this faculty bathroom. Well, one day one of my little kindergarteners had to go to the bathroom real bad so I let him go to the faculty's bathroom. The principal found out and told me it was against the rules and really chewed me out. The next time he had to go I told him he had to go to the other bathroom which is about 10 minutes away and he wet on himself before he could get there.
"If teachers appear to be another silent majority, it is not that they have nothing to say, but that they are mired in an unrewarding, denigrating workplace where no one listens" (Dombart, 1985:71). This disturbing observation by Dombart is reality for many newcomers in schools that do not adequately induct their teachers into their system. As a result, the newcomers do not understand the values and social structure into which they have been placed.

As discussed in Chapter 2, socialization is the process whereby individuals learn the culture, values and work skills of a new job setting. It is the adjustment of the individual to his/her environment (Feldman, 1976). Induction, on the other hand, is the process by which the leadership or peers in that job setting help individuals to understand properly what is expected of them in their new environment. As Schlecty (1985) pointed out, the purpose of induction is to develop new skills, knowledge, attitudes and values needed for individuals to effectively pursue their occupation in a particular setting. He added that it is most important that new members internalize the norms of the occupation to the point that the norms are the individuals' primary means of social control. The greater the commitment that the leadership and peers of the newcomers have to formally inducting them into their
"family," the higher the probability that newcomers will successfully internalize the values of the new system.

Unfortunately, there is ample evidence that teachers in new settings face challenges of acceptance from their principals and their peers. Edelfelt (1979) pointed out that there is a hierarchy or power structure designed to protect the system against change. Given the somewhat isolated nature of the classroom, it is not surprising that unless a special effort is made, a newcomer will have difficulty in adjusting to the new setting.

There has been little concerted effort in the past to help beginning teachers become properly inducted into their new schools. Griffin (1985) observed in his review of the literature that teachers tend to respond positively to the norms of a new school. However, as late as 1985, he noted there was little research available to guide educators on the proper use of the induction process.

Current research has focused not only on the goals of induction programs, but also on the evidence that schools with effective induction programs are more effective in educating pupils than those with ineffective programs. Fox and Singletary (1986) listed some requirements of an effective induction program, including reflective orientation and self-evaluation. Further requirements considered by Fox and Singletary include classroom management and discipline, reduction in isolation, stress control and evaluation of performance.
Kirby (in press) also studied the importance of reflective practice in the induction process. She found that reflective teaching did not have a very strong correlation with teacher effectiveness. She postulated that either the measurement tool did not measure reflective teaching, or that the sample chosen was inappropriate, or that reflective teaching cannot be tested using today's scientific methods. While she found the reflective teaching instrument reliable and valid when pretested in a sample of 40 teachers, it did not fare as well in a field study of 102 teachers. She did find, however, that in the effective schools there was a higher level of principal support for teachers who practiced reflective teaching skills such as new instructional strategies.

Studies by Roseholtz (1985, 1989) and Teddlie and his colleagues (1989) indicate the importance of a positive social induction experience on later teacher behaviors. The results of Teddlie et al. (1989) were based on case histories of 16 schools. One of their key findings was that teachers in effective schools demonstrated superior classroom performance compared with those in ineffective schools. Effective schools were those classified as effective based on two years of achievement data, controlling for socioeconomic status of the student body. Virgilio et al. (1991) replicated this study using both elementary and junior high schools.
The research in this study expanded on the work of Teddlie and his associates. This study was restricted to first year teachers in a school. The teachers were divided into two groups, those with more than one year of teaching experience and those with less than one year. In addition the schools were divided into three groups: effective, typical and ineffective. The classification of the schools is described in detail in the methodology section and will be addressed briefly later in this section.

This research contributes to the body of knowledge concerning the importance of teacher induction and its relationship to effective schools. This information should encourage principals to put the necessary time and effort into assertive and properly focused induction programs for new teachers. This work may also stimulate the creation of a better working environment not only for new teachers but for the entire staff. This research has uncovered themes that teachers feel are important in the induction process, which are done well in effective schools and done less well in typical and ineffective schools.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Problems In School Classification

This study was designed to have both a quantitative and a qualitative aspect. This research was designed as a causal comparative study using elementary schools divided into three groups: effective, typical and ineffective in
academic performance. Chapter 3 includes details of the methods used to classify the schools into these categories. Briefly, the first method used a designation developed by the Louisiana Department of Education (1990) in its State/District/School Profile Program. This program used norm-referenced testing of children and a regression model using socioeconomic background to estimate expected performance. Those schools which scored most above the regression prediction were designated as effective schools. Those which scored most below prediction were designated ineffective, and those which scored as predicted were designated typical.

The initial research plan called for placing eight schools into each category. However, serious questions have been raised about the validity of the LDE school selection process (Meyers, 1992). Methodological errors described in detail in Chapter 4 suggest that an additional criterion should be considered to validate the LDE designation. The work of Virgilio et al. (1991) suggested two criteria for determining school effectiveness. First, one should determine each school's effectiveness using regression techniques, and second, one should check to be sure that mean test scores for each effective school are higher than those for each ineffective school. This second technique was also used in this study.

