ED 465 725   SP 040 871

AUTHOR   Angelle, Pamela S.
TITLE   Socialization Experiences of Beginning Teachers in
                  Differentially Effective Schools.
PUB DATE   2002-04-00
NOTE   28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                  Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April
                  1-5, 2002). Contains small print.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Administrator Attitudes; *Beginning Teachers; Classroom
                  Techniques; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Mentors;
                  *Middle School Teachers; Middle Schools; Preservice Teacher
                  Education; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Competencies; Teaching
                  Skills
IDENTIFIERS   *Teacher Socialization

ABSTRACT
            This study examined the socialization experiences of middle
school novice teachers using interviews with principals, mentors, and new
teachers; surveys of new teachers; and classroom observations of new
teachers. With the middle school teacher as the unit of analysis, the study
used an aeronautical metaphor to describe the schools as organizations where
new teachers' initial flights into teaching occurred. Results indicated that
four-year preservice programs were not adequately preparing student teachers
for the realities of the classroom. Inadequate classroom management
preparation left them struggling to survive in the real world of teaching and
learning. University professors and student teacher programs did not
adequately bridge the gap between theory and practice. In those schools that
provided professional, instructional, and social support, members of the
school community said that if novices were adequately prepared, the time and
resources of the school could be used for other aspects of teacher
socialization. The results also indicated that interdisciplinary teaming, if
implemented to increase professional and collegial development, could
substantially aid new teachers during the socialization process. Finally, the
study showed that effective teacher socialization was the result of the
process within the school, rather than the result of its individual
components. (Contains 40 references.) (SM)

Socialization Experiences of Beginning Teachers
In Differentially Effective Schools

By

Pamela S. Angelle
Louisiana Department of Education
pangelle@doe.state.la.us

Paper presented to the annual meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
April, 2002, New Orleans, Louisiana

Statement of the Problem

Descriptive studies of beginning teacher socialization experiences can be found throughout the literature (Fox & Singletary, 1986; Su, 1992; Gratch, 1998a; Gratch, 1998b; Wells, 1984; Zeichner & Gore, 1990; Jordell, 1987; Nigris, 1988). However, socialization studies within the context of effective schooling are few (see Kirby, Teddlie, Stringfield, and Wimpleberg, 1992). This study examines school effects and teacher effects through the case study approach and builds on the work of Kirby and colleagues (1992) and Teddlie and Stringfield (1993). Understanding the role of the socialization experience as it relates to the instructional effectiveness of the new teacher can be crucial to the implementation of a school improvement plan. If the beginning experience contributes to teacher effectiveness in the classroom, this will, in turn, contribute to the overall effectiveness of the school as the teacher is socialized into the school culture.

This mixed method study examined the socialization experiences of middle school novice teachers through interviews with principals, mentors, and new teachers, survey data from new teachers, and from the classroom observations of the new teachers. With the middle school as the unit of analysis, an aeronautical metaphor was used to describe the schools as organizations where the new teachers initial flight into teaching took place.

Theoretical Framework

The framework within which this study was conducted is from the field of school effectiveness research. Teddlie and Reynolds (2000) have identified three strands of school effectiveness research (SER). These include: *studies of school effects* that attempt to relate school inputs to school outcomes using increasingly sophisticated mathematical models; *'effective schools' studies* that describe the processes of differentially effective schools using the outlier and case study approaches; and *school improvement studies* that document the implementation and sometimes the success of school change efforts (p.26). This research was conducted as an effective schools' study.

Yee (1990), in her examination of teaching as a career, points out the difficulties facing the first year teacher, challenges which are unique to the field of teaching. In the professional fields of law and medicine, those new to the profession are given a systematic way to induct beginners in to the job, a job which demands competence in a complex arena as well as the ability to make hundreds of management decisions each day. Conversely, Yee (1990) notes new teachers are required to enter their first year of teaching with the same teaching load and same responsibilities as those many years their senior. Professional socialization has been shown to influence teacher quality and longevity. This socialization leads to identification with the school organization, allowing the teacher to take on the same goals and missions as the school. The job of teaching becomes an issue of loyalty to the workplace, thus, leading to a teacher's intent to stay in the teaching profession (Yee, 1990).

Along with a variety of appellations given to mentors, the act of mentoring has been defined in several ways. Peterson and Williams (1998) note that Shannon (1988) calls mentoring "a nurturing process" and "an ongoing, caring relationship" (p.730). Zimpher and Rieger (1988) state that mentoring conveys both a meaning and a function, in that mentoring is both a casual support system and also an educative function. Other researchers, as noted in Hawkey (1997) define mentoring in terms of teacher developmental stages. A common thread in all literature speaks to the need for facilitation, both in social support and also in professional guidance.

Research has shown that mentoring has a positive relationship to the retention of new teachers. The National Center for Education Information found that only 67% of nonmentored teachers, new to teaching, that is, five years or less, would still be teaching in five years (Odell & Ferraro, 1992). After a teacher-mentoring program was implemented, Odell and Ferraro (1992) found that 80% of mentored beginning teachers expected to still be in the classroom in five years. Likewise, Blair-Larsen (1998) contends that the more problems new teachers encounter, the more likely they will leave the education profession.

While much of the literature centers on the importance of mentors in the beginning teacher's experience, principals are arguably central figures as well. A study conducted by Brock and Grady (1998) examined the role of the principal in the induction of novice teachers. While the results of the study indicated that principals and new teachers share common concerns regarding the initial experience, principals overlooked a key component identified as crucial by the new teachers – the expectations of the principal for the new teacher and the beginning teacher's need for year long assistance. As the person instrumental in the hiring and evaluation of the new teachers, the beginning

teacher is anxious to fulfill the principal's expectations. Lacking this, the new teacher can feel frustrated and abandoned. Realizing this, it is fitting that principals consider their role in the induction process.

Planning an induction program at the school level must include frequent and productive interaction between the principal and each new teacher. Understanding that induction programs will ultimately benefit the principal and school as a whole by working to develop a teacher who intends to stay in the field of education will be reflected in the design of the program itself. As a part of this design principals must take on the role of instructional leader by engaging the new teacher in discussions of the practice of teaching, thus, assisting them in their professional growth and their indoctrination as a colleague. Moreover, principals can end the sense of isolation through frequent classroom visits as well as increasing efficacy through timely and constructive feedback (Hope, 1999).

There are a number of other ways principals can ensure that the new teacher's first year is a productive one. While mentors are "assigned" to the new teacher, the principal can foster collegial relationships with other faculty and staff members. Accessibility to the principal is also a key ingredient. Knowing that "the door is always open" can be a great comfort to the beginner. Furthermore, principals should be ever mindful of opportunities to enhance a new teacher's professional development. Workshops, conferences, and other opportunities to gain additional skills can serve the school as much as the teacher. The principal can help maximize success for the new teacher through the classes and students that are assigned by the principal to the new teacher. Finally, one of the greatest fears of the novice is the dreaded evaluation. Principals can do much to alleviate this fear by stressing the evaluation as a means of improvement, rather than a means of criticism (Hope, 1999).

Methods and Procedures

Sampling Design

The research design called for purposeful outlier sampling using intensity sampling strategy (Patton, 1990). This strategy involves carefully choosing a sample which provides "information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon of interest intensely (but not extremely)" (Patton, 1990, p. 171). Intensity sampling is superior to extreme case sampling because deviant cases will likely distort the "phenomenon of interest." In other words, extreme case sampling may provide information that is so unusual that the findings may be disputed (Patton, 1990).

