DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 546 SP 030 821

AUTHOR	Huling-Austin, Leslie
TITLE	A Synthesis of Research on Teacher Induction Programs and Practices.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Texas State Univ., San Marcos.
PUB DATE	7 Apr 88
NOTE	28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; Mentors; *Research Reports; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Orientation; Teacher Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies and synthesizes findings from data-based research on teacher induction programs and practices. In order to be included in the synthesis the studies must have been: (1) data-based; (2) conducted on beginning teachers in an induction program; and (3) reported since 1977. A total of 17 studies were included in the synthesis. Findings are organized around five common goals of teacher induction: (1) to improve teaching performance; (2) to increase the retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years; (3) to promote the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers; (4) to satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification; and (5) to transmit the culture of the system to beginning teachers. As this synthesis reflects, there is research data to support that induction programs can be successful in achieving each of the five stated goals. In addition, the studies collectively include important findings about four other points: (1) the need for flexibility in induction programs; (2) the important role of the support teacher; (3) the importance of placement in beginning teacher success; and (4) the need to educate the profession (as well as the public) about teacher induction. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302546

A Synthesis of Research on Teacher Induction Programs and Practices

by
Leslie Huling-Austin
LBJ Institute for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning
Southwest Texas State University

Introduction and Methodology

Author's Point of View

The motivation for this paper is more pragmatic than scholarly. In my dealings with school practitioners, policy-makers and researchers across the country I am encountering with increasing frequency the question of what the research base "says" about teacher induction. Those asking primarily want to know if there are research data that support the assumption that teacher induction programs make a difference, and if there are research findings that indicate that certain induction practices or program components are likely to have positive effects?

In order to address these questions, I have attempted to synthesize reserach on teacher induction programs and practices. I established three criteria on which to select studies for inclusion in my synthesis. In order to be included, studies must have been:

1) data-based (i.e. data must have been systematically collected and analyzed),

2) focused on beginning teachers in an induc.. program (i.e. teachers must have been receiving some type of formal induction assistance; studies of beginning teachers not in an induction program were not included), and

3) reported since 1977.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 7, 1988.

SP 030821

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Huling-Austin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A number of sources were used to identify studies for inclusion in this synthesis including: an extensive search of the ERIC database, three ERIC Digests (1986) on related topics, a survey of members of a national teacher induction network, programs of the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) for the past five years, a monograph on teacher induction (Brooks, 1987), published proceedings from three conferences with a focus on teacher induction (Griffin & Hukill, 1983; Huling-Austin, Putman, Edwards & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; Hord, O'Neal & Smith, 1985), and several major journals devoting theme issues to the topic of teacher induction (Educational Leadership, November, 1985; Journal of Teacher Education January-February, 1986; Kappa Delta Pi Record, July-August, 1986; and Action in Teacher Education, Winter 1987). These sources yielded more than 25 studies that appeared to meet the three criteria outlined above. After a careful analysis of each study, a number of studies were excluded for various reasons (see "Selection of Studies" in Part II of paper) and the list was trimmed to 17 studies which ultimately were deemed appropriate for inclusion in the synthesis. The titles and authors of these 17 studies appear in Exhibit A.

I feel compelled to mention that from my viewpoint of one who has spent considerable time studying the teacher induction literature, the list of studies at first glance is somewhat surprising. Some of the studies included will be unknown to most who stay current on teacher induction literature as the studies have not yet appeared in professional publications. Conversely, many "key" induction references are not included in the list of studies synthesized primarily because the authors were either not reporting research or their studies were conducted on beginning teachers who were not participating in induction programs. I would like to emphasize that in my opinion many pieces of work not included in this synthesis are extremely informative and useful to the field

Exhibit A
17 Studies Included in Synthesis

Author(s)/Date	Title
Blackburn (1977)	The First-Year Teacher: Perceived Needs, Intervention Strategies and Results
Brooks (1986)	Richardson New Teacher Induction Program: Final Data Analysis and Report
Butler (1987)	Lessons Learned About Mentoring in Two Fifth-Year Teacl Preparation-Induction Programs
Elsner (1984)	First Year Evlauation Results from Oklahoma's Entry-Yea Assistance Committees
Friske & Combs (1986)	Teacher Induction Programs: An Oklahoma Perspective
Grant & Zeichner (1981)	Inservice Support for First Year Teachers: The State of th Scene
Hegler & Dudley (1986)	Beginning Teacher Induction: A Progress Report
Hidalgo (1986-87)	The Evolving Concerns of First-Year Junior High School Teachers in Difficult Settings: Three Case Studies
Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes & Paulissen (1986)	A Study of State-Mandated Beginning Teacher Programs
Huffman & Leak (1986)	Beginning Teachers' Perceptions of Mentors
Huling-Austin & Murphy (1987)	Assessing the Impact of Teacher Induction Programs: Implications for Program Development
Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik (1985)	Model Teacher Induction Project Study Findings: Final Re
Kilgore & Kozisek (1988)	The Effects of a Planned Induction Program on First-Year Teachers
Marockie & Looney (1988)	Evaluating Teacher Induction in Ohio County Schools, Wheeling, West Virginia
Odell (1986)	Induction Support of New Teachers: A Functional Approacl
Summers (1987)	Summative Evaluation Report: Project CREDIT
Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin & Drill (1987)	Virginia's Colleague Teacher Project: Focus on Beginning Teachers' Adaptation to Teaching