Thus, effective schools had an academic performance higher than that of the typical schools, which was in turn
higher than that of the ineffective schools. This process resulted in a final sample of 16 schools with five in the effective group, five in the typical group and six in the ineffective group. While this plan reduced the number of schools in the sample, it resulted in added confidence that the schools had been correctly designated. This is a crucial element of the study, since placing schools into the correct effectiveness group is fundamental to determining whether a school's induction process is related to school performance.

Reconciling Quantitative and Qualitative Data

Within the sixteen schools, teachers were asked to participate in this study if they were in their first year of teaching at that school. These teachers were divided into those with more than one year of experience and less than one year. Ninety-two teachers participated in the study. These teachers were given the Rosenholtz questionnaire described in Chapter 3 and contained in Appendix D. This questionnaire consists of 40 questions designed to determine the effectiveness of the induction process for teachers at a school. The questions are divided into seven groups, that are intended to probe the teachers' views of Shared Teaching Goals, School Goal-Setting, Teacher Recruitment, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socialization, Isolation/Cohesiveness, and Managing Student Behavior.

Teachers scored the questions one to five, with five being the most favorable response. The school
effectiveness and teacher experience levels were arranged as a 3 x 2 MANOVA design, with two levels of teacher experience and three levels of school effectiveness. Statistically significant results from the MANOVA analyses are presented in Chapter 4.

The second part of the research concerned interviews conducted with a portion of the teachers who participated in the survey portion of this study. Teachers volunteered to be interviewed and were allowed to expound on their answers to selected questions from the Rosenholtz questionnaire. The interview questions were written in advance exactly the way they were to be asked in the interview. This procedure is designated by Patton (1990) as a standardized open-ended interview. Patton listed the advantages of this approach, which include the following: data are complete for each person on the topics addressed in the interview, interviewer effects are reduced, the procedure permits others to evaluate the questions and it facilitates organization and analysis of the data. Some disadvantages include lack of flexibility and the fact that standardized wording may constrain and limit naturalness and relevance of answers. This approach was used because it allowed comparison with the results from the quantitative analysis of this research. Due to their interest in this subject, the teachers were not constrained in their answers. Using both qualitative and quantitative
information allowed for triangulation of the results, which increases the validity of the conclusions (Patton, 1990).

There were several problems, however, associated with the interview approach. It is critical that interviewer bias not prejudice the responses or the interpretation of the answers. This was one reason for the use of the standardized open-ended interview. A second problem involves the selection of respondents. For logistical reasons, only volunteers were used, and this can certainly bias the results (Borg & Gall, 1989). Teachers having special problems with the school may be more likely to volunteer in order to vent their feelings. However, in a school with high esprit de corps, teachers might also volunteer because they want to talk about the good things that are happening in their schools. These two factors could lead to an enhanced difference between teachers from effective schools and ineffective schools compared with the quantitative responses. Another potential problem concerns respondents talking about their favorite concerns, rather than the issues raised by the interview. This is another reason for the standardized open-ended approach, which helps the interviewer and the respondent to refocus on the question being asked.

Analysis of data from the interviews was the most difficult part of the qualitative research process utilized in this study. In this research study, this problem was addressed by considering the emergent themes based on
responses by the teachers at each type of school under each of the seven sets of questions. The research process synthesized the responses of all teachers at a given school effectiveness level to a particular set of questions. The summary of these responses was then compared to that from teachers at schools from differing effectiveness levels. This was consistent with the validation approach suggested by Patton (1990) involving checking out the consistency of different data sources.

Sixteen teachers were interviewed: five teachers (three experienced and two inexperienced) from the effective schools; five teachers (two experienced and three inexperienced) from the typical schools; and six teachers (three experienced and three inexperienced) from the ineffective schools. The results of these interviews will be discussed later in this chapter when they are compared with the results from the quantitative study.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The first hypothesis of this study was that first year teachers have more positive induction experiences at effective schools than at typical or ineffective schools. The results of this study support this hypothesis. Teachers at effective schools had a total average score on the Rosenholtz questionnaire of 169.6, while those at typical schools scored 154.1, and those at ineffective schools scored 147.2. Higher scores indicated more
positive perceptions, and these differences were statistically significant.

There are two observations regarding these results that are worthy of consideration. First, the absolute difference between the means was not great, particularly between the teachers at typical and ineffective schools. Second, all teachers on the average gave their schools a fairly high evaluation. The 169.6 total indicates an average score of 4.2 per question on a five-point scale, since there were 40 questions on the questionnaire. The teachers from the ineffective schools with a mean of 147.2 scored an average of 3.8 per question, which is higher than the median score of 3 for questions with a range from one to five.

These relatively high ratings overall may have contributed to the lack of spread between the means. However, it is not clear from this study why teachers rated their schools so high, other than perhaps that they were generally happy with their work situations. Results from recent studies of teacher job satisfaction in Louisiana (Schulz & Teddlie, 1989; Schulz, Teddlie, & Cleveland, 1989; Whelan, Hoover, & Teddlie, 1991) indicate that teachers give high ratings with regard to overall job satisfaction. The results of the interviews, however, suggest that for many teachers in ineffective schools, there is great dissatisfaction. More positive results on
the written survey may be a function of teachers making socially desirable responses.

