DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 444 SP 025 501

AUTHOR Hall, Gene E.; And Others
TITLE Beginning Teacher Induction: Five Dilemmas. The Proceedings from a Public Forum. Research on the Improvement Process in Schools and Colleges. R&D Report No. 3153.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 21 Mar 82
NOTE 93p.; Invited Symposium at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 21, 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM Communication Services, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX 78712.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Helping Relationship; Inservice Teacher Education; *Orientation Materials; *Research Needs; Teacher Certification; Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Orientation; Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Supervision.

ABSTRACT

A forum, convened to consider the subject of beginning teacher induction, focused on questions about: (1) the importance of the induction phase; (2) whose domain induction is; (3) what happens to the teacher in this phase; (4) training that is most needed in this phase; (5) how induction is related to licensure; and (6) whether induction is unique to the United States. An introduction to the proceedings (Gene E. Hall) is followed by the following presentations: (1) "Induction--An Overview" (Gary A. Griffin); (2) "Why Bother with Induction?" (Kevin Ryan); (3) "Why Bother with Teacher Induction?" (Kenneth M. Zeichner); (4) "What Happens to the Teacher during Induction?" (J. T. Sandefur and Ann Lieberman); (5) "What Should Happen to the Teacher during Induction?" (Karen Kepler Zumwalt); (6) "Sameness Drives Me Up a Wall" (Elizabeth Dillon-Peterson); (7) "Teacher Induction--Who Is Responsible?" (Richard C. Wallace, Jr.); (8) "Summary of Analyses for Lack of Recognition of the Importance of Induction in U.S. Teacher Education (Sam J. Yarger); (9) "Why Is There Not Greater Recognition of Induction in the United States?" (R. P. Tisher). Discussion that followed the presentations is also included, as well as discussant comments by Martin Haberman and Gene E. Hall. (JD)

BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION:

FIVE DILEMMAS

The Proceedings From a Public Forum

To order additional copies of this report or a catalog of publications, contact Communication Services, Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Education Annex 3.203, Austin, Texas 78712.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION:

FIVE DILEMMAS

The Proceedings From a Public Forum

R&D Report No. 3153

Invited Symposium
The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
and
The Journal of Teacher Education

Presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New York, March 21, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION -- FIVE DILEMMAS:

The Proceedings from a Public Forum

INTRODUCTION

This set of papers grew out of a series of discussions during the summer, 1981, involving Martin Haberman and Richard Western of The Journal of Teacher Education and program directors at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Staff members from both institutions are concerned about the need to coordinate and stimulate research and development activities in teacher education. They also felt that staff from The Journal and the R&D Center should work more closely.

As one step in addressing these concerns, Martin Haberman and Gene Hall organized a "public forum" proposal to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York City in March, 1982. Jim Hoffman of The University of Texas, who was an AERA Division C Program Chair, became interested and the public forum was scheduled as a Division C Invited Symposium.

Clearly, the induction phase in teacher education is problematic. Most of the research that has been done on teacher induction has been done in Australia and Great Britain. The importance of this phase is just beginning to be recognized in the United States. There is limited research and very few teacher education programs that are designed to address the induction phase. Further, there is some question of whether or not this phase should be given special attention through the development of induction teacher training experiences or whether teachers should be expected to make this transition on their own as all teachers "have done up 'til now."

The session was designed to be a "public forum." Brief papers were prepared around key aspects of six central questions. The paper presenters in

each session were asked to emphasize what they and the literature had discovered and to raise key issues and questions that the forum participants and the r & d community should consider.

The six basic questions that were used as organizers were:

1. Recognition of the importance of the induction phase.
2. Who's domain is it?
3. What happens to the teacher in this phase?
4. What training is most needed in this phase?
5. How should induction be related to licensure?
6. Is induction a discovery that is unique to the U.S. or has somebody else done something about this?

The overall design of the public forum and the sequence of papers and discussions in this monograph is as follows:

Chair: Oliver Bown, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin

Induction -- An Overview. Gary A. Griffin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin

Why Bother With Induction? Kevin Ryan, The Ohio State University

Why Bother With Teacher Induction? Kenneth M. Zeichner, University of Wisconsin, Madison

What Happens to the Teacher During Induction? J. T. Sandefur, Western Kentucky University

What Happens to the Teacher During Induction? Ann Lieberman, Teachers Collge, Columbia University

What Should Happen to the Teacher During Induction? Karen Kepler-Zumwalt, Teachers College, Columbia University

Sameness Drives Me Up a Wall. Elizabeth Dillon-Peterson, Lincoln Public Schools, Nebraska

Teacher Induction - Who is Responsible? Richard C. Wallace, Jr., Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pennsylvania

Summary of Analyses for Lack of Recognition of the Importance of Induction in U. S. Teacher Education. Sam J. Yarger, Syracuse University

Why is There Not Greater Recognition of Induction in the United States? R. P. Tisher, Monash University, Australia

Discussants: Gene Hall, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin
Martin Haberman, Journal of Teacher Education

The symposium itself was a happening. The various paper presenters, discussants and chair convened at 8:15 a.m. on a Sunday! There was even an audience of key researchers and teacher educators. A stimulating two-hour discussion unfolded, with some participants commenting that they would have liked it to continue longer. The papers and highlights from the discussions are presented in this monograph.

Gene E. Hall
Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education, The
University of Texas at Austin

INDUCTION -- AN OVERVIEW

Gary A. Griffin

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

INDUCTION -- AN OVERVIEW

Gary A. Griffin

The purpose of this paper is to present several of the issues regarding the induction period of teachers which appear to deserve attention. These issues are related to (1) the preservice period of teacher education, (2) the entry of the teacher into the teaching force, and (3) the inter-institutional responsibility for creating favorable conditions for teaching and learning.

The induction period of teachers is considered to be that period of from one to three years of actual teaching experience subsequent to the earning of a teaching credential or license at an accredited teacher education institution. This does not include the one or two semesters during which the teacher-in-preparation may have guided practice in teaching, conventionally known as student teaching. The period of induction can be defined as the time it takes for a beginning teacher to make the transition from "student of teaching" to "teacher." This period of time will differ with individuals, depending on a complex number of variables such as prior experiences in schools, the nature the teacher education program from which the credential was earned, the nature of the school setting into which the beginning teacher moves, the personal and professional skills and knowledge the new teacher brings to his/her first position, and so on. Needless to say, the beginning of any professional career will be a complicated time for the new worker but there are reasons to suspect that the beginning of a teacher's career is especially complex. Some of the reasons for this complexity are discussed below.

Preservice Teacher Education

It is a conventional practice for a teacher candidate to have certain field experiences during his/her preservice program. Usually, these field experiences are conceptualized in such a manner as to allow the student increasing opportunities for becoming familiar with, knowledgeable about, and skillful in the requirements of teaching. Such a sequence might begin with a set of focused observations as part of a psychology or learning theory course, become a set of planned and monitored interactions with elementary or secondary students as part of a subject matter or general methods course, and culminate in one or two semesters of student teaching. These field-based opportunities to learn the art, science, and craft of teaching have long been believed to be sufficient to prepare the novice teacher for entry into the teaching force.

There is a growing reason to question this reasoning. First, and most dramatic, is the reaction of many (if not most) first-year teachers to their first teaching assignments. This reaction may vary from a strong sense of inadequacy to blind panic. It is not unusual for teachers to describe their first years as "hell." Another common descriptor is "feeling my way." Blame this unawareness of what teaching and schools are all about is most often placed at the teacher education program door. New teachers in large numbers seem to believe that their preparation programs did not give adequate attention to the enormous demands of teaching, the intractability of certain students, the problems of collegiality (or lack thereof), the internal and external pressures upon them to respond to institutional and societal expectations, and so on.

There is some indication that the former students of teaching are realistic in their assessment of their preparatory programs. In an

investigation of student teaching currently being undertaken at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, we are discovering that many of the student teachers have had extremely limited experience in actual school and classroom settings. Not only has this experience been limited, it has sometimes lacked in focus. Students report to us that they have had some interaction with elementary or secondary students but are unclear of what the purposes of that interaction were. Further, they often report little or no experience which might be considered complementary (e.g., day care volunteer work, teaching Sunday School, working with youth groups, etc.). Also, we have very little evidence that the students have had <u>any</u> experience with teachers, school administrators, board of education members, and the like. This lack of personal/professional interactions with persons who will be clients, colleagues, and patrons of the teacher does not, it seems to some of us, auger well for the entry of the new teacher into that milieu.

The set of learning opportunities called student teaching was designed to provide a gradual, monitored entry into the world of teaching. This entry was to be characterized by increasing responsibility for and understanding of teaching in a typical classroom. It has been believed widely that (1) student teaching is the most important part of teacher education and (2) student teaching, with its careful monitoring by master teachers and university supervisors, will provide an "eased" entrance into teaching. The importance of student teaching is not under question here. The nature of the "eased" entry, however, is.

Although the rhetoric of most teacher education programs includes attention to a comprehensive and conceptually well-designed system to gradually immerse the student teacher into the life of the classroom, it is possible to find wide variations in practice. Possibly because of the growing

accountability movement, the public cries of "back to the basics," the increasing demands upon teachers to respond to critics of teaching and schooling, and the like, teachers with the responsibility to provide a clinical experience for a neophyte are more and more reluctant to "release" their classrooms and their students from their own well-developed sets of procedures and expectations. Although student teaching programs are supposed to be times when advanced teacher candidates work with whole classroom groups for concerted periods of time, this practice is not widely observed. Classroom teachers, frankly, appear to be fearful that student teachers will somehow interfere with the process of learning which they have guided prior to the college students' entries into their classrooms. Also, classroom teachers are very aware that, in the event of some mistakes on the part of the student teacher, it will be <u>they</u> who must pick up the pieces.

These examples illustrate the problems that are associated with the preservice teacher education program and appear to be associated, subsequently, to the problems beginning teachers face. They are <u>only</u> examples and exceptions can be found to counter them. However, it has been my experience, especially in recent years, that the problems do appear to be endemic in student teaching situations. As described briefly here and to be found in greater range in practice, these problems point to the need to consider induction as a critical period of a teacher's worklife.

Entry into the Teaching Force

In an informal examination of the preparation programs of approximately seventy-five teacher education institutions undertaken two years ago, I discovered that there was not one of these programs which gave attention to what the prospective teacher would face as he or she moved into a public elementary or secondary school. In that there had been so many studies of

teaching which appeared to have been influential upon teacher educators and educational researchers during the past decade (e.g., from Jackson, to Lortie, to Dreeben), I was surprised that the knowledge of the school and classroom as workplaces and the apparent effects of these workplaces upon teachers and students had not become influential upon teacher preparation. (Of course, there may have been instances of influence but my own experience makes me doubt how powerful they might have been.)

It appears to many of us that the demands of the school and the contexts within which schools operate must be given some consideration in the introduction of a neophyte to those schools and contexts. Consider the difficulties faced by a new teacher as he or she encounters (1) the principal's leadership style, (2) the "dailiness" of schooling with few encounters with adults, (3) the often apparently mindless routines of schooling (remember Bel Kaufman's Up the Down Staircase?), (4) the multiple curriculum demands, (5) the startling differences between and among students in several classes for secondary teachers and within one class for elementary teachers, (6) the ill-conceived relation between schools and their patrons, and so on.

The general conclusion formed by many new teachers is that there just isn't any way to "cope" with the school and its characteristics. That there isn't any way to "really teach." That frustration and lack of time and decreased energy and inadequate resources and ever-more-frequent demands upon those resources simply can't be dealt with in any sane fashion. And so the litany continues.

The consequences? Of course, some teachers, through some personal source of power or professional support system, manage to emerge, if not triumphant, at least relatively unbloodied. Others, also of course, give in to what they

see the system as being (even if their view may be inadequate of inaccurate). And others, frustrated in their attempts to move young people into the society in a productive and satisfying manner, leave for other workplaces. Worse, of course, is that many promising potential teachers simply do not opt into the system because they see little or no future for them there.