of teacher induction, I recommend "Teacher Induction A New Beginning " (Brooks, 1987) and "The Knowledge Base for Teacher Induction: A Selected Annotated Bibliography" (Johnston, 1988)

Finally, I believe it is important to point out that I am viewing this paper not as a finished product but rather as a modest beginning. I certainly intend to expand and revise this description of a "research base" for teacher induction as additional studies become available and I welcome others to take this as a first step and to build upon it.

Organizational Framework for the Paper

A number of organizational frameworks were considered for this synthesis. Because the 16 studies vary greatly in terms of their rigor, size, and comprehensiveness and serious consideration was given to grouping studies according to their various characteristics and then comparing and contrasting their findings accordingly. Another approach that was considered was to isolate induction practices being studied and to identify findings related to the various practices across studies. However, after much deliberation, both of these approaches were discarded because the author feared such frameworks would quickly become so fragmented that the resulting product would not be very helpful to practitioners and policy-makers who are requesting that a research-base be identified in order to help them make decisions and design programs.

The framework finally selected for use in this synthesis is focused around commonly accepted goals of teacher induction programs. Huling-Austin (1986) identified four such goals that she believes are common to most induction programs. These goals include:

1) To improve teaching performance,

2) To increase the retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years,

3) To promote the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers, and

4) To satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification.

Since that publication, Huling-Austin (1988) has added a fifth goal to the list that she believes is prevalent among many programs although probably to a lesser degree than the other four. This fifth goal is:

5) To transmit the culture of the system to beginning teachers.

In addition to categories devoted to each of the five goals above, a final category of the framework is devoted to other noteworthy findings that are either not clearly related to one of the five goals of teacher induction programs or cut across so many of the goals that it would be inappropriate to categorize them under a single goal. The use of this miscellaneous category provides for the inclusion of important findings without forcing them into categories in which they do not clearly fit.

Synthesis of Selected Induction Studies

Selection of Studies

Even using the three previously explained criteria for study selection, determining which studies to include in this synthesis was not an easy task. In order for this synthesis to be meaningful, it was necessary to maintain a sharp focus on induction programs and practices and thus it was also necessary to make a number of arbitrary decisions to clarify what studies should and should not be included. Among the studies that were excluded were those which were predominantly follow-up studies of graduates from university teacher education programs (for example, Arends, 1982; McCaleb, 1984). Follow-up studies were excluded because some graduates were in settings with induction programs while others were not, and generally no attempt was made to organize or

analyze data according to this distinction of supported induction vs. non-supported. Studies that focused on the general phenomena of mentoring (not in conjunction with a formal induction program) were excluded (see Galvez-Hjornevik, 1987) as well as studies that had an their primary focus the benefits of induction programs for experienced personnel as opposed to beginning teachers (for example, Hawk, 1984). Studies that were primarily descriptions of programs and program components were also excluded (for example, Elias, McDonald, Stevenson, Simon & Fisher, 1980). It should also be mentioned that when the same study data were reported in several different sources, the author attempted to select the single most comprehensive source for inclusion in this synthesis.

Even by limiting the number of studies included, it was still necessary to select only representative findings from each study. No attempt was made to synthesize every finding of every study, rather the author attempted to identify the study's strongest contribution(s) and focus on these. Occasionally, a common point or finding was present in so many different studies that it was not feasible to reference them all. In this instance, the author chose to reference those studies that she believed most clearly made the point. In addition, every attempt was made not to misrepresent a study by highlighting insignificant findings or taking findings out of context. In order not to unnecessarily belabor the point of how studies and findings were selected for inclusion in this synthesis, let us proceed.

Goal #1: To Improve Teaching Performance

The idiosyncratic nature of teaching makes if difficult to measure teaching effectiveness or to compare the teaching performance of one group of teachers with any other group of teachers. Even so, facilitators of induction programs,

like the profession at large, are beginning to tackle this issue and to attempt to document the effects of induction programs on teaching performance.