Despite the high overall average, there were rather large standard deviations for the overall score on the Rosenholtz questionnaire ranging from 17.6 for the effective schools to 26.6 for the typical schools and 22.8 for the ineffective schools. One reason for the wide variance in scores may be that there are very heterogeneous attitudes among teachers in a given level of school effectiveness. A second reason may be that some of the questions do not properly assess the induction process in the school, and thus, teachers had difficulty responding to items with low validity as far as induction is concerned. For example, some teachers saw little role for them in teacher recruitment, feeling that it is the administration's responsibility. Their responses to items in this area were, therefore, very inconsistent. Furthermore, the division of the questions into the seven categories was not supported by the factor analysis reported in Chapter 4.

As discussed in detail in Chapter 4, a factor analysis suggested a regrouping of the questions. One grouping included 17 questions under a category which might be defined as the teachers' understanding of the goals and values of the principal and of their peers. Also closely associated with this factor were items assessing teacher evaluation. Factor two concerned teacher reactions to
students. This included student behavioral problems and the teachers' commitment to student achievement. Factor three dealt with faculty cohesiveness. The results of this factor analysis suggest that some of the questions might be deleted and that only three groupings should be used instead of seven. Further research would be needed in this area, however, to verify these results.

As discussed earlier, the group of 40 questions was divided into seven theoretical groups by Rosenholtz (1989). Statistical analysis indicated that responses to some of the groups of items were statistically significant. The first subhypothesis stated that teachers in effective schools would score higher on having Shared Teaching Goals than teachers at typical or ineffective schools. This result on the combined average score was statistically significant in the predicted direction. The teachers from the effective schools gave a very high average score of 4.2 on these questions, while the teachers at the ineffective schools gave an average of 3.3. Goals are a major part of jobs, and therefore, this may be the most important subset of questions.

The second subhypothesis stated that teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of School Goal Setting than teachers at typical or ineffective schools. The result on the combined score was just below statistical significance, but all means were in the predicted direction. Furthermore, MANOVA analysis
indicated a significant overall effect across the six items in this group. This subset of questions differs from the previous subset in that these items are more concerned with the consistency of the rules set down by the principal and with how the school is run. The first set dealt more with how the teachers feel about their goals and those of their peers.

The sixth subhypothesis stated that teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of Isolation/Cohesiveness than teachers at typical or ineffective schools. The differences in means on the combined score for these items was statistically significant in the predicted direction. MANOVA analysis indicated no statistical effect overall on individual items. This set of questions is somewhat related to the first subhypothesis in that it deals with peer relationships and common goals and interests. Results from both of these subsets of items suggest that induction is a complicated process that cannot be achieved by simply having an orientation seminar for new teachers. Rather, it requires continuous efforts by the principal and teacher leaders in the schools to communicate to new teachers the goals and objectives of the school and to socialize the new individuals into the culture of that school.

The final subhypothesis stated that first-year teachers at effective schools will have a more positive perception of their schools' success at Managing Student
Behavior than teachers at typical or ineffective schools. The results on the combined score supported this subhypothesis. MANOVA analysis indicated that the school effectiveness independent variable had a marginally significant effect across all the items. In comparison with the other subsets of items found to be statistically significant, this subset is one in which teachers feel the principal plays a major role. Rules must be set, they must be fair and the principal must back the teacher in difficult situations. Furthermore, this set of questions is of critical importance to the new teacher, as discipline is always crucial if any meaningful teaching is to be accomplished. Nothing can discourage a teacher more quickly than discipline problems, especially if the principal is not inclined to get involved.

Three subsets of questions did not have statistically significant results on either the combined scores or the MANOVAS. One of these was Teacher Recruitment. This was probably due to the fact that new teachers feel little involvement in how their schools recruit additional teachers. Items on Teacher Evaluation showed no statistically significant differences either, although the means were all in the predicted direction. This again is a principal-oriented formal exercise and, as was the case with the other subsets of this type, the teachers did not rate the groups of schools differently.
Teacher Socialization items also showed no statistically different means. This was an unexpected finding. It would seem that this subset of items was related to the subsets Shared Teaching Goals and Isolation/Cohesiveness, which generated statistically significant results. However, an examination of the questions in this group indicates these questions are much more related to formal induction than teachers' feelings about how their new peers related to them. This feeling of being part of the school family was not addressed by these questions. The items concern the more formal activities of the principal when the teacher first arrives at the school. These included two questions regarding the principal's explanation of school goals to the new teacher, one at the welcome/orientation from the principal and another at the welcome from the faculty.

A second major hypothesis of this research was that new teachers with more than one year of teaching experience would rate their schools higher on the induction process than would teachers with less than one year of experience. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of this research. The seven subsets of questions showed no significant differences using teacher experience as the independent variable.

The interaction between teacher experience and school effectiveness level was not statistically significant for the overall score on the Rosenholtz questionnaire, but the
pattern of results was interesting. Experienced teachers rated effective schools higher, \(\bar{X} = 171\), and rated both typical and ineffective schools about the same \(\bar{X} = 149-150\). On the other hand, inexperienced teachers rated the effective and typical schools about the same \(\bar{X} = 160.5\), while rating the ineffective schools lower \(\bar{X} = 143\).