The question that guided this research examined the processes in differentially effective middle schools; thus, a sample which documents an intense manifestation of the effectiveness of the middle school, either more effective or less effective, will reveal the most valuable information regarding the processes in these schools which will result in a positive or negative socialization experience. Stringfield (1994) emphasizes the importance of outlier sampling for those studies seeking to understanding extraordinary events, calling the detailed outlier study a "most efficient research design" when questioning "what sets an exemplar apart" (p. 73). The efficiency lay in the ability to detail descriptions in the area of interest, thereby adding a richness to the overall study.

This study will examine outliers which are more effective middle schools and those which are less effective. The disadvantage to this design is that typical schools, those which are the majority of schools in the total population, are not studied. However, by studying the processes in outlier schools, information gleaned will allow typical schools to more efficiently focus on those processes needing attention in their particular context.

School Effectiveness Index

School Performance Score (SPS). Each year, schools in Louisiana are required to administer the state's LEAP 21 test (a state criterion referenced test). There are two components to the test, English Language Arts and Mathematics (school year 2000-2001 inaugurated the Accountability Cycle 2, where the SPS included all four LEAP 21 tests; that is English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The SPS, calculated annually by the Louisiana Department of Education, is determined by combining results from four index scores with their corresponding weights. The formula for the calculation of the SPS follows.

School Performance Score = The Sum of:

LEAP 21 index score	X	60%
Iowa Test index score	X	30%
Attendance index	X	5%
Dropout index	X	5%

The index scores for the LEAP 21 and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills were derived through conversion. Scores not included in the conversion were for students who were expelled, transferred to another school, or received a grade reassignment.

Establishing the School Effectiveness Index. Before a sample could be chosen, a school effectiveness index (SEI) needed to be assigned to the middle schools in Louisiana. The SEIs were derived through a linear regression procedure whereby the criterion variable, in this study the school performance score (SPS), was regressed onto three predictor variables, which for this study were percent of students in poverty, percent of minority students, and percent of special education students (Sammons, 1999; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993). The three independent variables (percent of students in poverty, percent of minority students, and percent of special education students) accounted for 66.5% of the variance in the dependent variable (1998-99 school performance scores) (Yuan, 2000).

The result of this regression was a set of both actual and predicted scores for every K-8 school in Louisiana. The difference between the actual score and the predicted score was the residual score, either positive or negative. The residual scores served as the school effectiveness index for this study.

Adjusted Scores. Research studies of school effects (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993) have used the strategy of adjusted scores in their study design. This strategy addresses the issue of internal validity in order to ensure that the study is designed to measure what it was intended to measure, while eliminating any extraneous variables that might affect the outcome. Thus, variables which might be related to student achievement, other than the school processes under study, should be accounted for (Teddlie, Reynolds, & Sammons, 2000).

Variables controlled for in the present study are those related to student background; that is, SES, special education, and ethnicity. SES refers to the income and educational background of the students' families. Schools often do not maintain data from student SES and when data are available, they are often not accurate (Freeman, 1997). In the present study, SES is determined through data related to the number of students enrolled in each school's free and reduced lunch program. To enroll in the program, parents must produce information related to the family income. A school which has a high percentage of students enrolled in the free/reduced price lunch program will likely also have a high percentage of students living in poverty; therefore, the socioeconomic status of the school will likely be lower. For purposes of the regression analysis, the SES of each school was determined by the number of students enrolled in the free/reduced price lunch program at the school divided by the total number of students enrolled in the school (S. Kochan, personal communication, January 4, 2001).

Ethnicity and special education percentages were also predictor variables utilized in the regression analysis (Sammons, 1999; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993). The ethnicity variable was determined by the number of minority students at each school divided by the total enrollment at each school. The special education variable was determined in like manner. The total number of gifted and talented students in the school was divided by the total enrollment of students. Data indicating the total number of minority students and gifted and talented students were received through the Louisiana Student Information System, which is a self-report system, but also an audited system as part of the Minimum Foundation Program school funding system (S. Kochan, personal communication, January 4, 2001).

Sample Selection

Residual scores were received from the Louisiana Department of Education, Office of Management and Finance, Division of Planning, Analysis, and Information Services, Planning and Analysis Section (Yuan, 2000). This study examined only those schools with some combination of middle school grades (i.e., 4-8, 5-8, 6-8, or 7-8). In order to standardize the residual scores, the sample of interest (all middle schools), were extracted from the total sample. The effectiveness of middle schools was determined on the basis of a sample using all schools in the state; therefore, the regression analyses utilized by the Louisiana Department of Education were not recalculated. Instead, using the SPSS statistics program, the residual scores of the middle schools were standardized into z scores ($\mu = 0$, $\sigma = 1$). This procedure yielded a list of middle schools with standard scores which ranged from +3.07 to -3.07.

In examining the distribution of residual scores for the school year (SY) 1998-99 data and looking for matched pairs of schools, it was determined that residual scores of ±.67 yielded a sample large enough to select an adequate number of more effective/less effective schools. Residual scores of ±.67 represent the upper 25% of the distribution and the lower 25% of the distribution (Lomax, 1992). The upper and lower 25% of the distribution constitute an appropriate definition of an "intensity sample." The upper and lower 25% of the distribution also approximates cut-off points used to determine more effective/less effective schools in prior school effectiveness research (e.g., Lang, 1991;

5

Purkey & Smith, 1982; Scheerens, 1992). Following this line of thinking, middle schools with an SEI of ±.67 were examined for possible inclusion in the study sample.

The final sample of five matched pairs of middle schools is found in Table 1. A formal request was made in writing to the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction of the school system's Central Office in the district where the sample schools were located. The request outlined the research, its purpose, what schools in the district would be visited, which parties within each school would be contacted, and the method of that contact (i.e., interview, observation, and/or survey response). The request to conduct research also included where and in what manner the findings of the research study would be dispersed. All schools in Table 1 agreed to participate.

Table 1. Matched Pair Sample for the Study.

PAIR	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SIZE	MINORITY	SES	Z SCORE
1	Polar Flight	Northside	986	29.8%	54.6%	+.72
	Blackbird	Northside	543	16.7%	36.7%	-.71
2	Barnstorming	Waterside	558	10.3%	31.3%	+1.24
	Mir	Riverside	715	14.7%	37.6%	-1.86
3	Cargo	Eastside	400	14%	42%	+1.79
	Kamikaze	Westside	458	12.8%	49.8%	-1.65
4	Concorde	Southside	687	75.9%	44%	+.94
	Tupelov	Southside	686	67.2%	42%	-1.52
5	Stealth	Northside	940	54%	56.5%	+1.30
	Tailspin	Southside	697	67%	51%	-1.98

Phase One Data Collection

Research questions for Phase One data collection included:

1. What are the differences in the assistance and monitoring factors at more effective and less effective middle schools?

a. What is the level of administrative monitoring for beginning teachers at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

b. What are the differences in the hiring practices of the administration at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

c. What are the types of assistance given to beginning teachers at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

d. What is the role of the beginning teacher's mentor at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

Objectives for Phase One data collection set out to:

• examine the level of administrative monitoring received by the beginning teacher.

• examine the level of assistance received by the beginning teachers.

• detail the system of induction and the mentoring program provided by the school.

Sample selection for Phase One data collection involved interviews with administrators and mentors. The principal or administrator in charge of the induction and assessment process at each middle school (refer to Table 1 for school selection) comprised the sample intended to measure administrative monitoring. The mentors who were assigned to the beginning teachers in this study formed the sample intended to measure assistance.

Data were collected through interviews with the administrator of the school's induction program, normally the principal, and interviews with the mentor assigned to the beginning teacher. Data were unitized, categorized, and then analyzed using the constant-comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). An interview protocol was used to insure comprehensive interviews across schools. Questions were open ended and interviewees were probed to relate processes within the school which might contribute to the quality of the socialization experience.