What this adds up to, for me, is the enormous difficulty associated with entry into schools. This difficulty is not, however, unsurmountable. Many consider that the induction period, not student teaching, is the time to attend to issues such as the ones I've raised here. These issues, it is argued, can only be dealt with when one is a part of the system -- not an appendage to the system. It is only the teacher who will really learn about and how to cope with the complexities of schools and classrooms. And, consequently, it is during the first years of a teacher's career (not his or her preparation) that this learning and coping can be aided. And this is the time that has come to be called induction.

Inter-institutional Responsibilities

But, how shall such a program of induction be governed, monitored, evaluated, modified? Given the criticisms of schools and school places as incapable of acting upon their own problems, should induction continue to be the province of the school administration? Given the charges of militant anti-professionalism leveled against teacher associations, should beginning teachers learn about their craft and their workplaces only from their peers? Given the hue and cry about the various programs which have been attached to teacher education institutions, should they continue to provide the primary (if not, sole) field-based guidance to prospective and beginning teachers? Of course, the way in which these questions were stated reveal a point of view.

There has been much talk and very little action about the shared responsibilities which institutions with like missions should demonstrate. In the matter of a teacher's entry into his or her career, it appears reasonable to assume that teacher education institutions, school systems, and professional organizations would have some vested interests in making that entry as positive as possible. What I am proposing as a model for guiding the induction of teachers illustrates this like-mindedness of purposes. That is, the teacher education officials, the school system officers, and the professional association would join together to provide guidance to the beginning teacher. This guidance would not be only "on the job," but would also reflect backward in time upon the program of preparation prior to entry and would project forward into the time when, one would hope, the new teacher would become a career teacher. It is believed that all parties to the action should be given some control of and influence upon the new teacher as he or she begins the often rewarding practice of teaching.

This new set of institutional relationships would alter existing practices in many ways, some radical. The teacher education institution would have to give up a good part of its power of program planning and implementation. The school system officers would have to join in some cooperative relationships with persons who have often appeared to be natural adversaries. Teacher organization officials would be required to continue an already-begun effort to influence, in substantive as well as political ways, what happens to colleges, universities, and school systems.

Conclusion

This paper has presented three areas of interest and selected issues for each area for consideration in thinking about the induction of teachers. They are not all-inclusive, they are illustratory. The other papers in this

symposium will address selected issues with more detail. It is our hope that this currently-emerging focus upon induction will continue and will be productive in terms of helping to provide effective teachers for effective schools.

WHY BOTHER WITH INDUCTION?

Kevin Ryan

The Ohio State University

WHY BOTHER WITH INDUCTION?

Kevin Ryan

"Why bother with induction?" Why bother with anything brings us quickly to a metaphysical, or possibly, a theological question. It is not unlike the question once asked to Sir Edmund Hillary, "Why did you climb mountains?" His famous answer does not quite suit, though. "Because induction is there!" does not answer the question as sharply as Hillary's response. And, there are people who raise questions about the usefulness of giving special attention to beginning teachers. Within this very month, Martin Haberman (1982) asked whether or not there is anything special about the way teachers enter the job market. Haberman suggested that beginning almost any job is difficult and teaching is no exception, and, by extension, it does not deserve much attention. As an educational thinker and spokesman, Martin Haberman is extraordinarily insightful and almost always on target. He is, however, wrong here. The induction of teachers is both important and special. Or, at least, that is the underlying assertion of this paper about which I wish to comment. I will support my contention with four arguments.

The first is that the first year of professional work is for the teacher the ultimate "teachable moment." This point is perhaps best expressed through the story of the city boy who bought a mule and was trying with no success to train it. He talked to it, scolded it, fed it sugar, and, in short, tried everything he could think of to train it. All this time an elderly, country-born neighbor watched his efforts with amusement. Finally, in desperation the city boy turned to his neighbor and said, "Can you help me?"

"Sure. I'd be glad to. Do ya have a two-by-four?"

"Yes, I think I have one in the garage. I'll go get it for you." Off he went and came back with a eight foot length two-by-four. The neighbor picked up the two-by-four, took a mighty swing and hit the mule in the side of the head. The mule slumped to its haunches, then shaking its head, got up on its hooves and peered at the old man. The old man turned to his stunned neighbor and said, "The first principle of education is, ya gotta git thar attention."

It is difficult to get the full attention of preservice undergraduates. They are busy about many things, among them separating themselves from their parents and their role as child; living away from home and becoming independent; searching for a mate; coming in contact, perhaps for the first time, with important ideas; possibly suffering a crisis of belief; and, in general, growing up. All of these social and intellectual learnings compete for their attention. And, having selected to "go back to school" as a teacher, they are not deeply convinced that they need to know very much. After all, they have been students for twelve years and experienced dozens and dozens of teachers. A lecture on behavioral objectives in pre-service training does not have the immediate impact that a lecture on taking out an appendix might to a medical student, who sees himself going into unfamiliar territory. The teachers are going back to familiar territory.

Coupled with this lack of intensity on the part of the learner is what might be called the "weak treatment" quality of most teacher education. Typically, it is not rigorous or demanding. As stated, the material is not novel. The chances of failure are low and the chances of success (certification) are high. The potential of the courses and experiences to radically alter behavior or even the way that people conceptualize their thoughts about teaching would appear to be quite low. People are accepted

into programs, take the courses, engage in the clinical experiences, and are certified as teachers.

The first year teacher, however, has a very different experience. Having secured a job in what is increasingly a difficult employment market, the new teacher feels under scrutiny and under the gun. After the honeymoon period, which can last anywhere from two days to two months, the euphoria fades. The beginning teacher learns from the students' behavior that things are not going well. He learns indirectly by poor student learning or signs of boredom. He learns directly by student misbehavior. What seemed like a familiar world of the classroom, quickly becomes the arena of failure. Sometimes it is the first time the young teacher has failed at anything. His new colleagues seem unaware, or worse, indifferent to his problems. His principal, who in a few short months will have to judge his suitability for another teaching contract, does not seem, upon reflection, like the one to go to for support. For many these early months of the first year of teaching are a nightmare of self doubt and disorientation.

Having confronted failure on a daily basis, the new teacher is ready to give his attention to the craft of his profession. This is the teachable moment. This is the time that the profession can either reach him with some lifesaving help or leave him to his own devices. We can be sure, however, that in this moment of failure and anguish, something will be learned. However, just what he learns in his induction is the crucial question.

A second reason why we should bother about induction has to do with the isolation of a beginning teacher. At the time when the new teacher is most ready to learn, there are a few avenues of help open to him or her, other than trial and learning. As Newberry (1977) has reported beginning teachers are cut off from their peers. Except in the case where a teacher had a colleague

at the same grade level in a contiguous room, there is no bonding between the beginning teacher and his more experienced colleagues. Why this is so is unclear. However, some possible causes might be that the beginning teacher is a threat to the fragile social ecology of a faculty. Also, fellow teachers may not be interested in extending themselves to someone who may be a very short term colleague. The experienced teachers have already established a friendship network and it simply takes time for new people to enter that network. Also, there is the possibility that many new teachers are burdened down with new chores and have little energy, psychic or otherwise, to reach out to their professional colleagues. But for whatever the reason, the fact remains that many new teachers feel cut off and isolated from those people who could be of most help to them: experienced teachers. The problems that they are having, with discipline, with identifying several materials, with trying to understand the clerical procedures of the school, often could be easily solved by people from whom they are shut off by invisible walls.

A third reason for giving attention to induction relates back to the point made by Haberman. For those unmoved by the teacher's plight and are able to dismiss this issue with the view that "life is hard" and entry into many jobs is painful, there is another factor that needs to be considered. This factor is the student. A class of 30-or-so first graders only have one first grade experience. If their teacher spends the year psychologically exhausted, simply muddling through, these children lose. A high school girl who needs chemistry toward her career plans normally only gets one chance at chemistry. If her teacher is groping through the year, sometimes hitting, sometimes missing, she and her fellow students are the victims. There is more to induction than the sleepless night and bruised ego of the beginning teacher.

Finally, attention to induction could be helpful to the colleges and universities which train teachers. Currently, in our country the system that "produces" teachers is organizationally separate from the system that "consumes" teachers. Colleges and universities prepare teachers for many different types of schools. They expect their students to transfer the generalized information and training of teacher education to a specific school site. It is a rare professor of education who sees the graduates of his course actually teaching children. He or she has little feedback on whether or not skills and teachers that are being taught are meaningful. The professor does not know what level of training is needed to transfer the skills into different situations. Often too many professors of education, again because of the institutional separation, are not current with school practice. Also, many do not have easy access to the schools. The opportunity to be part of an induction program in a school could be of substantial value to the university faculty members. Besides the fact that they could help the beginner handle instructional structure and institutional problems in a "third party" role, they could get some valuable inservice training for themselves.

CONCLUSION

This paper is not arguing that massive and expensive programs ought to be developed. Nor is it promising that such programs will be immediately effective. Rather it is suggesting that there is enough research and enough common sense among members of the education profession to establish a few carefully developed programs that bother with the induction of new teachers.

WHY BOTHER WITH TEACHER INDUCTION?

Kenneth M. Zeichner

University of Wisconsin, Madison

WHY BOTHER WITH TEACHER INDUCTION?

Kenneth M. Zeichner

My remarks today will focus on two of the questions that were identified by the symposium organizers under the dilemma of "Why bother with teacher induction?" (1) Are there any "hard data" to support the cost effectiveness of the investment of scarce resources in induction programs with respect to teaching effectiveness, teacher morale, longevity, and flexibility to meet changing situations and challenges? (2) What evidence could be advanced to support or on the other hand to discourage the allocation of greater resources to teachers during the induction years? In asserting my position on these issues, I will limit myself to commenting on the U.S. experience with teacher induction programs acknowledging that a discussion of the recent research and development efforts in both the United Kingdom and Australia would probably contribute much to the illumination of these questions.

I will argue the position that there is little empirical evidence that greater attention to teacher induction substantially affects the long term development of teachers in terms of such criteria as teaching effectiveness, sense of efficacy, and longevity in the profession. On the other hand, there clearly are many arguments that could and have been constructed on the basis of studies of the problems of beginning teachers, from listening to teachers talk about their induction experiences and on logical grounds that would support the view that greater attention to the induction of teachers is of the utmost importance.

My own position regarding this question remains somewhat ambivalent. On the one hand, I support the view expressed by many that we could and should be doing more than we are currently doing to make this experience less traumatic

than it apparently is for a substantial majority of teachers. On the other hand, I am somewhat skeptical about the view that a major effort should be mounted in this area because there are other matters, by focusing more attention on induction, that in my view need to be addressed before we will make any substantial headway in alleviating problems related to teacher effectiveness, morale, and longevity. The period of induction is clearly important and merits greater attention, but unless this greater attention to beginning teachers is coupled with systematic efforts to reform the structure of teaching and workplace characteristics affecting the development of all teachers, I feel the consequences of additional allocation of resources to the induction period will be minimal. In a time of fiscal crisis such as the present, we need to be careful that the legitimate claim of the induction period on our resources does not lead to the neglect of these other problems. It is my belief that problems related to teaching effectiveness, teacher morale, and longevity are probably more closely related to conditions of schools affecting the development of all teachers (such as the lack of teacher autonomy) than to problems that are unique to the induction period. In the final analysis, I feel that the general question of the relationship between the quality of induction to teachers' long term development and effectiveness remains unclear.

First, the question concerning the existence of "hard data" that would support greater attention to teacher induction. One way to think about this question is to examine evaluation data related to the impact of those induction programs which have been conducted to date. Since the publication of the Conant Report, in 1963, which contained several specific recommendations for the support of beginning teachers, there has been a revival of concern with the period of induction and several experimental

induction programs (both internships and school-based programs) have been implemented often with the support of federal and foundational monies.