The qualitative research was designed to amplify the results of the quantitative study. Patton (1990) suggested that one approach to triangulating data is to use different data collection methods to verify and validate each other. He stated that one should expect some problems reconciling quantitative and qualitative data. However, he further stated that most experienced researchers believe collecting both types of information is worth the effort and enhances the quality and credibility of the data.

The qualitative data, discussed in detail in Chapter 4, suggest a stronger effect for the different types of schools on teacher perception than was indicated by the quantitative data. The qualitative data was analyzed by considering themes for each school effectiveness group under each of the subsets of questions. It appears that when interviews are held, the teachers tend to hold the leadership more accountable for school problems than they do when responding to written questions.

The qualitative data supported the results from the quantitative analysis with regard to Shared Teaching Goals. The themes that emerged in the effective schools involved
shared commitment and planning, with pressure from parents and principals as a motivating influence. The teachers at the ineffective schools felt little involvement of the parents and more badgering than helping from the principal. The teachers at typical schools felt the personnel were involved, but the parental theme did not emerge from this group.

The qualitative data on School Goal Setting indicated that the teachers in the effective and typical schools had similar perceptions. Important themes at these schools were the use of state curriculum guides, good faculty meetings and a well-articulated action plan. The teachers at the ineffective schools were much more negative than the quantitative analysis had suggested. They felt that there were no guidelines and that the faculty meetings and teacher interactions were ineffective.

Similar to the results from quantitative analysis, no striking themes emerged concerning Teacher Recruitment. At both the effective and typical schools, some teachers were identified through the job fair. Both the quantitative and qualitative data suggest this is not high on the new teachers' evaluation of what is important to them in their schools.

Results from the qualitative analysis of Teacher Evaluation interview items were again more illuminating than the results of the quantitative analysis of the written survey. Perhaps the complexity of the wording of
the written survey questions contributed to the nonsignificant results. There were few differences in the themes that emerged from the effective and typical schools. Teachers in both groups of schools received formal and informal evaluation and feedback. The teachers at the ineffective schools, however, felt that there was no formal evaluation or feedback in their schools. It is clear from the interviews that the teachers are very interested in fair principal evaluation and feedback.

Qualitative analysis of the Teacher Socialization items yielded mixed results, as was the case with the quantitative analysis. New teachers felt that other teachers were friendly in both the effective and ineffective schools. The teachers felt less comfortable with the principals at the ineffective schools. Both the typical and effective school teachers felt the principals made them feel welcome.

The qualitative results again supported the quantitative results on Teacher Isolation/Cohesiveness. Teachers in the effective schools indicated some crucial themes for creating good feelings among individuals in any work setting. These included a friendly atmosphere, everyone pulling together, everyone being friendly and talkative, every teacher being part of the whole and having a special school spirit. The themes that emerged from analysis of teacher interviews from the ineffective schools would be potentially devastating to a new teacher: teachers
were stand-offish and there were many cliquish groups. The themes of the typical schools were intermediate, but much closer to the effective school themes than to the ineffective school themes. These themes included the following: a friendly, but not close-knit faculty; some faculty interaction on grade-level and committees; and teachers being helpful and pleasant. Again, the results of the qualitative research were more definitive than those of the quantitative analysis. The teachers at the ineffective schools rated the average question on Isolation/Cohesiveness above three on a scale of one to five. The interview responses suggest their ratings would be less than two on the five-point scale.

The qualitative analysis on the Managing Student Behavior items also supported the quantitative results. The themes that emerged at the effective schools included both a school-wide discipline plan and a grade-level discipline plan. The teachers at the ineffective schools felt discipline rules were vague both school-wide and at the grade level. Interview results from teachers at the typical schools produced themes more similar to those of the ineffective schools than to those of the effective schools. This was the only qualitative finding in which the teachers in the typical schools responded more similarly to teachers from the ineffective schools than they did to teachers from the effective schools. The quantitative results on these items for the experienced
teachers supported this finding, with the typical and ineffective means about the same and the effective schools' scores much higher. The inexperienced teachers had responses that were directionally the same, but not as marked.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS**

This study suggests that effective schools have better teacher induction processes than typical or ineffective schools. I use the word "suggest" because some might argue that effective schools attract better teachers due to the schools' reputations, and that the induction experience is not that important. I argue against that speculation on two grounds: (1) the assignment of teachers to schools by central office staff, not by teacher choice, is standard operating procedure in the district used for this research; and (2) my literature review, and the interviews conducted for this study, strongly imply that induction experiences are very important for new teachers.

The quantitative results suggest that these differences in induction experiences are more pronounced for the new teachers in terms of how they feel about their new social setting. Friendliness and acceptance by their peers are more important to the newcomers in the induction process than is a formal orientation. Moreover, both the quantitative and the qualitative results demonstrate that
the principal plays a key role in this process. This is consistent with Blase and Kirby's (1992) statement:

Studies conducted during the last decade or so have highlighted a host of factors associated with "strong" leadership. These include initiative, confidence, tolerance for ambiguity, analytic abilities, resourcefulness, vision, democratic-participatory style, listening, problem-centeredness, openness, time management skills, high expectations, knowledge of curriculum, and ability to allocate resources effectively (page 3).