Each site visit included an informal observation of the school operations. Overall observations of the school culture as a whole and the day-to-day rituals and dynamics of the school provided in-depth information of the system within which the new teacher worked. Data collected during observation of the school organization detailed the framework of the beginning teacher's socialization experience. Data were analyzed using the constant-comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1986) with particular interest in the similarities and differences in the organization and culture of more effective middle schools and less effective middle schools.

Phase Two Data Collection

Research questions for Phase Two included:

2. What are the beginning teachers' perceptions of the assistance, monitoring, and team building received during the socialization experience? Are these perceptions related to the beginning teachers' intent to stay in the field of education?

a. What are the differences in the beginning teachers' perceptions of quality and level of administrative monitoring received at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

b. What are the differences in the beginning teachers' perceptions of the quality and level of assistance received at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

c. What are the differences in the beginning teachers' perception of the quality and level of team building at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

d. Is the level of administrative monitoring related to the beginning teachers' intent to stay in the field of education?

e. Is the level of assistance given to the beginning teacher related to the beginning teachers' intent to stay in the field of education?

f. Is the amount of collegial team building related to the beginning teachers' intent to stay in the field of education?

Objectives in Phase Two set out to:

- gather data from the Beginning Teacher Questionnaire (BTQ) (Kirby, 1992) to examine beginning teachers' perceptions of the quality and level of assistance, monitoring and team building afforded to them during the socialization process.

- gather data from the Collegial Social Support Inventory (CSSI) (Angelle, 1999) to examine beginning teachers' perceptions of the quality and level of support received during the socialization process.

- gather data from the Teacher Intent to Stay Measure (TISM) (Angelle, 1999) to examine the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceptions of the quality and level of assistance, monitoring, and team building afforded to them during the socialization process and the beginning teachers' intention to stay in the field of education.

- confirm the reliability of the CSSI and the TISM from the pilot study.

All beginning teachers at the schools chosen for the sample of study (refer to Table 1 for school selection) were asked to complete the three survey instruments, then were asked if they would be willing to volunteer to participate in Phase Three of this study which would entail interviews with the beginning teachers.

Survey data were gathered from beginning teachers using three instruments: Beginning Teacher Questionnaire (BTQ) (Kirby, 1992), the Collegial Social Support Instrument (CSSI) (Angelle, 1999), and the Teacher Intent to Stay Measure (TISM) (Angelle, 1999). Two of the three instruments (CSSI, TISM) were new and determination of their reliability was a secondary goal of the study. The alpha reliability coefficients for both the CSSI ($\alpha = .87$; n = 43) and the TISM ($\alpha = .88$; n = 43) were acceptable for the data from this study (Gravetter & Wallnau, 1996).

Phase Three Data Collection

Phase Three research questions included:

3. What are the differences in the new teacher's perception of the processes within the school in more effective and less effective middle schools?

    a. What are the differences in the classroom performance of the beginning teachers at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

    b. What are the differences in the new teacher's perception of the assistance, monitoring, and team building received during the initial teaching experience at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

    c. What are the differences in the new teacher's perceptions of their intent to stay in the field of education at more effective and at less effective middle schools?

Objectives in Phase Three set out to:

- identify any differences in the components of effective teaching, including classroom management and instructional effectiveness, between beginning teachers at more effective middle schools and beginning teachers at less effective middle schools.

- probe, in-depth, beginning teachers' perceptions of the assistance, monitoring, and team-building received during the socialization experience.

- probe, in-depth, the beginning teacher's perceptions of those school process which will likely increase their intent to stay in the field of education.

Phase Three data were collected from several aspects of the beginning teacher's school experience (refer to Table 1 for school selection sample). Beginning teachers in the middle schools under study were observed in their classroom setting where data targeting the Components of Effective Teaching were collected. Interviews with those beginning teachers who volunteered to participate were also conducted to follow up from data collected during principal and mentor interviews. Moreover, interview probes were employed to elicit in-depth data.

Due to confidentiality concerns, administrators at the schools under study requested that special education classes not be part of the observations for the study. Many of the beginning teachers in the study were special education teachers. In an attempt at consistency and objectivity, two beginning teachers from each middle school under study were randomly chosen and solicited for permission to observe their teaching during two different class periods. Attempts were also made to observe classes with differing grade levels. Data from the observations were compiled using the scripting method, then transferred to the classroom observation instrument using the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (School Effectiveness and Assistance Program, 1999). The classroom performance indicates whether the new teacher works toward mastery of the components of effective teaching or whether the new teacher works toward management control with no goal of effective instructional strategies. Classroom observations of the beginning teachers provided information on effective instructional techniques (or the lack thereof) of the new teacher.

Data in this phase were also collected from beginning teacher interviews. Those beginning teachers who agreed to participate in this phase were interviewed in 30-45 minute blocks. Teachers were probed to outline their perceptions of the assistance, monitoring, and team building they received during their initial year of teaching. Data from interviews were analyzed using the constant-comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). Both a priori and emerging themes were examined to look for differences in the socialization experiences of beginning teachers at more effective and at less effective middle schools. Beginning teachers were interviewed to educe information regarding the needs, challenges, rewards, and successes of the initial years of teaching.

Findings

Phase Two Results: Survey Data

The BTQ measured the beginning teacher's perception of the subscales of assistance, monitoring, and team building, through subscales of the BTQ (Kirby, 1992). Beginning teachers in this sample perceived support in these three areas as generally very positive. The average for the full sample, that is, for teachers in both more effective and less effective schools ($\underline{n}$=45) was $\bar{x} = 43.4$. The most positive response for items on this 14 item Likert scale was 4; therefore, the highest possible mean was $\bar{x} = 56$.

Using the teacher as the unit of analysis, a MANOVA was calculated to determine whether beginning teachers in more effective schools differed in their perceptions of the socialization experience from novices in less effective schools. The overall multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated no difference (F (3, 41) = .905; p = n.s.). Following this, another MANOVA was run to determine if there was a difference in perception of socialization experiences with the school as the unit of analysis. Once again, no statistical significance was found. Scores on assistance, monitoring, and team building varied little in the more effective and less effective middle schools, as seen in Table 2. Therefore, responses to Phase Three research questions indicated no differences in beginning teachers' perception of assistance, monitoring, and team building in more effective and less effective schools. Collegial social support was also measured to determine whether beginning teachers perceived a difference in this area in more effective and less effective middle schools. Regardless of school type, teachers perceived social support to be strong. Using a Likert scale, with 4 indicating the highest level of support, the mean score for more effective and less effective schools was 95.5 and 94.16, respectively, out of a possible 120. A t-test indicated no statistical difference (t (1,41) = .468, p = n.s.) in teacher's perceptions of collegial social support at more effective and at less effective middle schools. Descriptive statistics for collegial social support indicate $\bar{x}$ = 95.53 (SD = 10.51) in more effective schools and $\bar{x}$ = 94.16 (SD = 8.03) in less effective schools.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Beginning Teacher Questionnaire Subscales.

	More Effective Schools (n=14)		Less Effective Schools (n=31)	
BTQ Subscale	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
Assistance	16.71	2.67	16.22	2.48
Monitoring	17.07	3.58	17.83	3.03
Team building	9.78	1.62	9.41	1.52

The final area of interest related to Phase Two of the study was to determine whether the assistance, monitoring, team building and collegial social support were related to a teacher's intent to stay in the field of education. Assistance, monitoring, and team building were used to predict intent to stay. Regression analysis indicated no statistical significance (r = .37, r^2 = .135, p = n.s.). Therefore, only 13.5% of the variance in intent to stay could be explained by a combination of assistance, monitoring, and team building.