To my knowledge there have been three attempts to synthesize the evaluation literature that has been generated by these programs (Elias, et al., 1980; Johnston, 1981; Zeichner, 1979). There are several conclusions that all three of these studies have drawn concerning our knowledge of the impact of planned and sustained induction programs. First, it is clear from an examination of this literature that only a handful of induction programs have been evaluated and reported in the literature. The literature contains many descriptors of induction programs and practices for which no evaluation or assessment is reported. Secondly, the evaluation data which does exist does little to illuminate the nature of the impact of specific induction practices on either the immediate or long term development of teachers.

With the exception of "user satisfaction," the results of the evaluations of induction programs are highly equivocal. On the one hand, beginning teachers who have participated in these programs overwhelmingly were satisfied and felt that they were helped by these programs. On the other hand, when one examines the data related to teaching effectiveness, teacher attitudes, and longevity the results are less promising.

For example, in several instances the performance of those teachers who participated in induction programs has been compared with the performance of teachers who did not participate in the program in two ways: (1) by observations and evaluations of the teachers; (2) through assessments of pupil performance and attitudes in experimental and control group classrooms. Although there are a few indications that planned induction experiences do affect teaching effectiveness in the short run (e.g., Kehl, 1977), the general lack of significant results in these studies makes any clear conclusions

regarding the impact of induction programs on teaching effectiveness highly problematic. This same situation holds true for the other criteria which have been assessed in this literature: teacher attitudes, morale, and turnover. Significantly, none of these studies has addressed the question of long term effectiveness over a career as it relates to the quality of induction. The kinds of longitudinal studies that would shed light on this question have understandably not been conducted to date.

However, despite the lack of "hard data" which would demonstrate the value of allocating greater resources to beginning teachers, there are many compelling arguments that have been set forth in the literature for paying greater attention to this area. One obvious reason why the evaluation literature on induction is so barren is because of the persistence of the "trial by fire" method of inducting teachers into the profession. Despite repeated calls for the development of practices designed specifically to support beginning teachers (e.g., Bush, 1966; Leiter and Cooper, 1978), and despite the implementation of several experimental programs, there is a general consensus that little is being done at present to support beginning teachers over and above the staff development support that is provided for all teachers (Grant and Zeichner, 1981; Howey and Yarger, 1980; McDonald, 1980). The observation made by Howsam, et al., (1976:101), in Educating a Profession, is probably as true today as it was six years ago: "Many new teachers function in a professional desert, abandoned by the institutions where they received their preservice education and neglected by overburdened school supervisory personnel." That this condition still exists is suggested by McDonald's (1980:71) comments regarding the most recent comprehensive study of the induction years: "If one conclusion is apparent in this study, it is that beginning teachers solve their own problems very much by themselves." Thus,

one justification for giving greater attention to the induction period is simply that there is not much that is being done now.

Secondly, as Lewis (1979) points out, there is no lack of information which tells us that teachers are dissatisfied with this condition of neglect. Teachers overwhelmingly indicate that they want or would have wanted greater assistance during their initial years (McDonald, 1980). This, coupled with the fact that a substantial number of teachers regardless of the quantity or quality of their preservice preparation, experience a great deal of trauma and frustration during their induction makes the case for "greater attention" even more compelling. These feelings of anxiety and frustration by beginning teachers have been consistently reported in several first-hand accounts of beginning teachers (e.g., Ryan, 1970); in empirical studies of the induction period (e.g., Eddy, 1969; Ryan, et al., 1980) and in the literature on the problems and concerns of beginning teachers (e.g., Johnston and Ryan, in press).

Furthermore, when one logically examines the reasons for allocating greater resources to the induction years, the comments of teachers which indicate a need for further assistance receive more support. For example, there is no question that preservice preparation however excellent cannot fully prepare teachers for the full range of classroom responsibilities that they will face during the first days of their careers. Ryan (1979) has described several aspects of this problem of "underpreparation." For example, the lack of rigorous admissions standards, the cursory nature of student evaluations, the much talked about "life space" problem and the necessarily general as opposed to situation specific nature of preservice training all contribute to the position that more needs to be done for teachers during their initial years.

Additionally, the abrupt nature of the transition into teaching in comparison with other occupations further complicates the problem of "underpreparation." As Lortie (1975) points out, teaching seems to be one of the few occupations where the beginner becomes fully responsible from the first working day and performs the same task as a twenty-five year veteran. The complex nature of the adjustment which is required of beginning teachers because of the abruptness of this transition together with the complexity of other nonteaching related adjustments that many beginning teachers are required to make (e.g., Johnston and Ryan, in press), makes the case for a more gradual induction hard to refute.

For all of these reasons and more, it has become increasingly common in the literature for some to go so far as to identify the induction years as the most critical period for determining the eventual effectiveness of a teacher. Many, including those who conducted the recent ETS study, have echoed the general assessment of the relationship of induction to long term development that was reached in a recent NIE review:

> The conditions under which a person carries out the first year of teaching have a strong influence on the level of effectiveness which that teacher is able to achieve and to sustain over the years; on the attitudes which govern teacher behavior over even a forty year career; and, indeed on the decision whether or not to continue in the teaching profession (NIE, 1978: 3).

McDonald (1980) while acknowledging that many of his claims are a result of a "theoretical or hypothetical interpretation of what the literature seems to be telling us" (p. 40), constructs several convincing scenarios that would support the view that the transition period is the critical period in the development of a teacher. Generally, McDonald argues that beginning teachers who are for the most part anxious and concerned with survival will adopt (without added support) many narrowly conceived survival mechanisms that will become part of their permanent repertoires of teaching strategies. "Whatever

habits they have acquired in this survival period will probably persist through much of their teaching careers" (p. 218). He sees one of the consequnces of the induction years as currently conceived as a narrowing of focus and argues that beginning teaches probably become less open to change after their initial experiences. These conclusions are supported in part by the comments of many experienced teachers who identify their induction year as a formative influence on the rest of their careers (Ryan, 1979).

While I am generally sympathetic with many of the observations and conclusions contained in the ETS study, there are several reasons why I am personally less optimistic than some regarding the likely benefits to be gained from greater attention to the induction years. In addition to the absence of the kinds of longitudinal studies that would support the position that the induction period is especially influential in determining a teacher's development over a career (a fact which is repeatedly acknowledged by McDonald), it seems to me that there are other factors which are more closely related to the nature of teacher development than those factors which are unique to the induction period.

For example, the literature on schooling has become increasingly concerned with the problem of teacher alienation and with identifying the institutional characteristics of schools that are related to widespread teacher discontent (e.g., Hoy, 1980). In this regard, teachers' sense of control over their work has been identified in several studies (e.g., Vavrus, 1979) as an important variable in determining the degree of teacher alienation. If those such as Wise (1979) and Apple (1982) are correct, the control of teachers over determining the objectives, content, and pace of their work has been gradually eroded and the work of teachers has increasingly become segmented and routinized as schools have been rationalized in response

to public demands for greater accountability. That the lack of teacher autonomy is a significant problem is supported by the findings of many studies, including a recent study of the graduates of teacher education programs in three Indiana universities (Chapman and Hutcheson, 1982). This study identified low salaries, lack of job autonomy, and the lack of opportunities to contribute to important decisions as the most important factors related to teacher attrition.

The lack of teacher autonomy is but one example of the kind of structural problem that is not necessarily addressed by allocating more resources to the induction years. It is my belief that unless we address this and other structural aspects of teachers' work and make the worklives of all teachers more fulfilling then the problems which we seek to ameliorate through induction programs will persist. If by "bothering with the teacher induction" we mean merely helping teachers fit more smoothly into a system of schooling that remains unaltered, then we are adopting a truncated view of the problem that is likely to have little impact on teaching effectiveness, teacher morale, and sense of efficacy and longevity. However, as I stated at the onset, I do support the view that we can and should be doing more than we are now doing to make the initial years of teaching less traumatic. My own research on beginning teachers has convinced me, however, (Grant and Zeichner, 1981; Tabachnick and Zeichner, in press) that there is much that we can be doing to help beginning teachers without the kind of substantial outlay of resources that is frequently advocated in the induction literature.

References

Apple, M. Curricular form and logic of technical control: The building of the possessive individual. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.) Ideology and practice in education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Bush, R. The formative years. In The real world of the beginning teacher. Report of the 19th National TEPS Conference. Washington, DC: NEA, 1966.

Chapman, D. & Hutcheson, S. Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 1982, 19, 93-105.

Conant, J. The education of American teachers. NY: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Eddy, E. Becoming a teacher. NY: Teachers College Press, 1969.

Elias, P., Fisher, M. L., & Simon, R. Helping beginning teachers through the first year: A review of the literature. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1980.

Grant, C. & Zeichner, K. Inservice support for first year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1981, 4, 99-111.

Howsam, R, Corrigan, D., Denemark, G., & Nash, R. Educating a profession. Washington, DC: AACTE, 1976.

Howey, K., Yarger, S., & Joyce, B. Improving teacher education. Washington, DC: ATE, 1978.

Hoy, W. Organizational structure and alienation from work. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, Boston, April, 1980.

Johnston, J. A knowledge base for teacher induction. A paper presented at the annual meeting of ATE, Dallas, February, 1981.

Johnston, J. & Ryan, K. Research on the beginning teacher: Implications for teacher education. In K. Howey and R. Dykstra (Eds.) Research and development in teacher education, in press.

Kehl, E. The resident teacher program: A pilot evaluation study. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, 1977.

Leiter, M., & Cooper, M. How teacher unionists view inservice education. Teachers College Record, 1978, 80, 107-125.

Lewis, C. Some essential characteristics of programs to support teachers in the beginning years. In K. Howey and R. Bents (Eds.) Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher. Minneapolis: USOE/Teacher Corps, 1979.

Lortie, D. School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McDonald, F. The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1980.

National Institute of Education. Beginning teachers and internship programs. (R.F.P. No. 78-0014) Washington, DC: NIE, 1978.

Ryan, K. Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Ryan, K. Toward understanding the problem: At the threshold of the profession. In K. Howey and R. Bents (Eds.) Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher. Minneapolis: USOE/Teacher Corps, 1979.

Tabachnick, B. R. & Zeichner, K. The development of teacher preparation perspectives and the relationships among teacher perspectives, school, and classroom processes and student diversity. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, in progress.

Vavrus. The relationship of teacher alienation to school workplace characteristics and career stages. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, 1979.

Wise, A. Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.

Zeichner, K. Teacher induction programs in the U.S. and Great Britain. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, San Francisco, April, 1979.

DISCUSSION

35

Discussion following presentations: "Why Bother with Induction?"

Q = Questioner C = Chair

C: You are invited to "jump in here." I'd like some comments.

Q: I have a real problem with the last presentation. One of the problems I have is with the administrator and supervisor--that critical first year, second year of the teacher--from my experience, they don't make it. They're not going to make that leap unless we leave room for it. Those experiences are so significant that to by-pass and wait until they encounter the problems of sixth, seventh, and eighth year teachers, is a fallacy...

C: I agree with you. We are trying to record this session, so we will try to recap that. For those of you who may not have picked it up, the essence of the comment was that the first year or two is really critical in terms of what happens to the teacher from then on. Dr. Zeichner, how do you justify your statement?

Q: I don't disagree with that. I thought I said that I think the first years are important, but unless we also address other things about schools--institutional characteristics--then we are going to still have people leaving the profession--things like not being paid enough, not having enough control over what they do. Helping teachers in the first year is not enough; I'm not saying don't help them in the first year at all. But I think we need not forget these other things, just like Fred McDonald in the EPS study examining sensitive preservice aspects. I think we need to look at all three of them together, and not just talk about induction in isolation. Personally, I'd like to see the whole panorama, then talk about it.

C: That's fine, but we would like to give people an opportunity to kind of throw questions or comments in while they're hot, although we are going to limit this and not hold you long here. Go ahead.