This statement underscores the fact that the role of the principal is far more than just preparing some formal programs intended to introduce the newcomers to the school. The research described in this dissertation demonstrates that while the principal plays a key role in the induction of new teachers, it is also a very complex role. It involves team building, rather than just setting formal guidelines on how the school will treat new teachers.

The quantitative results indicate that the teachers look for support from the principal in four areas: Shared Teaching Goals, School Goal Setting, Isolation/Cohesiveness and Managing Student Behavior. The qualitative results, on the other hand, indicate that all seven of the Rosenholtz areas are important functions of the principal. The qualitative results indicate that a principal who is able to develop in his staff a friendly, caring atmosphere, where teachers know what is expected of them, will be successful. Schools led by such principals will have teachers who reach out to help and accept newcomers, not because of formal instruction from the principal, but
because that is the behavior norm in that school. Blase and Kirby (1992) emphasize the idea of the principals' leading by standing behind the teachers. This theme is congruent with the idea that the teachers know what is expected of them, and that the principal will support them whenever they need support, whether it be with difficulties with students or with students' parents.

Both the qualitative and quantitative data suggest that the principals should interact often with their staff. This interaction between principal and staff includes personal communication and the provision of clear guidelines as to the principal's expectations for the faculty. The results also clearly indicate that the principal must have a plan for new teacher induction. It should have a component of formality, to be sure that critical items are addressed when the new teachers begin at their schools. Equally important, however, is that the experience should have an inclusive quality that involves all the teachers already present on the staff. The principal should lead, and the staff should be a key part of the induction plan, with participation based on the specific culture of the school.

This research indicates that the induction process is important to new teachers and that the principal plays a major role in defining that process. Conversations with professors in Educational Administration indicate that principals receive little or no preservice or inservice
training on how to set up an effective induction program. The results of this study imply that Colleges of Education should make such training a part of educational administrators' graduate training. For example, one aspect of graduate students' field experiences could be to analyze and/or set up an induction program at a field site.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

This study involved only metropolitan public schools and only elementary grade levels. It would be somewhat difficult to extrapolate these results to a rural area or to a large metropolitan area. This research dealt with schools in a city of about 300,000 people, a category into which a significant portion of the schools in the United States fall. While only elementary schools were involved, these are probably the grade levels where it is most important that a family spirit be developed among staff members. Children remain in an elementary school for about 5-6 years, passing from one teacher to another in that school. Thus, it is critical that school goals and discipline plans be understood by both teachers and students alike.

The process for dividing the schools into effective, typical, and ineffective categories was difficult. Using only a regression analysis approach that controls for the socioeconomic status backgrounds of students is open to criticism. For instance, there were apparent flaws in the
LDE regression-based procedure for selecting effective and ineffective schools (Meyers, 1992).

Using only raw achievement scores as a guide would also result in obvious problems. Researchers studying school effectiveness recognize this and rarely use this criterion alone. For example, schools with many children from low socioeconomic status backgrounds would have little chance of demonstrating effectiveness. Many studies have shown that children from lower socioeconomic status backgrounds perform more poorly on standard measures of achievement. Even if a school had an excellent teacher induction program and had increased the performance of the students over time, it still might have academic performance too low to be considered effective (Coleman et al., 1966; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Teddlie et al., 1984). This study addressed this issue by choosing schools where both evaluation methods resulted in consistent categorization decisions.

Another limitation of this study is one always associated with a causal comparative study. The study does not prove that the independent variables, school effectiveness and teacher experience, affected the dependent variable, the teachers' perception of their schools' ability to successfully induct them. The study's design made a viable control group infeasible, so schools were matched using a regression analysis that controlled for the effect of socioeconomic status background of the parents.
The first selection procedure for effectiveness of schools used Louisiana Department of Education data from 1988-89 and 1989-90. This research study was done in the schools in the 1990-91 school year. This work assumes stability of school effectiveness over this time.

The qualitative data had methodological limitations. The sample was limited in size to 16 interviewees. It was limited by those teachers who were willing to take additional time to be interviewed, making it a somewhat unrepresentative sample. The qualitative data were gathered and coded by only one rater, who knew the effectiveness level of the schools. Having an additional rater for the interview material would have been preferred, but practical considerations (i.e., time constraints, unavailability of trained raters) made that impossible. However, the triangulation process, comparing the qualitative data to the quantitative results, helped overcome some of these limitations (Patton, 1990).

It is also important to recognize that the qualitative analyses are true only for the time and place where the interviews took place. Patton (1990) emphasized that evaluator-analysts must be careful to limit conclusions to those situations, time periods, persons, contexts, and purposes for which the data are applicable. However, opinions of school teachers about induction into new school settings are likely to have relevance into the future so long as the general environmental conditions of their
schools remain the same. Additionally, issues that bother or please teachers in one school are likely to bother or please teachers in other schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

More research must be done to identify the most appropriate methodology for selecting effective, typical and ineffective schools. As described in a recent study by Lang (1991), the issue of misclassification of effective school status is multi-leveled and includes such factors as grade level studied (all grades or selected grades) and population studied (all students or identified subsets such as lower 25% on achievement, etc.). This classification issue is critical to any study of school effectiveness. If the school effectiveness determination is accurate, one can have far more confidence that the measured components are, in fact, related to the effectiveness level of the schools being investigated.