The only study identified that attempted to compare student achievement of first-year teachers in an induction program with first-year teachers not receiving induction support, found no significant differences in the student achievement of control and experimental teachers (Blackburn, 1977, p. 7). This study did, however, find significant differences in how principals rated the teaching competency of experimental and control teachers. The teaching competency of experimental teachers who had cooperating teachers assigned to them on a one-to-one basis were rated significantly higher than that of "nonsupported" first-year teachers.

Another controlled study was conducted by Project CREDIT (Certification Renewal Experiences Designed to Improve Teaching), a teacher induction program sponsored by Indiana State University and funded through the Indiana Teacher Quality Act (PL 102-1985). This study indicated that first-year teachers participating in the project showed specific and significant measurable changes when compared with the control group (Summers, 1987). The evaluation report indicated:

> CREDIT interns demonstrated (1) a significant gain in the use of mastery learning and mastery learning theory, (2) increased motivation to understand and use higher order questions, (3) increased inclination to teach critical thinking skills, (4) increased awareness of state and local curriculum guides, (5) enhanced ability to communicate with parents, and (6) improved ability to communicate with the public at large (p. 33-34).

In an evaluation of the Oklahoma Entry-Year Assessment Program (Elsner, 1984), committee members including entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, school administrators and higher education representatives were asked to rate the beginning teacher's knowledge, skills, and competencies in

10 areas at the beginning of the school year and again at the end. Data from this sample of more than 200 respondents indicated that first-year teachers made significant progress in planning skills, handling class discussions, preparation of unit and lesson plans, management of discipline problems, and the ability to teach or train others (p. 7).

In a study by Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) in an end-of-year interview, first-year teachers were asked what changes they had made as a result of the assistance they had received through their induction programs. These changes were documented by the researchers in a full-page figure (p. 25) which displayed items such as "I've changed little things like voice inflection and eye contact," "I've changed my pacing; I was going too fast, especially through the transitions," and "To use different techniques like going from the chalkboard to the overhead in the same class." The researchers comment:

> It is interesting to note both the number and nature of the changes mentioned. The list indicates that a substantial amount of change is attributed by first-year teachers to the assistance they received through the induction program. Also, most of the changes are of an instructional nature and are of the type that directly influence the quality of instruction with students. While it is difficult to quantify, based on the changes reported, it is reasonable to conclude that the teaching of the participating first-year teachers was improved as a result of their involvement in the induction programs (p. 23, 26).

Using a similar approach for measuring improvement in teaching performance, Marockie and Looney (1988) measured beginning teachers' use of suggestions and recommendations acquired from their Teacher Induction Program (TIP). The 15 beginning teachers in their study listed twenty different ideas which they had used that had emanated from the TIP Sixty-seven percent of the beginning teachers listed "use of time" as having impact on their instruction after presentation at a TIP seminar. Thirty-three percent listed

"praise", "conducting class in a businesslike manner", "classroom management techniques", "use of space", and "record-keeping". The researchers concluded:

> These responses suggest that instruction was improved through the use of practices translated from current educational research presented at TIP seminars. Since research findings presented in the seminars were those that have stood the test of time in terms of statistical evidence and systematic inquiry, it may be conjectured that instruction may have improved in the new teachers' classrooms (p. 6).

It is important to point out that as a profession we have a long way to go in being able to measure teaching performance with confidence. The problem is further compounded by the fact that it is unrealistic to use the same evaluation standards for beginning teachers that are used for experienced teachers. Teacher induction programs have only begun to address the issue of program influences on teaching performance. However, some progress has been made in this area and hopefully as improved evaluation measures, techniques and instruments are developed specifically for use with beginning teachers, these will be incorporated into the overall evaluation designs of more induction programs.

Goal #2: To Increase the Retention of Promising Beginning Teachers During the Induction Years

It is well documented in the literature that without induction support and assistance many potentially good teachers become discouraged and abandon their teaching careers (Ryan, Newman, Mager, Applegate, Lasley, Flora and Johnston, 1980). Schlecty and Vance (1983) estimate that approximately 30% of beginning teachers leave the profession during their first two years, compared to the overall teacher turnover rate of 6% per year. The turnover rate of new teachers does not level out to the overall rate of 6% until the fifth or sixth year. Of all beginning teachers who enter the profession, 40-50% will leave during

the first seven years of their career and in excess of two-thirds of those will do so in the first four years of teaching. These figures are especially depressing in light of evidence that suggests that those teachers who are the most academically talented leave in the greatest numbers (Schlecty and Vance, 1983).