A second regression combined the variable collegial social support with assistance, monitoring, and team building to determine the relationship of these variables to the beginning teachers' intent to stay in education. When collegial social support was included, 37% of the variance (r = .61, r^2 = .37, p < .05) in intent to stay could be explained. Therefore, the subscales of assistance, monitoring, and team building as measured in the BTQ predict teacher intent to stay when combined with collegial social support in this study.

A third regression was run to determine if the variable of collegial social support alone was related to a teacher's intent to stay in the field of education. Regression analysis indicated that 30% of the variance in intent to stay (r = .55, r^2 = .30, p < .05) could be explained. Therefore, collegial social support emerged as a significant predictor variable in a new teachers' intent to stay, whether singular or in combination with assistance, monitoring, and team building.

Three regressions were considered superior to using the stepwise method because of the inherent problems associated with stepwise regression. Thompson (1995) suggests three problems with the stepwise method which can be summarized as follows: (1) incorrect degrees of freedom in stepwise computations lead to inaccurate inferences; (2) stepwise methods greatly reflect sampling error and therefore, conclusions cannot be replicated in future research; (3) stepwise methods do not identify the best predictor variables in the set. Therefore, given the sample size of this study and the problems associated with stepwise analyses, linear regression analysis was considered superior.

Phase Three Results: Teaching Behaviors

Data measuring teaching behaviors of beginning teachers were gathered using the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET) instrument (School Effectiveness and Assistance Program, 1999). Observations were conducted in ten schools, five more effective and five less effective. Thirty seven regular classes (nineteen beginning teachers) were observed, seventeen in more effective schools and twenty in less effective schools. Beginning teachers were observed during the spring semester. Teachers who began teaching in the spring semester were not observed.

Scripting was used to record events during the instruction. The LCET, a measure of teacher effectiveness in the classroom was then completed on each observation. The instrument measures two domains: management and instruction. Each attribute of the domain is scored from 1 = 'Unsatisfactory' to 4 = 'Demonstrates Excellence.'

Upon initial contact with each school, several principals and teachers stated reservations about observations of special education classes, due to confidentiality constraints. Many of the beginning teachers were assigned to the special education classes, which initially eliminated several from the sample of observations. Considering this, as well as the number of teachers eliminated by a start date in January, it was determined that two teachers at each school would be observed two times each. In this way, each school would have a minimum of four classes observed. In addition, the reliability of the observations was increased by lowering the chance of observing teaching that was uncharacteristically good or bad for that teacher.

There were two exceptions to this. Overall study problems encountered at Concorde Middle School disallowed all but one observation. Problems were also encountered at Kamikaze Middle School, where four observations were conducted but only two were considered reliable, rather than the total of four. As a result, Concorde Middle School was eliminated from this phase of data analysis. In addition, only the two observations of the same teacher was included in the data analysis at Kamikaze Middle.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was calculated to determine whether beginning teachers in more effective schools differed in their teaching behaviors from beginning teachers in less effective schools using the teacher as the unit of analysis. The overall MANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference between the two (F (2,34) = 90.54; $p < .05$). The univariate Fs for both the management and instruction variables were also significant as indicated in Table 3. Another MANOVA was run to determine if there were differences in teaching behaviors with the school as the unit of analysis. Once again, there was a statistically significant difference (F (2,7) = 55.31; $p < .05$).

Therefore, responses to Phase Three research questions regarding differences in classroom performance indicated a significant difference in beginning teachers in more effective and less effective schools. Table 3 also presents the mean scores for the teachers in more effective and less effective schools, indicating that those in more effective schools are much better teachers.

Average scores were calculated with the individual teacher within each school as the unit of analysis and reported in Table 4. This descriptive data from the LCET provided even more pronounced differences in the more effective and less effective schools than that indicated by MANOVA.

Beginning teachers in more effective schools scored highest in the area of management on the organization of the classroom space to facilitate learning (3.9) and on the promotion of a positive learning climate (3.8). In the instructional domain, the components that "demonstrate excellence" provided evidence that these teachers consistently met the criteria for effective teaching. The teachers scored highest in presenting accurate subject matter (3.9), encouraging higher order thinking skills (3.9), and presenting the content at a developmentally appropriate level (3.9).

The average score in the Instructional Domain by teacher in more effective schools was 45.68 of a possible 52 on the thirteen indicators in the domain. In other words, by teacher, the average score was 3.49. A score of '3' on any indicator reflects an "area of strength" while a '4' reflects exceeding the standard.

The average score in the Instructional Domain in less effective schools was 21.55 of a possible 52 on the thirteen indicators in the domain. This translates, by teacher, to an average individual score of 1.66. A score of '1' reflects "unsatisfactory" demonstration of the indicator, while a '2' reflects an indicator that "needs improvement."

The Management Domain on the LCET measured six attributes of the classroom climate. The average score in the Management Domain in more effective schools was 21.625 of a possible 24.0 on the six indicators of management. By teacher, the average score was 3.60, indicating at least an "area of strength" for each indicator. The average score in the Management Domain in less effective schools was 12.11 of a possible 24.0 on the six indicators. By teacher, the average score was 2.0, indicating that the indicators "need improvement."

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Components of Effective Teaching.

Effectiveness Status		Management*	Instruction*
More Effective Schools	Mean	21.90	44.75
	Number of Observations	17	17
	Std. Deviation	1.51	2.31
Less Effective Schools	Mean	11.70	24.65
	Number of Observations	20	20
	Std. Deviation	1.77	5.29
Total All Schools	Mean	16.80	34.70
	Number of Observations	37	37
	Std. Deviation	5.59	11.27
Statistical Analysis	F (1,35)	111.91	165.30

*Note: Higher scores indicate a greater mastery of the component.

Beginning teachers in more effective schools scored lowest in the management domain on using monitoring techniques to facilitate learning (3.2). In the instructional domain, teachers in more effective schools scored lowest on adjusting the lesson, when appropriate (3.5).

Beginning teachers at less effective schools scored highest in the area of management in the organization of the classroom to facilitate learning (2.6). In the area of instruction, these teachers scored highest in demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively with students (2.9) and presenting accurate subject matter (2.76).

Beginning teachers at less effective schools scored lowest in the area of management in managing routines and transitions in a timely manner (1.5). In the instructional domain, teachers at less effective schools scored lowest in adjusting the lesson when appropriate (1.28) and in the promotion of higher order thinking skills (1.11).

Quantitative data in this study produced findings which prompted more questions than answers. Results addressed all research questions asked. However, results were not as expected.

While I thought the perceptions of beginning teachers at more effective schools regarding their assistance, monitoring, and team building during the initial year would produce results vastly different from those teachers at less effective schools, actual data indicated no difference. While initially surprising, upon further reflection, this can partially be explained by the negative impact of LaTAAP on the resources of the middle schools and by the positive results of the implementation of interdisciplinary teaming.

Table 4. Average Scores by School on Components of Effective Teaching.

Pair	Schools		Management	Instruction
1	Polar Flight	Mean	24.0	47.25
		Std Deviation	0.0	1.5
	Blackbird	Mean	11.25	32.
		Std Deviation	1.25	5.22
2	Barnstorming	Mean	21.0	44.7
		Std Deviation	2.44	1.5
	Mir	Mean	14.7	27.5
		Std Deviation	2.21	1.0
3	Cargo	Mean	21.0	45.75
		Std Deviation	2.44	1.5
	Kamikaze	Mean (n=2)*	15.0	27.5
		Std Deviation	0.0	3.5
4	Concorde	Mean (n=1)**	N/A	N/A
		Std Deviation	N/A	N/A
	Tupelov	Mean	10.25	23.75
		Std Deviation	1.25	5.22
5	Stealth	Mean	20.5	45.0
		Std Deviation	4.12	4.24
	Tailspin	Mean	10.75	18.25
		Std Deviation	3.86	3.77
All Schools (more effective)		Mean	21.625	45.68
		Std Deviation	2.80	2.44
All Schools (less effective)		Mean	12.11	21.55
		Std. Deviation	2.84	5.58

Unexpected results were also found in the lack of significance of assistance, monitoring, and team building as predictors of intent to stay in education. However, the significance of collegial social support as a predictor of intent to stay may also be explained through the emphasis on and success of interdisciplinary teaming, as well as new teacher reliance on informal mentoring by veterans.