There were some obvious construct validity problems with the Rosenholtz questionnaire. For further studies of the induction process, it should be altered or a new instrument should be developed. Factor analysis indicated that a regrouping of the questions, including combining some of them into larger sets, might increase the instrument's validity. Furthermore, the factor analytic results suggest that items such as teacher recruitment might be eliminated from the questionnaire. One approach
to the development of a more definitive questionnaire would involve asking beginning teachers what questions should be asked to distinguish an excellent induction process from a poor one.

Other research to determine what constitutes an effective induction program is needed. This research clearly indicated that the principal was important, but that the process appears very complex and challenging even to the best school administrator. Blase and Kirby (1992) touch on many factors that make a good administrator. The induction process is only one aspect of this myriad group of responsibilities. Further research is needed for the particular purpose of helping the principal focus on how to do each of these tasks.

For example, it is critical that the principal understand the balance between a formal induction program and one that really appears to be team building. Research should be done to help principals and others responsible for school performance understand how these concepts are related and the value of one compared to the other. While an orientation for new teachers is surely desirable a 'one shot' approach will not produce the desired results. On the other hand, frequent meetings to discuss induction will also be met with resistance. Research giving guidance to the principal on how to balance the formal and informal induction processes will surely be helpful.
Prospective studies are usually more definitive than retrospective ones. Before a principal is replaced at an ineffective school, it might be instructive to measure teacher attitudes towards induction and student performance. It would be important to take identical measurements two years after the change is made. The described study would focus on the induction process in a naturally occurring experiment, before and after a change occurs. However, to ensure sufficient sample size, more than beginning teachers would be required for this proposed research project. Such a study would face severe methodological problems. These include the extended time needed to complete the study, cooperation of the principal before and after the change and assurance that the performance of the student population is not changing for reasons unrelated to the induction process.

Many school districts are considering methods to improve the performance of the schools in their system. This research indicates that schools' performance on standardized achievement tests may be related to the schools' ability to successfully induct their new teachers. On the other hand, it may be that effective schools attract good teachers and ineffective schools attract poor teachers. If that were true, the induction process might have only a marginal effect. Also, it is certainly possible that some effective schools may have poor
induction procedures, whereas some ineffective schools may have good induction programs.

To address these possibilities, a school district could carry out a prospective study on induction of teachers. The research could determine the success of their schools' induction programs. The research could begin with an evaluation of the effectiveness of schools in the district and their induction processes. The initial evaluation could be followed by an intensive program educating principals on the key items in a successful induction program for new teachers in their schools. After two years, the academic performance and the induction programs in the schools could again be measured. The proposed research is potentially important because it would give us more definitive answers regarding the relationship between student performance and teacher induction over time.

All occupations face the question of induction into new jobs. On the assembly line the worker must be trained to do a very specific job. However, in many professional occupations the induction challenge is similar to that for new teachers. Research comparing induction results in other professions to those in teaching would be instructive. One can hypothesize that there would be many similarities, but there would also undoubtedly be several differences. Examination of both the similarities and the
differences would be helpful in better understanding the induction process in teaching.

The work of Virgilio, et al. (1991) indicates that teachers in effective schools outperformed teachers in ineffective schools. These results were consistent for both elementary and junior high schools. Further research should be carried out similar to the work reported in this dissertation for junior high schools. Research on the induction process has been very limited in the higher grades. There are additional challenges in junior high, as frequently the students have several teachers, and discipline problems become such a large part of the teachers' work. The interplay between the formal induction process and the team-building aspects of induction may be different in the junior high school. Using the data from the elementary school as a place to begin, a study in junior high schools seems reasonable. Differences in the results from such a study as compared with those from the elementary schools might also help educators better understand the induction process.

More research is needed on how principals provide assistance to teachers. The induction process is a key aspect of that support. Stringfield and Teddlie (1987, 1989) have suggested that this assistance is vital to a school if it is to become highly effective. Blase and Kirby (1992) also discuss this throughout their book. They list praising, expecting, involving, granting autonomy,
supporting, suggesting and directing as roles an effective principal plays. Many of those roles are part of the induction process. More research needs to be done on how skilled principals accomplish those roles.

In determining what support can be given, the characteristics of the principal and the new teacher must be taken into consideration. For instance, inexperienced teachers appeared to be more attracted to a principal who could give emotional support, while experienced teachers seemed to be more attracted to task-oriented principals who could provide informational support. Whether a principal is social-emotive or task-oriented could have an effect on a new teacher's perception of the principal's induction process.

This research strongly indicates that the induction process is most effective when there is a feeling on the part of the newcomers that they are welcome and that they understand the culture of the school. Future research could consider the congruence between the teachers' perception and the principal's perception of the induction process. While it is clear the principal plays a key role in this process, there is also an important role for the teaching staff. If these perceptions are incongruent, the induction process is not likely to be successful.