Q: Is there a lump of all the induction programs in one study? Are there some programs that are better than others?

Q: There have been a number of programs. The problem is that a lot of the things that have been going on are important, first of all. Secondly,

they are reported in the literature which were not evaluated and I was only referring to the evaluation made in 15-20 programs. One of the questions was hard data, and I said there wasn't any, but in terms of a lot of the other reasons, we should support beginning teachers. But I don't know that we really know that one sort of program is more effective; I don't think we have enough empirical research, although you can read the literature and draw conclusions from it, but there is a definite lack of "hard data."

Q: In the spirit of controversy, let me disagree with the point that Kenneth made, and that's the question of teacher autonomy and the need to make more important first-order concerns. Well, while I agree with that--that we agreed to change the school and do many, many things that would make the life of children and teachers more effective--I think we are going to have to wait a long, long time for that. And, I think there are things we can do immediately at low cost, in the lives of first year teachers, to make it more effective and make their adjustment to the school more effective, as a step forward at a time.

C: Good to see this hand back here. One more comment, please.

Q: Would you share with us what is the focus in an induction program like TAPE--what are some of the needs of these people? Rather than saying all of the above, is there a focus like key grouping, or support networking, or do they need skills or tips...

C: Yes, I think all those things, as long as...(laughter)...All of the above. Well, one thing is the sort of thing Carolyn Evertson did--the Survival Checklist. I think that was enormously helpful. That had a very concrete list of things that a teacher needs to get control of before they begin. A second thing is a mentor. And, the third thing, I think, is some kind of special pulling together of the other first year teachers who are focused in children's training by other people in the building. Also, the psychological T-grouping point could be made, just know you're not going through this alone--that other people are getting up at 5:00 in the morning and throwing up and/or having the same kind of self doubts you're having. Those things are very much a part of the first year and I think most of us have forgotten them, thank God. The sharing of that kind of information is very helpful.

C: Having demonstrated that we have a very live audience, let us move on quickly to the next set of presentations. Our next question is, "What happens to the teacher during induction?"

39

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE TEACHER DURING INDUCTION?

J. T. Sandefur

Western Kentucky University

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE TEACHER DURING INDUCTION?

J. T. Sandefur

Fred McDonald contends that there are two major tasks which have to be mastered if a teacher is to be successful in moving from an inexperienced beginner to a reasonably competent teacher. The first task relates to the (effective) use of the skills of teaching and the second task relates to adapting to the social system of the school in which the teacher teaches.[1] I am willing to accept McDonald's assumption that the mastery of these two tasks constitutes induction into the profession.

Having accepted a definition of induction, I am now prepared to make three assertions as to what happens to a teacher during induction:

1. Systematic, formalized plans for helping beginning teachers through the induction phase are virtually non-existent either in the schools or institutions of teacher education.

2. Induction as it presently occurs is a matter of survival, not necessarily of the fittest, but of the most durable.

3. Induction, or rather the lack of it, is the major cause of attrition from the teaching profession during the first three years of teaching.

Corcoran suggests that a major effect of the shift from university to public school is a period of intense shock, a period when beginners are paralyzed by the discovery that they do not know all that they need to know and are unable to draw on either previous training or on the wide range of potentially helpful resources that surround them in the present.[2] When beginning teachers say, "It's a jungle out there," they are drawing an analogy between teaching and being in a jungle without a guide to describe the characteristics and behaviors of the inhabitants, without a gun-bearer to present the appropriate weapon when under attack and without a trusted source

of advice as to how one may get out of the situation with both life and honor.

If the induction process is truly the tasks of mastery of teaching skills and adapting to the social system of the school, what are the components of those tasks? In mastering teaching skills, McDonald identifies (1) management skills, e.g., keeping pupils on task, maintaining social order, and using time effectively; (2) planning skills, e.g., preparing themselves, determining what will interest students, what questions students will ask, and what kind of problems will arise in developing comprehension of the material; and (3) integrating instructional skills into teaching styles and strategies, e.g., questioning, eliciting student opinion, assessing knowledge, encouraging discussion, motivating students, pacing and timing, and evaluating and grading.

In mastery of adapting to the social system of the school, he lists (1) adjustment to characteristics of students, e.g., learning rate, knowledge and experience, ethnic and racial background as factors in learning as well as other cultural and social differences; and (2) adjustment to the mores and values of the school, e.g., faculty socialization, kind and amount of supervision, and other conditions of teaching in a particular school.[3]

Again, assuming that McDonald's tasks are the correct ones, and the assertion that nothing is being done in a systematic and formalized way to assist the beginning teacher with induction into the profession, how do beginning teachers cope? The answer is "poorly" and with great waste to the profession. There is ample research evidence to indicate three basic reactions to the induction experience:

1. There is a progressive to traditional shift in teaching perspectives.
2. Teachers become embittered both against the teaching

profession and the teacher education program in which they were prepared and, in far too many cases

3. They leave the profession.

Zeichner and Tabachnick, reporting research conducted in Great Britain and the United States, state that it now has become commonly accepted within the teacher education community that students become increasingly more progressive or liberal in their attitudes toward education during their stay at the university and then shift to opposing and more traditional views as they move into student teaching and inservice experience.[4]

These findings are not unlike those of Adams, who, in a nine-year long longitudinal study of teachers from student teaching through the fifth year of teaching, found consistency in measures of desirable teaching behaviors between student teaching and the first year of teaching. However, he found a sharp upturn in desirable teaching behaviors at the third year of teaching. These findings offer support to the theory that students regress to some "safe" level of performance, usually traditional, during their first year or two of induction into the profession and that only after achieving a feeling of safety or security will they be willing to attempt some of the more liberal or progressive teaching behaviors they may have learned in their pre-service program.[5]

Using data obtained at Western Kentucky University, Adams found that only 40% of the elementary education students and 28% of the secondary education students could be found teaching in the classrooms of Kentucky schools five years after graduation.[6] High on the list of reasons for leaving teaching was the statement that they didn't like teaching. These and other findings caused Adams to conclude that there was a need for more support of the first-year teacher in transitioning from pre-service teacher education programs into the profession as first-year teachers.[7]

It is evident that induction should be placed high in a list of educational research priorities. Corcoran suggested four examples: (1) How might research test the validity of the concept of transition? (2) If such a concept were validated, how might its intensity and duration...be measured? (3) How might its short-term and long-term effects on knowledge gained from pre-service education be measured? and (4) How might the effects of different pre-service curricula, supervisory modes and student teaching or internship arrangements on the concept of transition shock be measured?[8]

With or without research on the effects of induction, several states recognize the importance of a formal induction experience and are moving to legislate or mandate internships. Included in a growing list are Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, New York, Oklahoma, and South Carolina. In each state, supervision of the intern is required and successful completion of the internship is required for certification.[9] Apparently, the need for a formal induction experience has already been established and the area awaits the attention it deserves from researchers.

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE TEACHER DURING INDUCTION?

Ann Lieberman

Teachers College
Columbia University

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE TEACHER DURING INDUCTION?

Ann Lieberman

The context dramatically affects the teacher in spite of the greatest teacher preparation program.

Consider this case:

1. Teacher -- age 28
2. Female -- 3 children of her own
3. Teacher preparation -- well known state university, high quality program
4. B.A. in English Lit -- Liberal Arts -- additional year Teaching Credential -- exceptional program
5. District building 3 schools a year
6. First assignment 6th grade
7. 18 teachers
8. Class has 42 students
9. Principal says average class: 17 homes divorced parents
   4 emotional problems
   11 students have been to over 9 schools
10. No library
11. Confronted with 42 sixth graders -- Responsible for teaching math, spelling, social studies, science, health, art, music, P.E.
12. Range -- 1st to 12th grade
13. Face self for the first time -- how to deal with these students in some honest way
14. End of first year decided to become a social worker
15. No one offered support
16. Next door Lydia Festerling -- 2 years from retirement
    Al Stein, age 35 -- tough "Shape up -- you take them too seriously"
17. Principal very supportive -- new, open
18. Teacher breaks out in hives -- eyes won't open -- feet swollen to double their size
19. June 30th -- the first year ends -- and all this with an excellent teacher preparation program
20. Context defined as immediate classroom principal, peers, students so powerful and appears to be unconnected to the teacher preparation program
21. As Dewey has warned us experience is a great teacher but many learnings are miseducative. The beginning teacher learns primarily from the context where he/she works. If it's open, supportive and nurturing there is a chance for growth, but unfortunately most beginning teachers are thrown in deep waters not knowing how to swim. Somehow we must solve the problem of the overriding and powerful effects of the context. It's always there in spite of the best teacher preparation program. Those first years are significant and I don't think it's too strong to say that context determines whether the teacher stays in teaching and how those early learnings get acted out.

DISCUSSION

Discussion following presentations: "What Happens to the Teacher During Induction?"

Q = Questioner R = Responder C = Chair

Q: Ann, if we did more study and analysis of what you are talking about, would it lead to any solution?

R: I don't think we need any more studying. I think we know what the teacher needs--we now have words for them. Now we call them "survival skills" and all of those other things. But, what are those words doing? We have to sort of get right in there with the teacher on Day 1.

Q: For what purpose?

R: Okay, for what purpose...if this is such a powerful experience that destroys people, then surely we must be doing something "pre" that isn't helpful, and we clearly aren't doing anything "during." Kevin has suggested that we do something as they get there, but why is it that with a prime preparation program, they get there and nothing has been transferred? Does that make any sense? And, I have asked hundreds of teachers--the particular person I referred to in my case study is me--but there are hundreds of teachers...anybody you ask tells you the exact same thing. I want to stop because there are other people who want to participate and tell you that there are some good things going on, and that I'm just barking in the night.

Q: Will you finish?

R: I'm willing. I have asked literally hundreds of students in my classes, and there hasn't been one person who has told me that their teacher preparation program has prepared them in any way for what they get when they get into their classroom.

Q: What about other professions? Would a doctor say he was prepared, or a lawyer? I've heard lawyers, graduates from law school, who when they write a brief, don't know what to do with it.

R: I think you're right; I think every professional school has their problems, but they don't quit.

Q: A lot of them quit.

R: Well, they quit later. I mean we quit altogether. Our people quite altogether.

Q: Well, there's another reason for quitting altogether and that is that many people go into teaching not because that's something they're committed to doing, but because they have this vague idea they might like to teach. And, then people quit because they find out that's not really what they want to do.

R: I agree with you, but good people quit, too--people who really have been committed and want to be teachers.

Q: I, and probably many people in this room have, I think, embarrassing experiences in teaching. Unfortunately, the more we are prepared to teach the kind of education that those of us in this room are interested in, the more we fall flat on our face. It's just this kind of viscous circle; we prepare people for what doesn't exist; we bemoan the fact that it doesn't exist. The suggestions are good ones, but they don't add up... is it going to be how to put the work on the board better, use the workbooks better...why bother with these questions?

R: Gary has suggested in his perusal of the programs that no one deals with context. I'm suggesting that that may be the most important thing and what has been absent from what people are teaching.

Q: Survival isn't much of a goal, though, is it? Don't we want something more than that?

R: No, that's why I'm angered. Now we're going to have courses on survival skills.

Q: How do you deal with the variety of contexts that they will encounter -- any suggestions?

R: Well, I think I would welcome just being in one context. Student teaching is not the same kind of context as has been suggested, unless you get a really good master teacher. My master teacher left after the first day and I never saw her again. We used to have a thing where you had to student teach at two places--that kind of fell by the wayside--an urban place and a suburban place--that disappeared. We know full well that people who go into difficult urban areas do not last and are totally unprepared for what they get.

Q: Let me suggest that the problem is you don't deal with the student in preservice teacher education in terms of developing values about education

and about themselves. If they had that they could see themselves in a variety of contexts and could fit themselves to the context, rather than having to go out and face it totally unprepared. I think the emphasis is now on skills, and I think that's the wrong place for it to be in preservice teacher education. You can't learn skills as well there as you can in the real world. But the point Dr. Griffin made before about being a student of teaching--I think that's a duty called for in terms of preservice teacher education. Preservice teachers will be taught to be critical students of teaching. I think that's what we need.