Just how much teacher induction programs have influenced the retention of beginning teachers is not well documented. However, of the evidence that is available, it appears that at least some induction programs are having the desired effects on retention of beginning teachers. For example, Project CREDIT conducted by Indiana State University reported that after one year of operation all 21 participating first-year teachers indicated a desire to return to teaching the following year. This compares to figures from a statewide needs assessment which indicated that 26.5% of Indiana teachers who entered teaching dropped out within two years and that 62% had dropped out within five years (Summers, 1987, p. 34).

Similarly impressive results have been reported by the University of Alabama/Birmingham First-Year Teacher Pilot Program (Blackburn, 1977). In this effort, data were collected from 100 first-year teachers receiving induction support and 100 first-year teachers in a control group not receiving support. Of the 100 teachers in the experimental group, all but four taught the following year; twenty of the control teachers did not teach the second year (p. 9).

In the fall of 1983, Doane College in Nebraska instituted an induction program as one component of its teacher education program. In 1987, the program reported that 24 of the 25 teachers participating in the induction program have remained in the teaching profession, some now in their fourth year of teaching (Hegler & Dudley, 1987, p. 54). Again, while it is difficult to know exactly to what degree retention is influenced by induction support, with a

96% retention rate overall it is difficult to deny that the induction program is having some positive influence on retention.

It is somewhat ironic that while increased teacher retention is probably one of the greatest potential impacts of induction programs, this particular effect has probably been investigated less than any others. To date, very few programs have systematically collected and reported retention data and this clearly is an area in need of additional investigation. However, premature as it is to speculate, the data reported to date indicate that teacher induction programs potentially hold a great deal of promise for retaining greater numbers of beginning teachers in the profession and thus reducing the waste of resources and human potential associated with unnecessarily high teacher attrition during the beginning years.

Goal #3: To Promote the Personal and Professional Well-Being of Beginning Teachers

Not all beginning teachers experience personal and professional trauma during their first-year even without the support of an induction program. However, many do and in extreme cases beginning teachers have been known to lose self-confidence, experience extreme stress and anxiety, and to question their own competence as a teacher and a person. For example, Hidalgo (1986-87), in studying emergency credentialled teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District found that teachers had persistent personal and management preoccupations which "obstructed, and even paralyzed their progress toward more sophisticated use of teaching knowledge" (p. 78). In several case studies he described in detail their anxieties, insecurities and frustrations.

Huling-Austin (1986) contends that a profession has a responsibility for the well-being of its members as well as its clients, and that it is professionally irresponsible not to provide beginning teachers with personal support when it is

needed. Teacher induction programs can serve as one avenue of providing this support, and many studies have reported positive outcomes in this area. One such example is provided by Huffman and Leak (1986) related to the "mentor" teacher component of the North Carolina Beginning Teacher Program. "Mentor teachers were found to have provided 'positive reinforcement,' 'guidance and moral support,' 'patience and understand,' and even 'a shoulder to cry on' (p. 23)." Brooks (1986) in his work with the Richardson ISD (Texas) New Teacher Induction Program found that beginning teachers in the program reported increased feelings of competence, motivation, belonging, support and attention as a result of their experiences in the program.

In their work with first-year teachers in the Virginia Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, researchers investigated the effects of the emotional support beginning teachers received from experienced teachers in the program (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin & Drill, 1987). They noted:

> The chance to interact with a colleague by asking questions, sharing materials or planning collaboratively has other benefits of an emotional nature. The beginning teachers sense this support from the helping or nurturing attitudes of their colleagues and depend on it to get them through those first, difficult, lonely months. The beginning teachers report being comforted with the experienced teachers share their trails and frailties with them. In addition, the recognition they they receive from the experienced colleague that they are performing satisfactorily is important to the beginning teacher in developing their positive teaching self-concept. In the first several months of school a number of beginning teachers report that their experienced colleague is the only person who has commented on their teaching competence. This is particularly true in our high school pairs. Thus, even general feedback on performance during the early months by the experienced colleague reduces the uncertainity of the beginner that they are meeting expectations. This reduction of uncertainity in turn creates a feeling of security (p. 12).

Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) studied groups of beginning teachers across the country who were and were not participating in teacher induction programs. Using a questionnaire designed to measure the beginning teacher's perception of his/her own effectiveness and the desirability of the teaching profession, they found that, "Responses from sites that had no formal induction program in operation were noticeably less desirable than the other sites (p. 33)." Summers (1987) found a similar situation in Project CREDIT. Control group comparisons revealed that intern teachers completed the year with significantly healthier attitudes and perceptions about teaching that did a siimilar group of beginning teachers who did not have the CREDIT support program. Control group data revealed that non-supported beginning teachers reported deteriorating attitudes or teaching perceptions in 88 or 98 surveyed variables (p. 33-34). These findings from these two studies suggest that when beginning teachers are not supported they may begin to question their own effectiveness and their decisions to become teachers.