Some teachers take this role seriously and are probably very instrumental in the induction of a newcomer teacher. Others feel their job is teaching and will make
little effort to assist in the induction of newcomers. Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) reported that teachers desire greater involvement in technical issues than in managerial issues. Schneider (1984) used the Decision Involvement Analysis Questionnaire to probe teachers' interest in the decision process. She found that some teachers are interested in setting and revising school goals and giving advice on hiring new teachers, but only when those decisions are related to their teaching areas. This research did not probe, however, the role of the existing faculty in the induction process.

What should be done to define the role of the facilitating teachers? How do principals identify these teachers? How do they train them to be more helpful? How do they reward these teachers? Are these teachers necessarily the best academic teachers at the school? These and many other questions could be addressed in future research on the facilitating teachers and their relationships with the principals and the rest of the staff.
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Appendix A

PARTICIPANT INTRODUCTORY LETTER

I am a doctoral student in the Curriculum and Instruction Department at Louisiana State University. My area of research is the relationship between effective schools and teacher social induction. With your help, my research study can significantly contribute to the current base of knowledge in school education by determining how new teachers are inducted into the social structure of a school.

I have received permission from East Baton Schools and your principal to collect data at your school.

I have been an elementary teacher for nineteen years. I know you are very busy and I appreciate the time you are taking to complete this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Carol Ter Haar
Appendix B

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

PLEASE COMPLETE:

SCHOOL__________________________________________________________
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE________________________________
MALE______________
FEMALE______________

I WOULD BE WILLING TO BE INTERVIEWED IN ORDER TO ADD GREATER VALIDITY TO THIS DATA. THE MOST CONVENIENT TIME IS:
BEFORE SCHOOL_________________________ TIME____________________
AFTER SCHOOL_________________________ TIME____________________
DURING FREE PERIOD AT SCHOOL__________ TIME____________________
AT HOME________________________________ TIME__________________
I CAN BE CONTACTED AT THIS PHONE NUMBER__________________________
ASK FOR (FIRST NAME ONLY)________________________________________

ALL INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.
Appendix C
ROSENHOLTZ'S QUESTIONNAIRE

SHARED TEACHING GOALS

1. At this school, we agree on the objectives we're trying to achieve with students.
2. If most teachers at this school feel that another teacher is not doing a good job, they will exert some pressure on him or her to improve.
3. I don't approve of the ways in which most of the other teachers in this school teach.
4. My principal's values and philosophy of education are similar to my own.
5. Most teachers at this school have values and philosophies of education similar to my own.
6. Teachers at this school share a high level of commitment to student learning.

SCHOOL GOAL-SETTING

1. There are explicit guidelines in the school about the things teachers are to emphasize in their teaching.
2. Discussion about school goals and means of achieving them is a regular part of our school faculty or inservice meetings.
3. The principal encourages teachers to talk with each other about instructional objectives.
4. At faculty meetings, we spend most of our time on the small stuff; we rarely get a chance to talk about the bigger issues in teaching and learning.

5. There are a lot of irrelevant side conversations that go on at our faculty meetings.

6. We have explicit goals for student achievement in this school.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

1. Before I came to work at this school, the principal "checked me out," read my references, called people who know my work, and asked me about my ideas and plans for teaching.

2. Whenever there is an opening at my school, the principal takes charge in locating a good and competent person for the position.

3. Our principal consults with teachers here before hiring new personnel.

TEACHER EVALUATION

1. The standards by which my teaching is evaluated are clear and well specified.

2. My students' gains on achievement tests are a good way for others to judge my instructional effectiveness.

3. The methods used in evaluating my teaching are objective and fair.
4. Student gains on achievement tests are a good way for me to judge my instructional effectiveness.

5. I know what I'm being evaluated on in this school.

6. Evaluation of my teaching is based on hearsay and gossip.

7. The principal spends time in my classroom observing my teaching.

8. When the principal comes into my classroom, the visit lasts longer than 10 minutes.

9. In this school, teachers participate in determining what they're going to be evaluated on.

TEACHER SOCIALIZATION

1. New teachers in this school know what our faculty is trying to accomplish and what will be expected of them as teachers.

2. When I started teaching at this school, the principal told me what the faculty wants to accomplish here.

3. The principal of this school spends time with any new teachers we may have, orients them and helps them feel welcome in the school.

4. The faculty makes new teachers feel very welcome at this school.
**ISOLATION/COHESIVENESS**

1. Most of the other teachers in this school don't know what I do in my classroom or what my teaching goals are.

2. Teachers in this school tend to be cliquish and catty.

3. I do things that are apt to be accepted by only a few teachers at my school; the others don't agree or don't understand.

4. I feel that what goes on in this school is my responsibility; I share responsibility for our school's successes and shortcomings.

5. Beyond saying hello, I regularly converse with:
   a. no other teachers
   b. one other teacher
   c. two other teachers
   d. three other teachers
   e. four or more other teachers

6. I can go for days in this school without talking to anyone about my teaching.

7. I'm pretty much a "loner" in this school.

**MANAGING STUDENT BEHAVIOR**

1. There are explicit rules for student conduct at this school.

2. We have rules for student conduct here, but nobody follows them.
3. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced by teachers at this school, even for students who are not in their classes.