Q: Simon talks about theories in use and espoused platforms. I think one of the things that we're guilty of in teacher education is that we've built up an espoused platform. Then people go out into contexts where it is almost impossible for them to implement the espoused platform. What we get then is a discrepancy between their belief system and what they feel they can do. That is one of the most self defeating, frustrating experiences people have, and I think that more than anything I can think of is the kind of thing that drives people out. They know what they should be doing--they think they know what they should be doing--they can't do it, they are frustrated, and they leave. Bunnie just made a point--we're maladapting--teaching them ideals they have no chance in the world of implementing in the context into which they go. Then, they can't face themselves in that situation.

R: I'd like to speak to a question Jim raised, because we studied the early field experiences that were mandated in Illinois without any evidence that they were efficacious. What we found was that our people learned negative goals. They learned not to do this, not to do that. "I'll never yell at a kid; I'll never get upset." It was just what Jim was saying, although it was not so much that they had a platform of positive things, they had a platform of negative goals they couldn't live up to.

Q: The young teachers in schools are caught in an awkward position. They don't want necessarily to fit into the way other teachers are acting; they are often used as proponents of change in the school. Horowitz talked a lot about young teachers being the change advocates in the school. There is I think, a fuzziness here as to whether we want teachers to fit into typical

school practice or whether we want to protect them to do things that they do especially well. I think J.T. pointed to the problem talking about some of the new state legislation where the legislation is pulling the support notion of helping new teachers out almost entirely and putting a lot of accountability as the main theme so that in the first year teachers are to be judged in purely arbitrary and harsh ways rather than being supported, perhaps even protected, from other teachers.

R: Perhaps we ought to look at law school and medical school. At least in law school lawyers don't learn how to behave with clients, which would be similar to teachers with kids. You don't learn the practice of law, but you do learn to think like a lawyer, and maybe there is something in that for us. I mean, how do you think like a teacher? I don't want to steal my colleagues' thunder...are you next?...because, I mean, it's just a thought, and I have not done...I'd rather have someone talk to this who really knows what they're talking about.

Q: Ann, what you just said leaves me with great concern because the solution is now to change the individual, in other words, think like a lawyer. Previously you were pointing out correctly that the issue was context in the schools. No matter what the hell we do to the individual person, now you've shifted and said that we should forget what you said earlier about context; the important thing is to change the way a person thinks. There's a psychological way of looking at it and your best point is the sociological ways. Whether we teach them to think like lawyers, you'll still get hives, you'll still have 40 children in the class, you'll still have all these other contextual things. So don't give up your previous point which is a much better one than this one.

R: As I told you, this is the one I don't know anything about. I'm thinking, though, that there is obviously a socialization process, and socialization can't be just the one thing. Part of the socialization can indeed be the way you think, which is different that what I think Bunnie was saying. I mean, I'm agreeing with Bunnie, which is not that you're thinking about this incredible person who is going to totally change the lives of all those kids. I got hives because I really thought I could change 42 kids, in spite of everything they had. I probably did a lot, but I didn't feel like I did anything. That's obviously the psychological point, but I didn't have any sense of the context. None.

Q: Both of the other two professional areas that have been brought up do have some kind of internship. I thought that J.T. had brought up the only really positive idea when he mentioned internship in several states. But am I wrong or were you saying that those internships were, in fact, just a period of accountability? Is there no solution to the isolation?

R: I think Bunnie is going to speak to that.

Q: I might just add...does anybody here know of any means that has been tested either by practice or research of alleviating some of this isolation in the first and second years?

R: I'll answer that question but first I'll answer the previous one you asked about what is going on in Georgia and some of these other states. Georgia has one model that provides two assessments for beginning teachers--one in the fall and one in the spring. That's the accountability notion but every school district is obligated to provide staff development for beginning teachers based on assessment data and the state provides money to the local districts to do that with monies that are earmarked for beginning teachers. It's not a lot of money but its the combination of help plus accountability. The accountability reaps a lot more press than the help does but the help is built into the system.

Q: What is your assessment of that kind of support?

R: We find all sorts of feedback but the predominate testimony seems to be that it was helpful, but just as many negative comments are generated.

C: I think that we probably need to move on. Glad to see you kicking in this way. The next question becomes a very weighty one in view of our preceding discussion "What should happen to the teacher during induction?"

WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN TO THE TEACHER DURING INDUCTION?

Karen Kepler Zumwalt

Teachers College
Columbia University

WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN TO THE TEACHER DURING INDUCTION?

Karen Kepler Zumwalt

As I read the literature on induction of new teachers, I keep thinking about the most delightful process of induction I've been involved in for the past fourteen months.

In reflecting on my induction into motherhood, I am struck by the possibility that what happens to the new mother might be what should be happening to the new teacher.

It is and should be a time of incredible learning--learning about yourself, testing your competencies and values, and deepening your understanding of the human experience.

Much of one's time and energy is and should be directed toward coping with the new demands that seem to keep building as fast as one masters one area. Regardless of one's preparation, one should expect that struggling and coping is the norm--something which is a desirable stance of a growing adult rather than a sign of personal failure or an indication of inadequate preparation.

The new teacher--and new mother--should be actively redefining the ideal in light of the real. The trick is to grow more realistic without losing one's enjoyment and positive orientation--a task which research shows is definitely a hard one for many teachers. Countering the tendency to shift to more traditional and/or survival forms of practice, one seeks a more pragmatic form of idealism.

While developing realistic expectations for self and others in one's new role, one also has to learn:

how to cope with exhaustion
the highs and the lows

the unexpected events
the impossibility of being perfect
the difficulty of maintaining consistency
the inevitable mistakes
the constant comparison with others
the dilemma of being an authority figure and wanting to be liked.

One struggles with one's priorities within the classroom and the nursery--but also within one's life. Spouses, relatives, friends, other interests and oneself cannot and should not be ignored no matter how all-consuming the new role appears.

Besides deciding and balancing priorities, one has to make planning, organizing and managing time a central effort to prevent the job from overwhelming--to prevent survival from becoming the only goal.

One also needs to come to terms with the fact that there is no one right way--in teaching and in mothering--that the right way evolves as one applies a good dose of one's personality, intuition, common sense, past experiences and values along with the accumulated knowledge and skills professionals offer. While the latter does shortcut some of the trial and error stumblings of the neophyte, most find that the job demands constant experimenting to find better ways. In this process, one should be able to call upon developed competencies and, most importantly, inquiry and problem-solving skills. One should know where and how to seek more insights and obtain more resources.

Here's where the new mother perhaps has an advantage over the new teacher. Literature on induction speaks of the stagnation that often follows when the new teacher does find something that works. It is harder for the new mother to fall into this trap because the baby is constantly developing, constantly presenting new demands. It will take more effort to keep the new teacher growing--an effort that must occur during the induction years, for it is unlikely to happen later.

Another way the new mother has it easier is that most are not fearful about asking for help--such a request does not reflect negatively on their basic competency nor does it have anything to do with whether they will be rehired! They are in a safer environment for analysis and reflection--the necessary ingredients for continued growth. And they are also in a more supportive environment--few question the wisdom of their choice, most share their joy and excitement. They are not surrounded by burned out peers. People do not ignore them as Kevin Ryan suggests happens to the new teacher. Feedback and recognition are more direct and constant. The beginning teacher would certainly benefit from the more conducive environment we provide motherhood.

One must add, however, that the new teacher does have an option that the new mother does not readily have--that is, the option of leaving. Hence, an additional agenda faces the new teacher.

This should be a time when the beginning teacher is helped to make a realistic assessment about his/her future as a teacher--in the particular school and in general. And it should be a time when we actively try to retain the services of those who bring something special to teaching. There are people who might still be in teaching if the struggling of their early years had taken place in a more supportive environment.

SAMENESS DRIVES ME UP A WALL

Elizabeth Dillon-Peterson

Director, Staff Development
Lincoln Public Schools
Lincoln, Nebraska

SAMENESS DRIVES ME UP A WALL

Elizabeth Dillon Peterson

In light of the current and potential future political, economic, and human considerations, focus on the induction period of the teacher training program has come at a good time. Limited numbers of new teachers will be coming to their first classroom assignments in the foreseeable future. For example, in Lincoln, Nebraska, there were 85 "new to Lincoln" teachers in the Fall of 1981, as compared with 139 just 5 years earlier. Even of this smaller number, only 32 were actually beginning their teaching careers.

Because of this trend the school district has lost, or is losing, a very important factor in its ability to change. There will continue to be drastically restricted input from new people with new ideas. Public school educators recognize (often reluctantly) that the staff we have now is essentially the one we will have for many years to come.

Consequently, it is extremely important that the right potential teachers be recruited, that they receive superior preservice education, and most importantly, that their beginning teaching experiences inspire them to continue to grow and become more effective throughout their professional careers.

Through one of the most comprehensive studies of the trials and tribulations of the beginning teacher reported in 1980, researchers for the Beginning Teacher Education Study[1] confirmed what many of us have long believed--the induction period is the most crucial period of a teacher's career.

In reviewing the data presented, one has the impression that young beginning teachers are placed in a lonely "sink or swim" situation. They

frequently feel overwhelmed, and are obliged to learn most of their survival skills on a kind of trial and error basis. There is often a kind of desperation. It is no wonder that they suffer from arrested development.

The authors of this study suggest that after the induction period, teachers take one of two courses. A limited number tend to continue to demonstrate an open, lively, continuous desire to learn more and get better at their work. Unfortunately, most tend to remain static, resistant to change, and unenthusiastic about continuing their professional development.

Two quotations from the study underscore this contention:

> "... we are reasonably certain that a substantial number of teachers are shaped by the experiences of the transition period and that some number of them never change from that point on."[2] (Ibid, p. 10)

> "We believe that the seeds of 'burn-out' are planted during this period. We think that some of the resistance to in-service activities, to curriculum development activities, to other efforts to improve the complexity and level of teaching are born out of the experience of having survived the transitional period--essentially alone."[3] (Ibid, p. 14)

However, in reflecting on this rather bleak state of affairs, one becomes aware that some teachers clearly do not fit the stereotype. These special teachers seem to exhibit a high energy level and remarkable self-confidence; most from the beginning. They have a genuine sense of who they are and an awareness of their own professional competence. They display a sophisticated sense of humor. It is easy for them to acknowledge what they do well and what they could do better (and they usually are working on some self-improvement project of their own choice or design). They exhibit a highly developed sense that anything worth doing is worth doing to the best of their ability. They are impatient with those who do not wish to go the second mile--particularly where students are concerned. Their view of education is integrated and whole, rather than piecemeal. In spite of the fact that they willingly (and

frequently) confront their peers who have a lesser commitment to excellence, they enjoy unmistakable respect among their contemporaries. Their frustrations come primarily from limitations to their creativity. They require freedom to move in ways which they feel will make education better (often in opposition to the status quo). They have a lively interest in theory and its application. Their sense of time is flexible and determined largely by the nature of the task. They are different not so much because of any one of these elements but because of the combination and particularly the intensity and independence with which they approach their professional lives.

As I thought about the 1500+ professional staff members with whom I have worked for the past thirteen years, obvious examples of the "unstuck" ones came immediately to mind. Since the Beginning Teacher Education Study had reported that little had been done to document what happens to teachers during the induction period for even a day, much less than a week or a month, it occurred to me that I might informally collect some of the data, using as my resources some of those individuals who insatiable desire to be better teachers is so obvious.