Clearly, the greatest difference in beginning teachers in more effective and less effective schools was demonstrated in the area of effective teaching. In both management and instruction, teachers in more effective schools outperformed teachers in less effective schools. Teachers in more effective schools held higher expectations for their students and more often encouraged higher order thinking skills in their students. While teachers in less effective schools communicated well with their students, they held low expectations for student performance and had difficulty in managing routines and transitions. This, in turn, led to a failure to present material at a developmentally appropriate level.

Organizational Processes

As part of the data collection, beginning teachers who volunteered to do so were interviewed regarding their perceptions of assistance, monitoring, and team building. Two elements of the organizational processes emerged which bear explanation. An understanding of the middle school concept of interdisciplinary teaming and the procedures advocated by Harry Wong is called for as beginning teachers pointed to these as impacting their successful socialization experience.

Middle School Concept of Interdisciplinary Teaming. Interdisciplinary teaming is commonly associated with the middle school level. Teams of two to five teachers, normally representing core disciplines (language arts, social studies, math, and science), share the same group of students, have a common planning time and teaching schedule, and are located in the same area of the school building (Erb, 1997; Manning & Saddlemire, 2000). Though team roles and responsibilities vary by school, effective teams usually emphasize caring, respect, and success (Manning & Saddlemire, 2000).

Research on the teaming concept (Lee & Smith, 1993) has concluded that students in teamed settings were more engaged and less bored, more often completed their homework, and were less likely to be aggressive. In this same study, students in schools which were more teamed and less departmentalized scored higher on standardized achievement tests in both math and reading. Teachers also garnered benefits from being members of teams. A sense of collegiality gave teachers a more positive outlook on teaching which led to an increase in teacher efficacy and a more positive professional self-image (Erb, 1997).

Not all middle schools in this study utilized the middle school concept of teaming (n=5) and, of those which did, three were less effective schools. However, as noted in the case studies, for those new teachers who worked at schools embracing this concept, teams played a substantial role in their socialization experiences in terms of collegiality and social support.

First Year Procedures Advocated by Harry Wong. Harry Wong, a former high school science teacher, is the author of The First Days of School, a book based on Dr. Wong's lectures on the importance of classroom management (Starr, 1999). Wong focuses on classroom management as a key to student achievement, positing that classroom routine and procedures ensure that students know what is expected of them. Procedures are vital because children cannot learn in chaos (Starr, 1999).

Several major concepts are discussed in Wong's book, including some of the following: (1) start each class with an assignment, rather than by calling roll; (2) position yourself near the students because problems are proportional to distance; (3) rehearse procedures with the students until they become routines; (4) ask a question after 10 sentences then wait five or more seconds for responses after asking a question; and (5) you can have achievement or you can have excuses (Wong & Wong, 1998).

Not all beginning teachers interviewed referred to the work of Dr. Wong. However, some of the new teachers interviewed for this study reported Wong's work as part of their teacher preparation program or as a part of the school system's induction. Those teachers who reported reading his book and utilizing his concepts also reported more success in first year classroom management.

13

Metaphors in Qualitative Research

Patton (1990) and others (e.g. Eisner, 1998) have called for the use of metaphors to summarize complex sets of situations, behaviors, and patterns. Metaphors are used as a way of "communicating the connotative meanings of analytic categories" (Patton, 1990, p. 400). Powerful and clever metaphors can convey meanings with a single phrase. Throughout the case studies from this research, a metaphorical name was given to the schools and, in the cross case analysis, to the new teachers and appropriate others.

Teachers, upon graduation from their university preparation program, are flying high. These teachers enter the school system idealistic and ready to impact the lives of children. Once assigned to their crew (the faculty) and led by a pilot (the principal) and a navigator (the mentor), the beginning teacher is prepared to take flight. The resulting socialization experiences of that first year greatly depend on the flight plan of the aircraft to which the new teacher is assigned, the collegiality and support of the crew, and the leadership of the pilot and navigator.

Multiple Schools Qualitative Analysis

Analysis of all schools in the sample took place in two cycles. Interviews of principals, mentors, and beginning teachers were first unitized and categorized (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) with a priori themes by school context. General a priori themes included: mentoring assistance, administrative monitoring, collegial team building, and effective instruction. More specific a priori themes included: challenges facing the new teacher, successes of the new teacher (or key to success from interviews with administrators and mentors), teacher intent to stay, and, in those schools which implement teaming, the perception of interdisciplinary teaming.

Through the process of analysis, additional themes emerged that were manifested across cases and contexts. These themes provide insight in to the overall socialization experiences of beginning teachers. The emerging themes deal with the role played by various aspects of the socialization experience. These include: the role of the principal, the role of the assigned mentor, and the role of the university preparation program.

General A Priori Themes

General a priori themes for all schools in the sample are documented in Table 5. A discussion of these themes as observed in all samples follows.

Mentoring Assistance. Schools across contexts in Louisiana are required to assign official state trained mentors to beginning teachers. While all schools in the sample adhered to this requirement, the level of mentoring assistance and the vigor with which mentoring was provided differed greatly by school context.

Official mentors in less effective schools were more likely to view their role as one limited to state mandated paperwork and observations. Of those mentors in less effective schools who ventured beyond the minimum duties of the program, that role was a passive one, restricting themselves to introducing the new teachers to the rest of the faculty or to disseminating information to the novices about workshops or programs which the beginner had the option to investigate, if interested.

The two less effective schools in Southside Parish had the least effective schoolwide mentoring programs. Only one of the eight new teachers at Tupelov was assigned an official mentor and he stated that he would approach the principal for questions or concerns before he would go to his mentor. Only one of five new teachers at Tailspin was assigned an official mentor. Seven months after school began, this new teacher reported that her only contact with the mentor was an introduction. The four new teachers at Tailspin who were not assigned a mentor also were not familiar with the state's teacher assessment program.

Four of the five more effective schools had a proactive, vigorous mentoring program at their schools. Polar Flight was the exception to this. The other four schools, however, had programs designed to address the whole person of the new teacher. Mentors at the more effective schools were more likely to offer moral support, counseling, and serve as a "sounding board" to the new teachers. More frequent meetings with mentees, particularly in the first few months

of school, were more common at more effective schools than at less effective schools. Mentors at more effective schools were also more likely to address issues beyond the scope of the state assessment, such as conduct during a parent/teacher conference, how to set up a roll book, and classroom management.

Table 5. General A Prior Themes for Multiple Schools.

PR	SCHOOL	STATUS*	MENTORING ASSISTANCE	ADMINISTRATIVE MONITORING	COLLEGIAL TEAM BUILDING	EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION
1	Barnstorming	ME	↑	↑	↑	↑
	Mir	LE	→	↓	→	↓
2	Polar Flight	ME	→	↑	→	↑
	Blackbird	LE	↓	↓	→	↓
3	Cargo	ME	↑	↑	↑	↑
	Kamikaze	LE	→	↓	↑	↓
4	Concorde	ME	↑	→	↑	↑
	Tupelov	LE	↓	↓	↓	↓
5	Stealth	ME	↑	→	↑	↑
	Tailspin	LE	↓	↓	↓	↓

*ME = More Effective; LE = Less Effective
Legend: Effective: ↑   Ineffective: ↓   Holding Steady: →

Monitoring. Like official mentors, administrators, most often the principal, are also required to monitor instruction of the beginning teachers. All schools reported fulfilling this expectation. However, like the mentoring aspect, the quality of the monitoring varied by school context.