Interestingly, while beginning teachers often report that the emotional support they received was the most beneficial aspect of their teacher induction program, Odell (1986) found in analyzing categories of support provided to first-year teachers, that emotional support accounted for only a small percentage of the assistance provided. She wrote, "Although emotional support was of considerable importance across semesters, clinical support teachers generally offered more assistance with the formal teaching processes to new teachers than emotional support (p. 28)." This may suggest that emotional support is very important and without it beginning teachers have difficulty dealing with other matters. However, once emotional support is established, beginning teachers do not require large amounts of such support but rather can "move on" rather quickly to deal with instructional matters.

Goal #4: To Satisfy Mandated Requirements Related to Induction and Certification

Once a mandated program is implemented in a sense the mandate has been satisfied, but the more important question is to what degree the initial "intent" of the mandate is actually being addressed. There is some evidence that mandated state induction programs are "working." Blackburn (1977) in his report on the University of Alabama/Birmingham First-Year Teacher Pilot Program noted, "Despite some program shortcomings, the project demonstrated that the local school systems, the State Department of Education, and institutions of higher education can work together and that the cooperative effort can result in a positive difference in the behavior of teachers" (p. 12).

Elsner (1984) in his evaluation of the first-year of the Oklahoma Entry Year Assistance Program came to a similar conclusion. He wrote:

> For a new program with no model to follow the Entry-Year Assistance Program achieved an unusual number of their stated objectives. It appears that much of the apprehension expressed by some school administrators prior to program implementation had disappeared and that higher education faculty members made a significant contribution to the success of the program. Lines of communication have developed between teacher educators and practitioners in the field (p. 7).

Friske and Combs (1986) also worked with the Oklahoma Entry Year Assistance Program and concluded that the program by-and-large has been implemented across the state. Their concern, however, is that studies on the program to date have focused on how the program has been implemented and the factors influencing implementation, but have not examined the extent to which the program has fulfilled the original intent of "improving the quality of teaching in Oklahoma."

A similar concern was expressed by another set of researchers in their study of two state-mandated teacher induction programs (Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes & Paulissen, 1986). They wrote:

> At the school level, our analyses of implementation focused on the work of the support teams with the beginning teacher. It is useful to draw a distinction at this level between procedural compliance and substantive implementation of program requirements. Procedurally, the teams included in our sample accomplished all of the required activities in terms of observing, conferring, completing necessary forms, and so on. Substantively there was great variance in terms of how the program was carried out. . . . In cases where no strong team leadership appeared, the induction program seldom rose above the procedural compliance level (p. 19).

These same researchers also noted an interesting point related to the "gate-keeping" function of teacher induction programs. From data secured from interviews with state officials in the two states it was indicated that nearly all of the teachers statewide enrolled in both programs were recommended for certification. They comment, "Such patterns would seem to call into question either the "gate-keeping" capacity of such programs or the real need for such programs in the first place on the grounds of controlling for the quality of entering teachers" (Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes & Paulissen, 1986, p. 18).

Goal #5: To Transmit the Culture of the System to Beginning Teachers

As mentioned earlier, it appears that this goal is less prevalent in many programs than the other four. It appears that while many programs recognize that one program function is to "socialize" beginning teachers and to familiarize them with the workplace norms, the program stops far short of defining and transmitting the culture of the system. It can be speculated that locally developed programs more often tend to emphasize this "culture" goal than state-mandated programs in that local agencies are more likely to "own" a

common culture which they want to transmit to the beginning teacher. In any case, the two studies which address this goal most directly are both locally-developed programs.

The Ohio County School Teacher Induction Program in Wheeling, West Virginia, has as one of its objectives that teachers would develop a sense of ownership and bonding to an excellent system (Marockie & Looney, 1988). In the evaluation report on the program, it states:

> Results of evaluation of the Teacher Induction Program indicated that the program was extremely successful in guiding inductees in becoming bonded to the system and adopting the goals of the system. Through a positive interaction between central office personnel and new teacher as well as principal and new teacher, ownership began to develop. Results seem to suggest that each teacher became more and more a part of the system and the sense of belonging to an excellent system became greater and greater. Out of the developing ownership emerged a real commitment to the system and the teacher's role in it (p. 2-3).

A similar phenomena was described by Brooks (1986) in his work with the Richardson ISD (Texas) induction program. He wrote, "Beginning teacher reports of increased feelings of competence, motivation, belonging, support and attention combine to produce an overwhelming perception of district competence and motivation to assist and develop entry year professionals" (p. 7). From this observation it can be inferred that the Richardson program has attempted to address the goal of transmitting the culture of the district to beginning teachers and has indeed accomplished this goal to a reasonably high degree.