In order to provide some variety in my data, I interviewed one teacher from each of the following age ranges: the twenties, thirties, forties, and fifties. There was a little slippage in the latter--I had thought one teacher was in her fifties but discovered that she was into her sixties, which probably says something about why she was selected in this totally biased sample. These teachers represent each of the teaching levels: elementary, junior high, and high school. They responded to questions about their personal view of themselves, their initial training, their student teaching experience, and their beginning teaching experience. They also made introspective comments about how they perceive themselves to be different from

their colleagues, and how they view their potential and need for growth and change. Selection of these teachers was purely on the basis of professional judgment based on perceived attitudes and demonstrated behaviors which contrast with the picture of the static teacher.

What motivated them?

Teacher A represents the 50-60 age group. Initially she had no interest in becoming a teacher. She "drifted" into the teachers college because she had no clear sense of direction. Her description of how she arrived at that position was, "I was just 'dumped' in it. I had never wanted to be a teacher." For many years, she has been a highly respected English department chairperson.

Teacher B is the forties-person. She also drifted into teaching rather than moving purposefully into it. Her description of her decision: "I had decided either to go back to school or have another baby. Obviously, I chose the school. I opted for teaching since I could manage it along with my family and because I thought it suited my temperament--I like kids. I was twenty-nine when I started back to school." She teaches high school art.

Teacher C is thirty-one. He, too, came into education almost by default. In his words, "I was in college with an arts and sciences background. Friends were starting to talk about the vocations they would enter, with their degrees in architecture, law, pre-med. I began to wonder what occupation I would have with an English degree. I liked learning and books, I liked discussion and people--so, I asked myself, 'Why not be a teacher (for a while)?'" He has taught on a junior high English/Social Studies team, and now teaches English at the high school level.

Teacher D is in her twenties. She differs from the other four in that she has always wanted to be a teacher, since the time she was very young. She worked constantly with young children during her growing-up years in church and city recreation. A particular interest was work with retarded youngsters. She has taught primary children for five years. Before the end of her first year, she announced firmly that she intended to become one of the teacher-leaders who work with new teachers during their induction period because she had found her own help so useful. And she did.

What were their beginning teaching experiences like?

The beginning teaching experience of these four could hardly have been more different. For three of them, the experiences were equally satisfying. For the fourth, the experience was almost totally unacceptable. Their own words describe the experiences best:

Teacher A. "I was the most unsuccesful teacher than Iowa ever hired. My schedule was this: all the high school English (four preparations), 8 through 12, two 3-act plays plus a one-act play contest, declamatory contest, library, study hall, journalism, and girl's club sponsor. Nobody could have succeeded, so I just giggled my way through. I didn't take it seriously. I didn't even grade papers.

I had no overall plan whatever--they gave me the books and said, 'Here they are.' So, I gave the students a page a day, and if we got through that page, we did. I skipped the racy parts of Shakespeare because I was too embarrassed. I didn't even admit to my family that I hated teaching and was a failure.

Finally, after gradually changing jobs to more manageable ones and gaining more skills, I arrived in a situation where my real career began. We

had guides, opportunity to write curriculum, and to learn from experienced teachers. I have loved teaching from that time.

I think I started out with everything in isolation, with nothing related. Now I see how important it is to see things as related--to have an overall view rather than bits and pieces. That's my goal now--to help students see those relationships."

Teachers 2, 3, and 4 give high praise to their supervising teacher role models. Teacher 4 describes her exemplar as "having a positive personality, having positive interactions with children, being caring and extremely competent. They acted glad they were at school. They spent their time productively rather than attacking each other, or education, or kids."

Teacher 2: "Both my supervising teachers were super-teachers. They also wanted very much for me to succeed and they put a lot of extra time and effort to make sure that I did. They were very honest. When I didn't know what I did wrong, they explained it carefully and gave me several options for correcting the problems. They 'eased' me into it gradually until I was ready to assume all the responsibility. I also student-taught the whole day so that I saw the whole reality, rather than a piece of it. I had a sense that they wanted to teach me all they knew. I learned to teach from them--not in education class. I was lucky. I had really caring, supportive persons who genuinely wanted me there and with whom I worked very well. Of course, I worked like crazy, too. I still do."

"I had super experiences in pre-student teaching," reported Teacher 3. "Luckily, I was placed in an innovative, receptive, responsive, educational environment, working with Piagetian learning theory, and new approaches to grouping students exclusive of ability grouping. I got excited and loved it. The teachers were in the throes of trying to learn a new model. They didn't

have an answer, but they didn't seem to feel the need to dictate to me. They took an active interest in my ideas, and asked me to analyze my own educational experiences as data. They treated me as a responsible, contributing member of their team and involved me in all their brainstorming sessions. I felt they genuinely welcomed my input. I thought, 'My God--I'm still in college--I'm not sure my input has any relevance.' And I'm not sure it did. But the way they listened to me got me so completely interested in their programs that I put in many more hours in the pre-student experience than almost any other prospective teachers were putting in at the time. Luckily, I was assigned to the same team for student teaching and hired there for my first job.

From my discussions with other student teachers, I had become painfully aware that I was in a unique situation. Many of the others had become bookkeepers, paper readers, hall monitors, and very small group leaders--if they were lucky. Others became very good typists. They probably didn't spend as much time as I did--as we did--spent hours, because we enjoyed it. It didn't seem like work."

How do these teachers differ from their associates?

These four teachers have mixed perceptions of their contemporaries. When asked what percent of their colleagues are like them, and how they perceive themselves to be different, they respond in different ways.

Teacher A describes her department as "a very dedicated group who are student-oriented. Teachers like students. They want to improve their teaching and are willing to try new things. We like to work together very well and are willing to share ideas and expertise. We have much compassion in our department--concern for one another, and that has nearly always been the case except for a very few who have dropped by the wayside. When people come

into the department feeling insecure, they learn to trust us and we are all proud of each other. I invite new members to come observe my classroom and we all try to do some visiting back and forth."

Teacher B is less kind. She feels that "very few" (1-2%) of her contemporaries are essentially similar to her in terms of their attitude toward, and approach to, their work.

She explains the difference, "Age-wise I'm behind because I started school later. I haven't taught as many years as other teachers my age. Maybe that's part of the reason I'm a maverick. I look for other experiences and new ways of doing things. I get a whole lot more excited than a lot of people do. I just want to push them and say, 'Don't you really want to get excited about anything -- don't you care about anything enough to get up and do something different?' I can't stand being in a rut -- I get bored very easily."

Teacher C makes the same kind of assessment. "Maybe one in ten have a similar perspective. I don't mean that as a putdown and to elevate myself. My first assignment was the difference. I was raised professionally in a climate where innovation was respected. If in an autocratic regime, the 'good' teacher will follow the rules; keep a tidy classroom; maintain an orderly group of students at all times in their classroom, in the hall, and for God's sake in the lunchroom; keep attendance records absolutely up to par; explain his or her gradebook without even having to look at it. Not that these things aren't important--they are--but they aren't paramount. Some of my best days in teaching would probably be classed as disorderly, if not even chaotic, but kids are turned-on and learning is taking place--for all of us.

If you've never experienced a situation where it's okay to break the mold occasionally and to realize that the foundations of the building will not

crumble because you forgot to take attendance second period, it's probably impossible to get a sense of the overriding idea of education. If I had ever been in a different situation at the beginning I don't think I ever would have taught. I would have looked again at insurance. Now my enthusiasm is waning. So is my interest in the profession. I'm no longer finding people to work with who have the same collaborative desires I do. Most don't want to give the extra time to make it enervating. I still have colleagues in the district who feel like I do, so I'm still learning a lot, but there are blocks in the way which prevent people from being creative and growing.

I see it as a profession which requires more time than others. We may spend four hours, or we may spend fifteen--that's what a profession is all about. When problems arise, midnight oil is needed. That's fun. It's the instability that makes me a stable teacher in my profession. Sameness drives me up a wall.

I don't see attitudes about teaching changing. Most people teach content. I teach people, and I see a lot of unfeeling content specialists--very few humanists. That bothers me. I get so tired of hearing, 'What's wrong with these kids? Why can't <u>they</u> learn?, as opposed to 'What am <u>I</u> doing wrong that's impeding the progress of these kids' I know it's a two-way street, but I think there are lots of people who aren't willing now to put forth the extra effort."

Teacher D is most positive. Perhaps her early elementary focus has some bearing on that. She estimates that fifty percent of her associates have a similar attitude and dedication. But she does say that her attitudes are "more positive." Like the other three, she mentioned her willingness--even enthusiasm for giving the extra effort. "I strive to go the extra mile where some settle for average. I'm willing to put forth more effort, and I'm more

positive about the kids. I live more positively with the system and administrative decisions than some. Unfortunately, it seems like lots of people come to put in their eight hours and go home. If anything will take more than eight hours, then they're not interested. Even if it would help them or help the children they work with. I don't think that all teachers have a genuine feeling for the kids that they work with, or they'd think 'If something extra might help one kid through, I'll do it.' Instead they think it would be extra work for them, and they think, 'It's only one kid--no big deal.'"

Signifance for the future

The deep commitment and genuine caring, the craving to be better, to learn more, to serve better shines from the pages and pages of quotations which were part of these interviews. What does all this mean in terms of the induction period of new teachers? I think it means that it is imperative that new teachers be exposed to positive, dedicated, somewhat selfless role models during their pre-teaching experiences. It may even be the only significant way we can materially improve the teacher education process.

It also means that it is significant for them to be treated as respected colleagues who are at the very least junior partners in the teaching/learning process and whose contributions are worth giving serious acknowledgement and recognition. It means that those of us who have influence on the direction of schools and school systems must take seriously the challenge of keeping places alive where the creative, restless, caring, devoted, energetic, and un-time-self-conscious in our midst will be able to survive. We desperately need their incalculable continued contribution to the future of our profession, so that opportunties similar to those which nurtured them along toward their paths to excellence will be available to those who follow them. This is

particularly and potentially tragically true in this era of retrenchment from innovation, pressure toward conformity, and growing evidence that for many teachers, education is just another job rather than an opportunity to affect the precious lives of those who enter our schools.

DISCUSSION

Discussion following presentations: "What Should Happen to the Teacher During Induction?"

Q = Questioner R = Responder C = Chair

C: Do we have a quick question or comment?

Q: After what Karen said about being a parent and some of the differences between that and teaching, I'd like to suggest something only half in jest and that is instead of induction programs, have states require the teacher to take a five year contract at the beginning. This would eliminate the option of "I can just quit at the end of this year" and for the beginning teacher and for the other teachers in the school it would eliminate the thought "Well, this is a teacher that won't make it; they're going to be out at the end of the year anyway."

C: Thank you. Any response, Karen?

R: I'm not sure that most people should be locked into a five year contract. I think the analogy with motherhood breaks there.

Q: Betty, you're not suggesting that teachers are born, are you?

R: Well, I have a debate with myself about that all the time. I think it's important for researchers to study why people like teaching because I I know a whole lot of teachers who got into education by accident who turned out to be super teachers. It's important to see if there's something in the nature of these people that made them successful and to assign student teaching supervisors on that basis to see if their love of teaching does transfer.

Q: The point made about context being a powerful change force, I think is one I agree with and I think that in our induction programs and in our preservice programs we need to be directing students more toward what is and not what ought to be. If we feel what is needs to be changed, then we need to start changing the context. I'd like to hear you talk more about what the school organization ought to be like and what are the implications of that in regard to induction.

R: I believe you're the second or third person that has said something like that today. As a preservice educators, I feel strongly that we don't have to do one thing or the other. We still have to present students with an

ideal. People have to have dreams to grasp for. At the same time, though, we can expose them to the reality and what teaching is and what life is like in the classroom to sort of stimulate a dialogue of talking with yourself about your dreams and ideals and what you really have to deal with. This is the situation that we all deal with in our jobs as professors--we have dreams that aren't fulfilled. We have to constantly juggle dreams with reality and make some compromises as well as make some commitments, too.

C: We do need to move ahead and we will have a discussion period at the end so please hold those questions in your minds and we'll get to all of them. The next question will deal with "Who should be responsible for teacher induction?"