Principals in less effective schools were more likely to carry out the minimum number of required observations for the district and state. Observations at the less effective schools were more likely to fulfill state requirements rather than to facilitate instructional effectiveness. Two other aspects of monitoring, quality of feedback and attitude toward the state assessment program, were manifested in the study.

Three of the five principals in less effective schools only gave positive feedback, as reported by the new teachers. Encouraging words, rather than a critique followed observations. Some feedback from observations came in the form of pep talks. One principal did not provide feedback at all. His view was that if something needed to be addressed he would do so immediately. He monitored by "no news is good news."

Monitoring from more effective schools included frequent visits to teacher's classrooms, both formal and informal. Principals in more effective schools were more likely to advocate "walk through" visits, also called "pop ins" or "popcorns." These visits lasted from one minute to ten minutes, with a cursory but thorough look at lesson plans and student engagement. Feedback was immediate and, likely, in writing. New teachers, often intimidated initially, grew comfortable with these visits. Beginners at more effective schools reported inviting the principal to visit their classes and students anticipated "showing off" for the principal. Feedback from one administrator took the form of reflection, a method the new teachers appreciated as one which motivated them to objectively view their instruction.

Principals at more effective schools were also more likely to be viewed as open to new ideas and new instructional techniques. One principal utilized school wide faculty email to both solicit and share ideas from teachers. Another principal operated through shared decision making, a policy which empowered the new teachers to view themselves as professionals as well as instilling them with confidence in their abilities.

Team Building. New teachers across school contexts reported some type of collegial team building. However, the form of the team building varied.

New teachers at less effective schools which incorporated teaming (Mir and Tupelov) depended on team members for support, while new teachers at Tailspin relied on themselves, feeling free to ask other faculty for help but receiving nothing from them voluntarily. Team building at Kamikaze was more social (Ladies Night Suppers); however, the social support was limited to those who "fit in." New teachers reported that those who did not take the advice of veterans were ostracized and some veterans viewed the novices as incompetent. Blackbird was the exception for the less effective schools. New teachers perceived a strong level of team building there, believing that the faculty, as a whole, takes care of the novices.

More effective schools were more likely to have supportive and friendly faculties. One new teacher at Concorde reported that the faculty was the reason she chose to stay at Concorde. Informal mentors were numerous and readily provided resources as well as social support.

Effective Instruction. Teachers in more effective schools were more likely to demonstrate the components of effective teaching in their instruction than were teachers in less effective schools. Teachers in more effective schools were more likely to incorporate elements of higher order thinking skills and to encourage student participation. Transitions were more expeditious and higher expectations were established for those teachers in more effective schools.

Teachers in less effective schools, overall, demonstrated the ability to effectively communicate with their students but were less likely to involve the students in class participation. Teachers in less effective schools were more likely to hold low expectations for their students and rely on knowledge and comprehension questions. Teachers in both more effective and less effective schools faced challenges in monitoring techniques.

Specific A Priori Themes

Table 6 illustrates the differences in the specific a priori themes found from all schools in the study. This table outlines frequency of mentions by teacher for the challenges and successes at all schools in the study. Teacher intent to stay is indicated by number of teachers. Not all teachers responded to all items. Interdisciplinary teaming and level of support are indicated by the general view of all new teachers at each school who were interviewed for this study. Those schools which do not implement interdisciplinary teaming are shaded.

Intent to Stay. Collegial social support was a variable predicting a new teacher's intent to stay in education. This, along with overall school processes as perceived by the new teacher, led to the novice expressing an intention to continue in the field of education. New teachers at more effective schools were more likely to express an intention to remain in teaching (93.7%) than were teachers at less effective schools (62.9%). Reasons reported for an intention to leave included money, a lack of professionalism, and a view that teaching was temporary until a better opportunity presented itself.

Support for the New Teacher. Overall support which includes colleagues, mentor, administration, parents, and the community at large was rare in the ten schools under study. Only three schools in the study could claim overall support.

New teachers at six of the ten schools perceived there was some form of support. Teachers at Kamikaze, and Tupelov perceived that support from their colleagues. Teachers at Mir, Polar Flight, and Blackbird received support from both their colleagues and their principal. Along with colleagues and the principal, teachers at Stealth also turned to their mentor. However, they perceived very little support from the parents and the community at large. Beginning teachers at Tailspin did not perceive any measure of support from any of these areas.

Challenges of the Beginning Teacher. School context was not related to perceptions of the beginning teachers regarding first year challenges. Across contexts, classroom management was more often reported as the greatest challenge facing new teachers. Thirteen of twenty seven (48%) of beginning teachers in less effective schools named discipline as a challenge as did seven of sixteen (44%) of teachers in more effective schools. Moreover, three administrators in less effective schools and one administrator in a more effective school also stated classroom management as a challenge for new teachers. Other challenges mentioned more than once were paperwork, survival, and establishing a rapport with students.

Table 6. Specific A Priori Themes for Multiple Schools.

PAIR	SCHOOL	STATUS*	SUPPORT			GREATEST CHALLENGE		GREATEST SUCCESS		INTERDIS-CIPLINARY TEAMS		INTENT TO STAY		
			Overall support	Some support	No support	Discipline	Other	Student Success	Other	Profess/collegial	Structural concept	Intend to Stay	Intend to Leave	Intend to Stay but not at present school
1	Barnstorming	ME	X			2	2	3	1	X		4	0	0
	Mir	LE		X		3	1	3	1		X	2	2	0
2	Polar Flight	ME		X		2	2	1	3			4	0	0
	Blackbird	LE		X		2	2	1	1			3	0	0
3	Cargo	ME	X			1	1	1	1			2	0	0
	Kamikaze	LE		X		3	4	0	4		X	3	2	2
4	Concorde	ME	X			1	1	1	1	X		2	0	0
	Tupelov	LE		X		6	2	2	6		X	5	3	0
5	Stealth	ME		X		1	3	0	4			3	1	0
	Tailspin	LE			X	2	3	0	5			3	2	1
All Schools														
All schools		ME	3	2	0	7	9	6	10	2	0	15	1	0
All schools		LE	0	4	1	16	12	6	17	0	3	15	8	4

*ME= More Effective; LE= Less Effective

Success. First year successes were also reported across contexts. Viewing success in their students was listed most often as a yardstick for the new teacher's personal success (seven teachers in less effective schools, or 27%, and five teachers in more effective schools, or 31%). Also reported as an indication of success was establishing a rapport with students. Rapport was mentioned more often in less effective urban fringe schools while student success was mentioned more often in more effective urban fringe schools.

Interdisciplinary Teaming. Five of the ten schools implemented the middle school concept of interdisciplinary teaming. Of the five schools, three were less effective (Kamikaze, Tupelov, and Mir) and two were more effective (Barnstorming and Concorde). The contrasts between the two lay in the perception of teaming as a structural concept (less effective) or as a means to professional development and effective instruction (more effective).