It is possible that many developers and implementers of induction programs have not yet given much thought to the goal of transmitting the culture of the system to the beginning teacher. As more programs begin to incorporate

this goal and report their results, it may be that greater numbers of those working in the field will begin to recognize the benefits of such a goal and to address it more directly in the future.

Other Noteworthy Findings

While the 17 studies included in this synthesis collectively include many more findings than have been discussed here, it is the author's hope that most of the major findings have been captured in the preceding sections of this paper. However, the author believes there are four additional points that are clearly present in these studies that have not yet been discussed and are worth examining here. These four points include: the need for flexibility in induction programs, the important role of the support teacher, the importance of placement in beginning teacher success, and the need to educate both the profession and the public about teacher induction.

The Need for Flexibility in Induction Programs. Because beginning teachers are individuals, they will experience their first-year of teaching and the induction process in individual, personal ways. In a study of the Virginia Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin & Drill, 1987) a great deal of attention was given to this point. These researchers argue that it is important to consider beginning teachers individually because their sources of problems, their ways of reacting and their aspirations for teaching can vary dramatically from person to person (p. 9).

Grant and Zeichner (1981) acknowledge the personal nature of teaching by noting that the problems and concerns experienced by the beginning teachers in their study were extremely diverse. They write:

> As Lewis (1980) argues, blanket statements about what to provide for first-year teachers are not very helpful. While general conclusions can be drawn about the necessity of more in-school support and better orientations, our data

> seem to indicate that the most useful thing that can be done with regard to induction is to personalize and individualize this support and gear it to the needs of the specific beginning teachers (p. 110).

Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik (1985) recommend that induction programs should be structured flexibly enough to accommodate the emerging needs of participants. They write:

> A prepackaged, 'canned' program determined in advance will not be flexible enough to meet the variety of needs that are likely to emerge. . . . It is important to closely monitor the specific emerging needs and concerns of participants and to select appropriate interventions accordingly. By anticipating this need in advance it is possible to build in periodic assessments of the program and to plan at various points in the year to make adjustments in the types and amounts of assistance provided (p. 52-53).

The Important Role of the Support Teacher. Probably the most consistent finding across studies is the importance of the support teacher (sometimes called the mentor teacher, helping teacher, peer teacher, buddy teacher, etc.). Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik (1985) contend that, "The assignment of an appropriate support teacher is likely to be the most powerful and cost-effective intervention in an induction program" (p. 50). Most of the beginning teachers in their study reported that having a support teacher was the single most helpful aspect of the program because it gave them someone to turn to on a daily basis as problems arose.

The role of the support teacher or mentor teacher has probably been most carefully studied by the staff of the Center of Excellence in Teacher Education at Memphis State University. Butler (1987) outlined a number of personal factors which appeared to support the development of positive mentor-protege relationship. Some of these factors include: (1) prior experiences in assisting student teachers and novice teachers in understanding and mastering the responsibilities of teaching, (2) years of experience as a classroom teacher,

(3) willingness to commit time to the protege early in the relationship so that both had opportunities to come to know and respect each other, (4) ability to conceive the relationship in developmental terms with sensitivity to the need to modify the mentor role as the protege progressed, and (5) possessing high status within the school and within the profession, such as attainment of higher rank on the state's career ladder program (p. 3-4).

From their study of mentors, Huffman and Leak (1986) made the following two observations:

> 1) Having a mentor who teaches the same grade level or subject matter as the new teacher was highly desirable. In order to provide a full range of assistance, addressing issues including classroom management and instructional methodology as well as content, knowledge and experience in a similar discipline or grade level is important.
>
> 2) Providing adequate time for informal and formal conferencing, planning, and conversation between the mentor and the new teacher is a primary factor in addressing the needs of the beginners. Informal conferencing with the mentor was particularly valuable to these new teachers (p. 24).

As to what exactly mentors do, the list of responsibilities and activities is considerable. Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) found that first-year teachers in their study reported receiving help from their support teachers in 14 different areas. Areas most frequently mentioned included "someone to talk to/listen to," followed by "locating materials" and "help with clerical work related to district policies and procedures." Other areas most frequently mentioned were "lesson planning," "classroom organization," and "discipline" (p. 33). Because the role of the support teacher is so extensive, Huling-Austin and Murphy recommend that support teachers should receive training in how to provide assistance in a variety of areas and in how to work with another adult in a supportive manner

and should be compensated for their participation in induction programs (p. 34-35).

Kilgore and Kozisek (1988) came to a similar conclusion from their study in which mentors were provided with neither training nor compensation. They concluded from their study that the role of the mentor teacher as envisioned was not fulfilled primarily because mentors were not provided with support for assuming the duties of a mentor (e.g. extra pay, recognition, training) by their principals. They concluded that, "The school as an organization has to come to grips with how they see mentors or career teachers helping those working their way into the system" (p. 12).