4. Teachers' rules for student conduct are always changing at this school.

5. In this school, teachers participate in establishing rules for student conduct.
Appendix D

TEACHER PERCEPTION INVENTORY

Please circle only one number. 1 indicates STRONGLY DISAGREES and 5 indicates STRONGLY AGREES.

ROSENHOLTZ'S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. At this school, we agree on the objectives we're trying to achieve with students.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. There are explicit guidelines in the school about the things teachers are to emphasize in their teaching.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Before I came to work at this school, the principal "checked me out," read my references, called people who know my work, and asked me about my ideas and plans for teaching.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. The standards by which my teaching is evaluated are clear and well specified.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. New teachers in this school know what our faculty is trying to accomplish and what will be expected of them as teachers.  
   1 2 3 4 5
6. Most of the other teachers in this school don't know what I do in my classroom or what my teaching goals are.

7. There are explicit rules for student conduct at this school.

8. Teachers in this school tend to be cliquish and catty.

9. We have rules for student conduct here, but nobody follows them.

10. When I started teaching at this school, the principal told me what the faculty wants to accomplish here.

11. Discussion about school goals and means of achieving them is a regular part of our school faculty or inservice meetings.

12. If most teachers at this school feel that another teacher is not doing a good job, they will exert some pressure on him or her to improve.
13. I don't approve of the ways in which most of the other teachers in this school teach.  
14. The principal encourages teachers to talk with each other about instructional objectives.  
15. Whenever there is an opening at my school, the principal takes charge in locating a good and competent person for the position.  
16. My students' gains on achievement tests are a good way for others to judge my instructional effectiveness.  
17. The methods used in evaluating my teaching are objective and fair.  
18. I do things that are apt to be accepted by only a few teachers at my school; the others don't agree or don't understand.  
19. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced by teachers at this school, even for students who are not in their classes.
20. Teachers' rules for student conduct are always changing at this school.

21. I feel that what goes on in this school is my responsibility; I share responsibility for our school's successes and shortcomings.

22. Student gains on achievement tests are a good way for me to judge my instructional effectiveness.

23. Our principal consults with teachers here before hiring new personnel.

24. At faculty meetings, we spend most of our time on the small stuff; we rarely get a chance to talk about the bigger issues in teaching and learning.

25. I'm pretty much a "loner" in this school.

26. My principal's values and philosophy of education are similar to my own.
27. Most teachers at this school have values and philosophies of education similar to my own.

28. There are a lot of irrelevant side conversations that go on at our faculty meetings.

29. I know what I'm being evaluated on in this school.

30. In this school, teachers participate in determining what they're going to be evaluated on.

31. The principal of this school spends time with any new teachers we may have, orients them and helps them feel welcome in the school.

32. Beyond saying hello, I regularly converse with:
   a. no other teachers
   b. one other teacher
   c. two other teachers
   d. three other teachers
   e. four or more other teachers

33. I can go for days in this school without talking to anyone about my teaching.
34. In this school, teachers participate in establishing rules for student conduct.  
1 2 3 4 5

35. The faculty makes new teachers feel very welcome at this school.  
1 2 3 4 5

36. Evaluation of my teaching is based on hearsay and gossip.  
1 2 3 4 5

37. We have explicit goals for student achievement in this school.  
1 2 3 4 5

38. The principal spends time in my classroom observing my teaching.  
1 2 3 4 5

39. Teachers at this school share a high level of commitment to student learning.  
1 2 3 4 5

40. When the principal comes into my classroom, the visit lasts longer than 10 minutes.  
1 2 3 4 5
Appendix E
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

SHARED TEACHING GOALS

1. What personnel are included in planning the objectives for the school?
2. What kind of pressure is exerted on teachers who aren't doing a good job? Who exerts this pressure?
3. Tell me how teachers teach in this school.
4. How do your values and philosophy of education fit with those of the principal and other teachers?
5. How do the teachers show their commitment to students' learning?

SCHOOL GOAL-SETTING

1. What are some of your school's established guidelines for teaching?
2. How does the principal encourage verbal interaction between teachers to discuss instructional objectives?
3. How is the time spent during faculty meetings?

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

1. How did you come to teach at this school?
2. How does the principal locate new teachers?
3. What is the teachers role in hiring new teachers?
TEACHER EVALUATION

1. What methods are used to evaluate your teaching?
2. Do you feel these methods are adequate?
3. When the principal observes your class do you receive feedback?
4. How do the teachers determine the criteria under which they are evaluated?

TEACHER SOCIALIZATION

1. What did the principal tell you were some of the goals for a new faculty member?
2. How did the principal make you feel welcome?
3. How did the teachers make you feel welcome?

ISOLATION/COHESIVENESS

1. How do the teachers interact with each other?
2. How do the teachers interact with you?
3. How do you share the responsibility for your school's success and failure?
4. When you talk to others, what do you usually talk about?
5. What makes you feel as if you are alone in this school?
MANAGING STUDENT BEHAVIOR

1. What are the rules for student conduct in this school?
2. Do all the teachers have the same class rules? If not, why not?
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