The less effective schools viewed teaming as a block schedule format. As part of this organizational schedule, teachers were grouped with other core teachers, all with the same group of students. Kamikaze eliminated school bells and allowed the teams to decide when to change classes. While the school had a general guideline for class times, the teachers had the option to hold the students longer or release them from class earlier, determined by teacher need. This convenience in the lengthening or shortening of class periods to allow students to finish tests or projects was an added benefit of the schedule, according to the teachers. Teachers at Mir and Kamikaze credited the team with their induction and relied on the teams for social support. Drawbacks to teaming were found at Tupelov where new teachers complained of poor treatment by other team members and the long class periods associated with teaming.

Teachers at more effective schools held a different perception of teaming. Though scheduling was a part of the teaming effort, the main benefit, according to the teachers at Barnstorming, was an opportunity for professional development and research. Learning teams gave the new teachers insights into instructional strategies and the ability to gather data from these strategies. Teachers at Concorde credited the teams with help in classroom management, implementing higher order thinking skills into their lesson plans, and social support.

Emerging Themes
 The general themes of assistance, monitoring, and team building, along with the specific themes of intent to stay, challenges, successes, and interdisciplinary teaming produced results which delineated differences between more effective and less effective schools. However, data analysis produced additional themes, not initially sought. Themes which emerged as a result of data analysis focus on the various roles played by parts of the school organization as they impact the socialization experiences of beginning teachers. These include: the role of the principal, the role of the mentor, and the role of the university preparation program.
 The Role of the Principal. Analysis of the role of the principal in the socialization experience resulted in a clear delineation between more effective and less effective schools. Those principals in the more effective schools are focused. Those in the less effective schools are either frenzied, fractured, or floaters.
 Across school contexts, principals in more effective schools rarely sit behind their desks. These principals move down the hallways, into classrooms, and out on to the playground. Their focus is on every aspect of the school, ensuring that every member of the school community is also focused on the mission of increasing student achievement in an orderly atmosphere. During transition time between classes, these administrators are in the hallways monitoring and greeting, while, at the same time, ensuring that students are moving rapidly to their next learning experience.
 Principals in effective schools are focused on bringing together a committed faculty through recruiting or through interview techniques geared to this selection. Input from other faculty ensures that a common vision for potential faculty exists. Once employed, principals in more effective schools go beyond the minimal instructional monitoring required by the state. Their monitoring is frequent, often unannounced, and invariably followed by thought-provoking feedback for the novice.
 Beginning teachers in effective schools clearly understand the emphasis placed on effective instruction by their principals. New and creative instructional strategies are encouraged, as long as the end result is focused on an increase in student achievement. Beginning teachers understand that they are a valued part of the school community because their input and ideas are accepted and often shared with other faculty. Support from these principals includes, but often extends beyond, social support. Teachers in effective schools are supported in their decisions regarding classroom management and challenges from the public.
 The focus on excellence in the classroom permeates throughout the schools and in to the surrounding community. Beginning teachers in these schools enlarge their efforts as they, too, focus on the vision of the principal for their students. As the novice teachers are socialized into a school culture of excellence in education, they, like their principal, are "all about the kids," with a focus on achievement.
 Principals in less effective schools fell in to three categories: the floater, the frenzied, and the fractured. As they fell, so did their beginning teachers.
 The floater in this study was a friendly administrator, easy going and well liked. The floater "goes with the flow" and, according to the novices, is a "laid back" manager. Freely admitting that he has no say in the hiring of teachers, he accepts the faculty that the school district sends to him without question. The school somewhat operates itself, with no bells and a very powerful mentor, one who, according to one new teacher, handles the incorrigible students that the principal cannot handle. The other floater principal drifted in to school in the morning with no explanation, greeting everyone and in no hurry to begin the work day.
 The majority of the faculty appeared to personally like the floater but few viewed him/her as a leader. Facets of the socialization experience which are normally viewed as important are overlooked by this principal, such as forgetting to assign a mentor to a new teacher or limiting classroom visits to once a semester, often with no follow up feedback. Frequently seen at the after school "Miller Time"(called so, because at these informal gatherings, the principal invariably said, "Boy, I could use a Miller beer about now.") in the commons area of the school, one of these principals was observed telling stories and laughing at the end of the school day, rather than monitoring students in

18

the bus area. Another *floater* had a matronly air and the beginners turned to her, rather than the mentor, for social support. Novices felt comfortable working for her.

For those beginning teachers who desire an instructional leader, the *floater* is a source of frustration. Searching out instruction and management advice from colleagues, some novices diligently work while observing that other novices teach only for the state assessment, spending the remainder of their class periods "behind their desk counting out money for their fundraiser." These beginners believe their principal "lets things slip by" and therefore, conversations and behavior unbecoming to a professional educator become the norm. For some of the new teachers, their frustration quickly grew into resentment. Other new teachers become a part of the culture of drifting and begin to float through the year as well.

The *frenzied* principal has a diametrically opposed work style. In a constant state of upheaval, she is always behind, always in crisis, always on edge. The rigid posture and clenched jaw are physical manifestations of the pressurized atmosphere in which this principal perceives she works.

Managing with an external locus of control, the *frenzied* principal calls teacher selection a "crap shoot" and is never certain whether a teacher will continue in employment, once hired. Suspicious of the applicants, she accepts that the truth will be stretched during the selection interview. Induction of novices is delegated to the mentor, a teacher overwhelmed by yearbook advising and special education lead teacher duties.

Beginning teachers either like or fear the *frenzied* administrator but the atmosphere of pressure and suffocating duties transfer to the new teacher. The novices who work in this atmosphere become acculturated to living in a pressure suit and, likewise, are thrown in to frenzies by paperwork and events out of the norm. Under the guidance of the *frenzied* principal, the school community becomes one which is acted upon, rather than acting.

A third type of principal which emerged from this study was the *fractured* administrator. Both of the fractured principals were employed by the same school district, a district, which has experienced several breaks in the recent past, including, but not limited to, white flight, superintendent turnover, teacher dissatisfaction, and dismal local funding. These problems in a fractured district may have filtered down to the office of the principals, who also appeared broken by problems in their schools.

The schools which were led by *fractured* principals were characterized by little discipline; therefore, time which the principals spent disciplining students was time taken away from monitoring and supporting beginning teachers. Classrooms in these schools had little or no instruction taking place and in those classes where teachers were attempting instruction, students were often observed disengaged or off task.

Schools managed by the *fractured* principals had the largest numbers of new teachers in the study. These new teachers reported little support from administrators or from colleagues. Communication was poor between the teachers and the administrators with teachers often discovering that they were uninformed about deadlines or upcoming events. Moreover, the viewpoint of the teachers and the *fractured* administrator were inconsistent; thus, little data triangulation was found in these schools. Many of these new teachers were teaching out of their area of expertise and more uncertified teachers were found at these schools than at any other.

Role of the Mentor. All schools across contexts had at least one faculty member trained by the state's Department of Education and assigned as the official mentor. Beginning teachers in all schools also turned to other faculty for professional and social support who were willing to serve as unofficial mentors. While informal mentors played a role in the socialization of new teachers across school contexts, this discussion centers on the officially trained and assigned mentors.

The Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program Mentor Training Manual (LaTAAP) (Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program, 1997) outlines three basic roles of the mentor, along with the responsibilities of each of these roles. A generalized summary of the roles is as follows:

- Coach
  - analyzes new teacher's instructional process and performance
  - expands and applies repertoire of instruction and management
  - conducts advisory interviews and observations with feedback for the assessment program
- Model
  - models effective instruction
  - guides management of professional responsibilities

          O provides encouragement and support
- Professional Development Specialist
    - O helps new teacher analyze and resolve problems
    - O directs new teacher to resources
    - O helps formulate Professional Development Plan for new teacher
    - O assists new teacher in analyzing student performance data and student records to plan instruction

Analysis of data regarding beginning teacher's perceptions of their mentoring experiences revealed that, while the job description was identical across contexts, the mentors themselves held differing attitudes toward what they believed was required of them and what they perceived the novices needed from them. While the source of the attitude or perception differed by school, generally the official mentors fell into three categories. Four of the five more effective schools had mentors who offered *maxi*mum support to the novices (Barnstorming, Cargo, Concorde, and Stealth). Three of the five less effective schools and one more effective school had mentors who offered *mini*mum support to the novices (Mir, Blackbird, Kamikaze, and Polar Flight). The two less effective schools in Southside Parish (Tupelov and Tailspin) had mentors who were missing in action (*MIA*) for the beginning teachers. There were commonalities in each group.