The Importance of Placement in Beginning Teacher Success. Beginning teachers are often placed in teaching assignments that would challenge even the most skillful veteran teachers. These difficult assignments can take several forms including teaching in a subject area for which the teacher is not certified, having numerous class preparations, "floating" from classroom to classroom, working with low-ability or unmotivated/disruptive students, or being responsible for demanding or time-consuming extracurricular activities.

Hidalgo (1987) recently completed a study of first-year teachers in difficult settings. His case studies give vivid accounts of novice emergency-credentialled teachers assigned to teach high-demand subjects in low-income, overcrowded junior high schools while they were still enrolled in teacher preparation classes. While certainly Hidalgo's subjects were in extremely challenging assignments, even less extreme circumstances can have major effects on the induction process, according to a number of different teacher induction researchers who have noted the importance of teaching assignment as it relates to beginning teacher success.

For example, in their study of two state-mandated programs, Hoffman and his colleagues (1986) noted:

> The programs appeared to work best when the teaching context was appropriate to the talents and interests of the first year teacher. The programs did not provide sufficient support to overcome inappropriate placements or stressful work conditions. And, in fact, in such situations the programs only serve to further antagonize and exacerbate negative feelings (p. 20).

In a later study, Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik (1985) came to a similar conclusion. They wrote:

> Placement of first-year teachers may well be the most influential variable in first-year teaching success. Which classes a first-year teacher is assigned to teach will be extremely influential in how successful a year that teacher is likely to have. The first-year teacher in our program who had the most difficulty was the one who had the most difficult teaching assignment both because not only were the students low-achievers, but also her academic background had not prepared her to teach the specific subject to which she was assigned. In comparison to other first-year teachers in the project, the teacher in the difficult assignment appeared weak. Our staff speculate that had this teacher been placed in a "less difficult" assignment or that the other first-year teachers had been placed in a similarly difficult assignment, that the resulting experiences may well have appeared quite different. The interventions supplied in the project were not sufficiently powerful enough to resolve the types of problems beginning teachers will experience in a difficult teaching assignment (p. 48).

<u>The Need of Educate the Profession (as well as the Public) about Teacher Induction.</u> This final point , while it may appear to be obvious, is one that the author fears is being overlooked in our rush to implement induction programs across the nation. Many of us assume that because more legislatures are mandating induction programs and programs are rapidly increasing in number across the nation, that there must be general consensus in the profession at-large about the need for and potential benefits of teacher

induction programs. It is this author's experience that this is simply not the case. For example, in a recent presentation to teachers from more than 75 schools in Central Texas, not a single school had any type of induction program in operation (not even the assignment of a "buddy" teacher for new teachers). This evidence indicates that beginning teacher induction is not viewed as a pressing need in the field.

Kilgore & Kozisek (1988) comment on the same issue, "For the most part, school personnel are not aware of the literature or effects they have on first-year teachers. Simply stated, principals and teachers treat novice teachers like they were treated, and have had no reason to think that things should be any different (p. 11)."

If induction programs are to succeed, school practitioners need to be educated to the needs of beginning teachers and the role of experienced personnel in assisting with the induction process. In addition, those conducting induction programs need to be provided with the resources needed to fulfill these roles. If this information and support is not provided, induction programs have little chance of succeeding on a widespread basis. Friske & Combs (1986) perhaps summarized this point best:

> Improving the quality of education can not merely be legislated. On paper, requirements can be met, yet still not effect true educational reform. . . . Without the commitment to the quality with which each (school practitioner) fulfills responsibilities to the beginning teacher and the teacher induction program, new teachers will merely be socialized into the existing system (p. 72).

Summary

The purpose of this paper was to identify and synthesize findings from data-based research on teacher induction programs and practices. In order to be included in the synthesis studies must have been: 1) data-based, 2)

conducted on beginning teachers in an induction program, and 3) reported since 1977. A total of 17 studies were included in the synthesis.

Findings were organized around five common goals of teacher induction programs. An additional category was devoted to "Other Noteworthy Findings" for study findings that either did not clearly relate to one of the five goals or that cut across so many of the goals that it would be inappropriate to categorize them under a single goal. The organizing framework for the synthesis, therefore, included the following:

1) Goal #1: To improve teaching performance,

2) Goal #2: To increase the retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years,

3) Goal #3: To promote the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers,

4) Goal #4: To satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification,

5) Goal #5: To transmit the culture of the system to beginning teachers, and

6) Other Noteworthy Findings.