TEACHER INDUCTION - WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

Richard C. Wallace, Jr.

Superintendent of Schools

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

71

TEACHER INDUCTION - WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

Richard C. Wallace, Jr.

Induction of teachers has at least three components - community, school and professional induction. In this paper these three components will be examined in order to: 1) identify the need; 2) examine what can be done to address the need; 3) indicate what individual or agency could address the need; 4) identify the responsible person, agency or institution.

Community Induction

A critically important factor in the teacher induction process is to develop a general awareness of the broad community in which the novice is to work and the individual school community in which he/she is to teach. To know and to understand the educational values of the community and some of its history can be very important to the new teacher in providing an appropriate context for instruction.

Community induction can be accomplished by means of sponsored tours of the community designed to provide the teacher with an eyewitness view of the home environments from which the students come. The new teacher needs to understand something about work life in the community - that is, what type of business and industry provide employment to the parents of the children attending school. A knowledge of the community social agencies that provide assistance to the schools in meeting the goal of education of youth may provide valuable future resources. Among the many agencies that can play an important role in community induction are the following: The Chamber of Commerce, The League of Women Voters, The United Fund, and Parent-Teacher Associations.

A reception for new teachers, sponsored by the business community, may do much to develop the spirit that is needed to assist the new teacher to understand the dynamics operating within the community.

The school district has the prime responsibility to coordinate this component of the induction function. In so doing, it should freely call upon formal institutions and agencies within the community. Social groups that have an educational focus to their mission may also be called upon to assist.

School Induction

Induction into the particular school in which a new teacher is to practice his/her profession is second in chronology, not in importance. The school should approach its responsibility from the point of view of the expressed or implied concerns of the beginning teacher. Undoubtedly, the most important initial concerns of the teacher are personal. Surviving the first day of school, and the first week, in and of themselves are not small tasks. The school through its principals and other suborganizational leadership must assist the new teacher to organize for the opening day of school. Among the components for this "basic training for survival" include the following: 1) the identification of the textbooks and other teaching materials; 2) location and procurement of supplies; 3) familiarization with the operating and procedural routine of the school as a whole, the department, the team, and/or the grade level as sub-units. New teachers should be provided with a tour of the physical facility; they need to be informed regarding the safety procedures for students and themselves.

Beyond "basic training for survival" comes the socialization process. Schools are complex social systems that have their own norms, sanctions, rewards and reprovals. It is important that the new teacher be made aware of these elements of the social system over an extended period of time. First,

the development of relationships among the immediate peers at the same or contiguous grade level/or department is important. Secondly, the identification of the designated and opinion leaders within the building will assist the new teacher to understand how the formal and informal system operates. Thirdly, the teacher union may provide facilitating or inhibiting force within the social system with which new teachers will become familiar. While the inductee may be introduced to persons who play various roles in the social system, the process of understanding "how the system works" usually has to be learned over a period of time.

Who is responsible for school based induction? Clearly, the building administration has the prime responsibility for orientation of new leaders to the physical plant, the materials of instruction and rules and regulations governing school life. Beyond that, the appropriate department heads, team leaders or grade level peers must share the responsibility to assist the new teacher in the socialization process. The assignment of a "buddy" or a "mentor" teacher can provide the much needed support that a new teacher requires in order to cope with the first days and weeks of the school year. In the final analysis, however, the ultimate responsibility for socialization of the new teacher belongs to the inductee himself or herself. Once the organization has done its "orientation" job, and the subordinate structure has begun its orientation process, the inductee must take the responsibility to seek the additional development of relationships.

Professional Induction

The third and perhaps the most important induction role is that of continuing induction for the professional growth of the new teacher. Too often, a new teacher who appears to others as having the classroom in good order, who maintains appropriate discipline, and who appears to be using

instructional materials appropriately, is left alone! This is probably the most serious omission in the total induction process! It is during the first two to three years of a beginning teacher's development that supervision and assistance must be provided to promote professional growth to insure that the instruction is appropriate and effective for pupils. In that respect, it is important that the following be achieved: 1) the inductee must be guided to gather and use diagnostic information that is available for his/her pupils in order to plan instruction appropriately; 2) the inductee must be made aware of the scope of the curriculum over time (a semester or a year) in order that he/she may pace instruction for students appropriately; 3) the methods of testing and/or grading used by the inductee must be frequently reviewed by the principal and supervisors in order to ascertain whether or not the instructional materials, the methods of testing and grading are at appropriate levels of difficulty for the pupils, and the grade level. One of the common problems of beginning teachers is the tendency to set instructional tasks for students at too high a level of complexity. Beginning teachers need guidance to insure that they are presenting instruction at the appropriate level of difficulty and with appropriate pacing. New teachers need to receive frequent feedback regarding the re-teaching of skills when students demonstrate a lack of mastery of skills or knowledge. They need to be advised to check for student understanding constantly during the delivery of the instruction to insure that the students are grasping the intended learning outcomes.

During the formative first few years inductee's need to be advised regarding classroom management techniques for differentiated instruction; it is also important that inductee's be provided guidance and feedback regarding the effective use of questioning techniques in order that the goals of instruction be attained.

The development of competence in the young professional over the first three years is probably the most important part of the induction process, one which is often overlooked. It is encouraging to note that some states, such as Massachusetts, have begun to implement a certification process that provides a three year probationary period to verify the new teacher's competency to instruct. During this period, consultation and visitation is provided to the new teacher by peer groups in order to provide corrective feedback or make appropriate judgements regarding this important process of certifying the developing professional as a competent teacher.

Roles and Responsibilities

What are the respective roles of local school districts, teacher training institutions, state education agencies in the induction of teachers? Where practical, the teacher training institution should play a role, though somewhat limited, in the verification of an inductee's competency in a full-time professional capacity. It is recommended that the teacher training institution which granted the baccalaureate degree plan at least two visits in the first two years of an inductee's experience (or assign that role to another institution closer in proximity to the inductee's site of employment) as part of the "verification" process.

The local school district has major responsibility for initial and continuing induction of the developing professional. Union leaders should also bear some of the responsibility for the induction of the professional. This should be done in a positive sense, promoting the responsibilities of the professional, as well as providing a knowledge of the inductee's rights. Too often, union leadership is solely concerned with teacher rights and with wages, hours and conditions of employment. Yet, they can play a very positive

role in urging teachers to pursue aggressively the effective teaching techniques which will reflect well upon the union, the profession and the community. The state certification agency itself, must play a role in the process. It is insufficient for such an agency to be only a clearinghouse for processing of appropriate papers. Whether the agency handles its responsibility directly or assigns it to other intermediate agencies, its responsibility to very professional competence cannot be relegated to paper analysis alone.

Conclusion

In this presentation, three levels of induction - community, school and professional have been presented. While the author does not wish to underestimate the importance of the initial community and school induction processes, the continuing development of competence in the young inductee must be the primary focus. It is not enough to orient a new teacher to the surroundings, the community, the rules, regulations and norms which govern their institution. It is far more important to accept the responsibility to influence the continuing growth of the inductee toward professional maturity. Resources exist within the reach of all relevant institutions to do the job. What is required, is the will to do it. This can best be achieved by assigning the development of instructional effectiveness as the top priority of a school district and by providing appropriate personnel. It is through coaching the young professionals by means of competent observation and constructive feedback that we can best achieve the short and long term goals of inducting the young professionals and insuring their growth toward the maturity of professional competence.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSES FOR LACK OF RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF INDUCTION IN U. S. TEACHER EDUCATION

Sam J. Yarger

Syracuse University

78

SUMMARY OF ANALYSES FOR LACK OF RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF INDUCTION IN U. S. TEACHER EDUCATION

Sam J. Yarger

If the term "induction" were placed on one of the emerging teacher competency tests, it is likely that only a visionary would understand its meaning. Although the term "internship" may evoke greater recognition, the point is that the concept of programmatic efforts to aid in the transition from preservice teacher education to practice is not well established in the United States. Although a few American educators (e.g., Howey, 1979, and McDonald, 1981), have recognized the importance of induction as a distinct phase of teacher education, it is probably safe to assume that most teacher educators view the preservice student teaching experience as the transition phase of teacher education.

One can probably build a case for the existence of an informal induction phase in American teacher education. This is possible even though graduating teacher education students don't think about the need for an induction phase, as they report feelings of efficacy upon completion of their undergraduate program (Joyce, et al., 1977). Yet, in a study of inservice teachers, it was noted that teachers recognized the need for help during their first year and found that help in the form of collegial support (Yarger, Howey, Joyce, 1980). Although few would deny the importance of helping novitiate teachers get started on the right foot, there probably is no consensus that formal programming efforts are required for this to occur.

Assuming, for purposes of this presentation, that the problem has been clearly delineated, then the question of why the problem has not received greater attention in U. S. teacher education becomes important. The

literature is clearly sparse. Although some conceptual work has been performed, and some hortatory literature exists, for the most part, one must read between the lines of American teacher education literature and make high inference judgments concerning the reasons for the problems related to recognition.

LACK OF RECOGNITION FOR INDUCTION -- A CONTEXTUAL PROBLEM

Formal programs for the induction of classroom teachers have not been tried and found to be wanting. Rather, they have not been tried at all! Thus, one is faced with a different analytical problem than is typically encountered in attempting to understand the lack of success or support for programs in teacher education. The question becomes, Why have they never been tried? The position taken in this brief presentation suggests that the context of teacher education--the conditions that exist both within and outside of the field form the basis for addressing that question. Logistical considerations and lack of financial support are typically presented as impediments to induction phase program development. However, it is more likely that there are deeper and more important problems to be encountered-problems that transcend logistics and fiscal resources. For purposes of this presentation, these issues are labeled "contextual," and four will be explored.

Lack of institutional responsibility for teacher education. With the exception of preservice teacher education, no institution has assumed or been charged with the responsibility for any phase of teacher education. Although this problem is usually discussed in relation to inservice teacher education, it appears that it would also plague efforts to develop induction programs. One clear way of understanding the level of responsibility an institution

assumes for an activity is to look at the expenditure of money in support of it. Institutions of higher education commit resources primarily in programs for undergraduates, and then they put forth precious little (Peseau and Orr, 1980). They typically see programs beyond the preservice phase as designed to generate revenue, not as a place to expend it. Local education agencies typically put far less than one percent of their budget into any form of teacher education. Although a few states (e.g., Florida and Michigan) have earmarked state funds for teacher education, the movement can hardly be considered widespread. Thus, it appears that no established institution has assumed responsibility for teacher education beyond the preservice phase. This lack of institutional base for post-preservice training probably constitutes the single greatest impediment to the development of formalized induction programs.

Ambiguous status of skilled teaching and teacher education. Are classroom teachers professionals, skilled artisans, public servants, or something else? Although teachers possess few of the talismans generally associated with recognition as a profession, the desire to be seen that way is pervasive. Unfortunately, public recognition does not appear to support this perception. Rather, there have been notable attacks on teaching, the competence of teachers, and teacher education (e.g., Time magazine, 1980, Lyons, 1980). The status issue is important, because it is unlikely that the public would ever support post-graduate training for what is perceived to be middle range public servant positions. At the present time, the public response to improving teaching appears to be embedded in competency tests rather than in training programs. Certainly, teacher unions have done little to enhance the public perception of teaching, and maybe the quest for professional status is unrealistic given that teachers comprise such a large

labor force. Regardless, the ambiguous status of teaching and teacher education in American society constitutes a major roadblock to the recognition of the need for induction programs.

Lack of tradition in teacher education. Teacher education is an infant in the world of college based professional preparation programs. As recently as the early 1950's, some states had virtually no regulations concerning who could instruct children in classrooms. As is well known, the history of teacher education is embedded first in efforts to inculcate religiously based values, next in training programs established by cities or counties (normal schools) and only most recently in institutions of higher education. Not only are schools and colleges of education recent newcomers to the world of higher education, but state certification programs as we know them today are inventions of the last 30 years.