As this synthesis reflects, there is research data to support that induction programs can be successful in achieving each of the five goals stated above. In addition, the studies collectively include important findings about four other points: 1) the need for flexibility in induction programs, 2) the important role of the support teacher, 3) the importance of placement in beginning teacher success, and 4) the need to educate the profession (as well as the public) about teacher induction.

While there is evidence to suggest that induction programs can successfully achieve the goals outlined above, it is important for those who develop and implement programs to realize that for any of these goals to be achieved to any appreciable degree, program features and activities specifically targeted at addressing each goal must be planned and implemented. Program facilitators can make their own decisions about which goals to emphasize to what degree, but it is important to recognize that these goals will rarely be achieved "by accident" just because a program exists. In order for the goals to be achieved, program activities specifically targeted toward identified goals must be carefully designed and implemented appropriately.

ERIC

List of References

Arends, R. I. (1982). Beginning teachers as learners: A descriptive report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Reserach Association, New York.

Blackburn, J. (1977). The first-year teacher: Perceived needs, intervention strategies and results. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC No. ED 135 768)

Brooks, D. M. (1986). Richardson new teacher induction program: Final data analysis and report. Richardson, Texas: Richardson ISD. (ERIC No. ED 278 627)

Brooks, D. M. (1987). Teacher induction: A new beginning. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators. (ERIC No. 279 607)

Butler, E. D. (1987). Lessons learned about mentoring in two fifth-year teacher preparation-induction programs. Memphis: Memphis State University, Center of Excellence in Teacher Education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Houston.

Elias, P., McDonald, F. J., Stevenson, C., Simon, R., & Fisher, M. L. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers Vol. II: The problems of beginning teachers: A digest of helping programs. Berkeley, CA: Educational Testing Service.

Elsner, K. (1984). First Year Evaluation Results from Oklahoma's Entry-Year Assistance Committees. Paper presented at the anual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans. (ERIC No. 242 706)

Friske, J., & Combs, M. (1986). Teacher induction programs: An Oklahoma perspective. Action in Teacher Education, 7 (2), 67-74.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). Teacher mentors: A review of the literature. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC No. ED 263 105)

Grant, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1981). Inservice support for first year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14 (2), 99-111.

Griffin, G. A., & Hukill, H. (1983). First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? (Report No. 9051). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hawk, P. P. (1984). Making a difference: Reflections and thoughts of first year teachers. Greenville, NC: East Carolina University.

Hegler, K., & Dudley, R. (1986). Beginning teacher induction: A progress report. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (1), 55-56.

Hidalgo, F. (1986-87). The evolving concerns of first-year junior high school teachers in difficult settings: Three case studies. Action in Teacher Education, 8 (4), 75-79.

Hoffman, J. V., Edwards, S. A., O'Neal, S., Barnes, S., & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 16-21.

Hord, S. M., O'Neal, S. F., & Smith, M. L. (Eds.). (1985). Beyond the Looking Glass: Papers from a National Symposium on Teacher Education Policies, Practices and Research (Report No. 7203). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 22-25.

Huling-Austin, L. (1988). Teacher induction. A speech presented to the South Texas Teacher Center, San Antonio, Texas, February 2, 1988.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. & Murphy, S. C. (1987). Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C. (ERIC No. 283 779)

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., Edwards, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). MTIP Satellite Conference proceedings (Report No. 7209). Austin: The University of Texas At Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling, Austin, L., Putman, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). Model Teacher Induction Project study findings: Final report. Austin: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC No. ED 270 442)

Johnston, J. M. (1988). The knowledge base of teacher induction: A selected annotated bibliography. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego.

Kilgore, A. M., & Kozisek, J. A. (1988). The effects of a planned induction program on first-year teachers: A reserach report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego.

Lewis, C. (1980). Some essential characteristics of programs to support teachers in the beginning years. In K. Howey & R. Bents (eds.) Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher. Minneapolis: USOE/Teacher Corps.

McCaleb, J. L. (1984). An investigation of on-the-job performance of first-year teachers: Follow-up study I. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

Marockie, M., & Looney, G. E. (1988). Evaluating teacher induction in Ohio County Schools, Wheeling, West Virginia. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego.

Odell, S. J. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 26-29.

Ryan, K., Newman, K., Mager, G., Applegate, J., Lasley, T., Flora, R., & Johnston, J. (1980). Biting the apple: Accounts of first year teachers. New York, NY: Longman.

Schlecty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), 468-487.

Summers, J. A. (1987). Summative evaluation report: Project CREDIT. Terre Haute: Indiana State University, School of Education.

Wildman, T. M., Niles, J. A., Magliaro, S. G., McLaughlin, R. A., & Drill, L. G. (1987). Virginia's colleague teacher project: Focus on beginning teachers' adaptation to teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C.