This lack of tradition in teacher education makes it very difficult to provide a foundation and a sound rationale for the development of new formal training programs. It is difficult, if not impossible, for teacher educators to look to their history for sound rationale and support for the development of induction programs. Perhaps more important, it is questionable whether institutions of higher education sufficiently value teacher education and will allow the development of a tradition in history that is so important in long-term program improvement.

Politics precludes the luxury of induction phase program development. The feistiness of the teacher union movement over the past 20 years has, among other things, led to a political power struggle in teacher education. For example, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), once a sedate higher education organization, has become a hotbed of controversy, and is being seriously questioned by its client group. State

capitals are beset with different vested interest groups, all attempting to influence legislation and regulations in support of their own constituency. Often, it appears that the groups working disparately undo each other's work. Recently, in the apparently ill-fated effort to establish teaching as a profession in New York State, issues such as whether or not to consider intern teachers as full-salaried members of the teaching staff were clear obstacles in the deliberations. The point is that as long as the debate is held at the level of political power, issues of substance are typically placed on the back burner. It is difficult to foresee how a unified supportive position concerning induction phase programs in teacher education can be established until the vested interest groups in teacher education establish alliances that will allow them to speak in concert rather than as adversaries.

TOWARD SOLVING THE PROBLEMS

The problems are clearly easier to understand than they are to solve. Because they are deep rooted and contextually embedded in society, one can assume that there are no easy solutions, and that any attempt to solve the problems will demand inordinate amounts of time and energy. It is recognized that the logistic and fiscal considerations are formidable. They are also political, and amenable to change only if conditions exist that prompt policymakers, with the support of society, to view them as important and worthy of serious consideration.

The disjointed state of American education suggests a crying need for a broad based coalition that will address a wide spectrum of educational issues from a dispassionate point of view. Although at risk of appearing to be a fantasy-like pipe dream, such a coalition has been proposed (Mertens and

Yarger, in press). Labeled the American Education Congress, this permanent and prestigious body would have at least the following characteristics:

1. An objective, primarily external, and clearly non-political selection process for members. The membership would be representative of all educational groups, and would not be politically weighted.

2. The Congress would be committed to monitoring and offering strong advice on a wide range of issues in American education at all levels.

3. The Congress would be committed to the use of political processes for the achievement of non-political purposes.

4. The Congress would create for itself an image of high visibility and societal respect.

5. The Congress would be recognized within the profession as prestigious, and would be expected to assume positions that are sometimes contrary to the vested interest position of some of its members.

In essence, the Congress would operate as an educator of the public and as a conscience to the profession.

If one accepts the position that teacher education is not highly valued in the United States, then it is difficult to escape the conclusion that serious consideration will not be given to the creation of induction phase programs. Rather, one must explore the reasons for the relatively low status of the profession, and one must propose strategies that may appear to be improbable, impossible, and perhaps outlandish. Such an analysis and proposal constitute the basis of this presentation. It is likely that strong measures can be taken only in times of crisis. The question of whether or not education is encountering such a crisis is debatable, and only time coupled with the diligent efforts of those who believe in the importance of the training of teachers will provide us with viable answers.

REFERENCES

Help! Teachers Can't Teach. Time, June 16, 1980, pp. 54-63.

Howey, K., and Bents, R. (Ed.). Toward Meeting the Needs of Beginning Teachers. Minneapolis: Midwest Teacher Corps Network, 1979.

Joyce, B., Yarger, S., Howey, K., Harbeck, K., and Kluwin, T. Pre-service Teacher Education--Report of a National Survey. Palo Alto: Stanford University, 1977. ERIC #SP 011 438.

Lyons, G. Why Teachers Can't Teach. Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1980, 62, pp. 108-112.

McDonald, F. J. and Elias, P. A series of four volumes titled The Study of Induction Programs for Beginning Teachers. Currently unavailable. Executive summary available from Joseph Vaughan, NIE, 1200 19th Street, NW, Mail Stop #6, Washington, DC 20208.

Mertens, S., and Yarger, S. Escape from Deja Vu: On Strengthening Teacher Education. Journal of Teacher Education, in press.

Peseau, B. and Orr, P. The Outrageous Underfunding of Teacher Education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, pp. 100-102.

Yarger, S., Howey, K., and Joyce, B. Inservice Teacher Education. Palo Alto: Booksend Laboratories, 1980.

WHY IS THERE NOT GREATER RECOGNITION OF INDUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES?

R. P. Tisher

Monash University

Australia

WHY IS THERE NOT GREATER RECOGNITION OF INDUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES?

R. P. Tisher

By induction I mean the formal introduction of new teachers into the profession by which they come to be, at a basic level, professionally competent and personally at ease in the role of teacher. The induction period is consequently deemed to begin when newly trained teachers accept their first teaching assignment and it may span from between one and three years.

Now the fact that there are few places in the United States that deliberately and consistently make formal provisions for induction is hard for me to explain. One possible reason may be that educationists, teachers and educational administrators hold strongly to a mistaken view that informal induction support volunteered by experienced colleagues is more effective and is to be preferred above formal provisions.[1] This situation is akin to the "my door is always open" attitude which usually results in no help or consultation whatever.

Another way to answer the question is to highlight those characteristics which I believe have led Australians to invest a great deal in induction programs and leave you to judge which of the factors are present or absent in the United States.

Factors which have led to and continue to foster formal induction provisions in Australia are:

* a preconceived weakness in teacher preparation programs by educational employing authorities and school principals coupled with a belief that practicing teachers have a proper role in teacher preparation.[2]

* a recognition that new teachers definitely need help in adjusting to their schools and require practical advice with respect to teaching strategies.[2,4]

* a desire by employing authorities to have some control over and influence on the nature of teacher preparation. (Several decades ago the State education employing authorities were also the main training authorities.)

* a significant commitment to induction by influential state educational leaders (e.g., Directors General of Education) which has resulted in the production of official state policies on induction and the inclusion in the job descriptions of duputy principals of statements specifying a responsibility for induction in their school.[3]

* a strong belief within the profession in the value of inservice education and that some of this should be school-based.[4]

Associated with this belief about school-based inservice education and induction is the emergence of another view of professionalism which contrasts with the view of the fully-fledged trained teacher who is solely responsible for a class of 20-30 pupils and well able to cater for their needs. The collegiate view of professionalism maintains that teachers cannot be effective on their own, that greater effectiveness is achieved through collaboration, co-operation, sharing and joint planning. This view of professionalism is compatible with Zeichner's (1979)[5] dialectical view of teacher socialization. In one Australian state the collegiate notion of professionalism and dialectical view of teacher socialization are fostered in part in a school based induction scheme[6] which could serve as a model for other countries. Some essential elements of the scheme are:

* selection of about three experienced teachers from each participating school to act as induction/professional development tutors for a specified period of time after which another set of three are appointed.

* a special training program for the tutors before they assume induction responsibilities in conjunction with some teaching duties.

* a detailed set of materials providing the bases for a school-based induction program which recognizes the importance of collaboration among teachers and that beginning teachers also can play a creative role in

induction.

Induction can work and its quality will be enhanced when programs recognize that new teachers, too, have talents and ideas of value to contribute to more experienced colleagues and that they must not be subjected to induction activities which primarily fit (or squeeze) them into the profession. Could it be the case that the low level of involvement in induction programs in the United States[7] is also a function of the nature of professionalism among teachers? This is a tantalizing question for a few courageous researchers!

DISCUSSANT COMMENTS

DISCUSSANT COMMENTS

Martin Haberman:

It's been a very stimulating meeting for me this morning and I'm sure it has been for many of you. The people who are in this room now have been invited; not only the ten people who presented their ideas but many of you in the audience were invited through an informal network of people saying did you hear about this, etc. So this meeting we're having this morning is somewhat staged and that's part of the reason why it is good in my judgment. But also there's a certain sadness about it because it's never going to happen again. There's an organizational set of activities and factors which are going to prevent a group like this from ever getting together again and honestly discussing and criticizing each other. The superintendents go to AASA in Atlantic City every year, the people who have kin interest go to ATE, and Dean is the former president of AACTE. There are people in the audience who go to early childhood groups or to the psychological associations. What happens when we go back to our normal routine is that each of us talk with our own colleagues about why don't colleges do a better job and about how we have a fractionated profession. In fact, the profession is so fractionated that what we have this morning is a very significant and dramatic event--people are talking to each other from their respective points. I assume also that the persons in this room are not typical in that they have above average interest in teacher education. And, since this is a thinking, honest session, I would also like to say that there is not, in my judgment, such a thing as basic research in professional education. All research is applied or should be applied and if you want to do basic research you shouldn't be supported by a school of education. People in this association have in many cases over the years worked against good teacher education because they've fostered the notion that if you just throw some data out there some magical other people will come along and take responsibility for implementing it, seeing if it works, and being accountable for it. So if you create an organization of 6,000 people to just do bits and pieces that nobody ever takes responsibility for applying, you've created quite a tumor. I'm not saying it's malignant but it could go either way.

The problems we've discussed with induction have shown us to be a fractionated profession and you can see as the different speakers presented

how this came about. I'd just like to take another minute or two to talk about things we can do that are under our control. It's much easier to take the attitude that I can't do anything about preservice education at the university because the real factors are in the school and therefore beyond my control. If we really believe in looking at our own data and some of our own experiences with beginning teachers, we might take the position that what most beginning and other teachers do is not a result of what they've been taught at any university, but rather is a throw back to what they experienced in their own education. Therefore, the first job of teacher education is to stamp out the learnings that people begin the program with. It's not a question of filling vessels with competencies and behaviors as much as eradicating behaviors which people have put into practice when they start to teach in isolation and because they're in very difficult situations.

Most people in teaching, whether they're beginners or experienced people, think that giving directions without reason, making assignments without goals, grading without feedback and performing acts of discipline in some escalated form is teaching. Most graduates are going to go out and engage in those four kinds of behaviors. They're going to give directions, make assignments, discipline and grade, so a good part of our teacher education, before you ever get to teach anybody anything, has to do with eradicating and erasing preconceptions. Then as Jim Ross mentioned, we can't end up with just a lot of admonitions that are idealistic about things you must not do or very idealistic statements which they can't implement. At that point we have to look at Leo Smith or somebody and say here's a catalog of behaviors or competencies or something that we know something about. Now I have never seen a teacher education catalog that before it gets to the courses it's going to teach, says these are the things we're going to help the student forget about, these are the cultural hang-ups we're going to help you overcome and these are the things about you as a person that we're going to try to somehow work around.

I have a couple of suggestions to make about studying and controlling context. One of the things we've heard for years is that every professor of education, regardless of their specialization, should spend a little time teaching in schools. I don't think that's enough or necessarily a correct idea. I think those of us who are in teacher education should have some direct experiences in a school working with a faculty group because it's that group that

controls the induction and behaviors of the other teachers in the building. Our experience should not be one of going to PS 2½ to help Joe become a better math teacher. The issue, as we've all said this morning, is that Joe in a school is in isolation and being persecuted by some kind of support group either because it doesn't exist or because it's socializing him into the wrong values. Therefore, your experience as a college person is to work with some group in the schools that will start to exert different values on the beginning teachers. That's one of the problems again of many of our paradims and constructs. We approach all of these issues as if we're dealing with the individual beginning teacher in isolation. We need to realize that we're not just dealing with individuals but rather with groups in schools.

This ends my part of it. I want to thank you for coming at 8:00 in the morning. You've shown through your attendance and through what you've said here that we can work against the whole context and organization and produce a very stimulating meeting of people who ordinarily wouldn't get together at a very difficult hour.

Gene Hall:

I have a whole list of notes that I deliberately left down there. I want to thank you all for participating. Martin and I started putting this cast of characters together in June and I think we did reasonably well. There are sign-up sheets if you want to get a copy of the formal publication that will result from this forum.

Have a nice day.