With the exception of Polar Flight, mentors in the more effective schools generally addressed all areas (coach, model, professional development specialist), viewing their role as one of *maxi*mum support. Mentors at the more effective schools saw their responsibilities beyond preparing the new teacher for the assessment at the conclusion of their second semester. They viewed their duties as addressing the whole person of the beginner. This overall approach to mentoring was a "hands on" approach which targeted instruction, classroom management, resources, and general encouragement. These mentors did not wait for the novice to approach them but sought out the new teacher and offered help and resources.

Contact with the new teacher was frequent and interactive. The mentors targeted upcoming events such as report cards or parent teacher conferences, helping to prepare the beginner through dissemination of information or through role-playing. This was a proactive approach to induction; that is, rather than solving problems after they occur, the mentor addressed upcoming responsibilities of the new teacher and attempted to educate the novice to situations prior to the development of problems.

Mentors in more effective schools were more likely to take on the role of social support. One of the responsibilities listed under the role of "Model" was that of encouragement and support. The LaTAAP Mentor Training Manual states, "the mentor must be a confidant and friend as well as a resource and developer" (p.3). This role was not observed as a common one at the less effective schools. The task of nurturing the new teacher was more often undertaken by those mentors in effective schools. One teacher reported that two years after her assessment, she still turned to the school's mentor for counseling and advice.

Mentors at more effective schools took on all three roles of mentoring, the coach, the model and the professional development specialist. In doing so, the beginning teacher received moral support, resources, assistance in the formulation of a Professional Development Plan, as well as coaching in preparation for the final assessment. This approach is a *maxi*mized approach to mentoring and was found in more effective schools, regardless of whether interdisciplinary teaming was implemented at the school.

Mentors at less effective schools were more likely to limit their role to that of "coach"; that is, these mentors were more likely to singularly address the role of assessment preparation. The LaTAAP Mentor Training Manual warns against taking this narrow approach by stating that

> The mentor is not responsible for the new teacher's performance in the assessment process. The
> mentor can and should help the new teacher prepare for that process, but the mentor's responsibility
> is to help him/her become a competent, confident teacher (p.6).

Beginning teachers at the less effective schools whose mentors took this *mini*mum approach to their role were forced to seek informal mentors. The informal mentors were sometimes found on grade level teams (Kamikaze, Mir) or, in the case of those schools which did not incorporate teaming (Polar Flight and Blackbird) to department coordinators or veteran teachers who were in close proximity. The veteran teachers who were tagged as the informal mentors were perceived by the new teachers as willing to answer questions, provide information, or point out resources. However, new teachers also reported that information was rarely volunteered; it had to be sought out by the beginner.

Beginning teachers reported that the "hands off" approach resulted in minimal contact with the mentor, often only for LaTAAP observations or to complete the paperwork required for the assessment. New teachers who found themselves with a *min*imum mentor, overall, did not perceive the situation in negative terms, but instead credited conflicting schedules, differing certifications between mentor and mentee, or the additional duties assigned to the mentor which made interaction with the new teacher difficult. Moreover, the importance of successfully completing the assessment loomed large for the new teachers; thus, limiting the mentor's role to assessment preparation was not viewed in a negative light by the novices.

A third category of mentors are those which are "missing in action" (*MIA*). Two of the less effective schools, Tailspin and Tupelov, both located in Southside Parish, had official mentors but who, according to the statements of the new teachers, were not assigned to mentor them. Only one of the eight new teachers at Tupelov was assigned an official mentor and he stated that his comfort level with the mentor was minimal. He reported going to the principal for needed support and information, rather than the mentor. Only one new teacher at Tailspin of the five novices had been assigned a mentor and was going through the assistance/assessment process. Other new teachers at Tailspin did not know who the school's mentor was, when asked.

Beginning teachers at Tupelov and Tailspin could not articulate what LaTAAP was but reported that they had been observed by the principal (Tupelov) and assistant principal (Tailspin). Mentors at both schools stated that assigned obligations prevented them from optimally fulfilling their duties as mentors. Information regarding the responsibility for the failure to assign a mentor to the new teachers was vague. Thus, beginners at two of the less effective schools completed their first year with mentors who were *MIA*.

Role of the University Preparation Program. Interviews with principals, mentors, and beginning teachers found dissatisfaction with teacher education preparation programs. Across school contexts there was agreement that universities do not prepare students for what will greet them in the "real world" of teaching. Only one school from the ten in the sample (Cargo) expressed satisfaction with the preparation program of the new teachers on staff.

Three problems with university preparation programs surfaced during data analysis, though all concerns are interrelated. One problem focused on the training the pre-service teachers receive in classroom management. Though one university offers a one-hour course in discipline methods, in general, students do not receive practical experience. Another university was faulted because the impetus of the curriculum and instruction courses was on creativity and fun in instruction. Beginning teachers reported that they quickly discovered that fun in instruction translated into chaos until a firm classroom management plan was in place. One new teacher noted that the content of the classroom management course was as much about bulletin boards as it was about discipline.

A second concern of those interviewed centered around student teaching. Related to the concerns about being unprepared to discipline students, fault was found with the experience of student teaching itself. Students are normally placed in schools with student populations much unlike the student populations to which first year teachers are assigned. If there is a discipline problem in the classroom during student teaching, the supervising teacher in the back of the room quickly addresses it. There was general agreement that the student teaching experience was too controlled. According to one principal, university professors "teach as if all students come from good homes with good values" and therefore, new teachers don't know how to deal with students who don't care. One mentor expressed concerns about the selection of supervising teachers. She noted that the same supervising teachers are chosen year after year and not all are effective teachers, particularly, "as they look at retirement."

A final concern, related to the previous discussion, is that universities do not prepare education majors for "the real world." One assistant principal stated that "universities teach techniques and theory and in schools you get behavior problems with social and emotional issues." Incorporating theory with classroom practices should be addressed at the pre-service level, not at a two day workshop given by the school district at the start of the initial year of teaching. In addition, several beginning teachers stated they were unprepared for the time that teaching involved, time beyond the classroom, which included grading papers, preparing for class, attending meetings and workshops, filling out district and state paperwork, and sponsoring activities assigned by the principal.

As can be seen from Table 13, the emerging themes outline some commonalities. More effective schools are more likely to have an effective principal and mentor, a team whose vision for the school incorporates successful socialization with student achievement. Less effective schools, on the other hand, are more likely to have an ineffective or missing mentor who, teamed with an "out of focus" principal, provide a less than smooth socialization experience for their new teachers.

School personnel who agreed to be interviewed expressed the hope that universities will address these concerns, stating that doing so might mean that challenges faced by new teachers might be solved before the initial year begins. Those principals and teachers familiar with the Holmes programs enthusiastically endorsed it, noting that teachers who graduated from that program were more self-confident and better prepared to deal with the real world of teaching.

Results from Multiple Schools

Analysis of qualitative data found patterns both by and across contexts. Organizational processes and roles of the members of the school community reveal a picture of a negative socialization experience and a positive one. Summary results of analysis can be found in Table 7. Contextual variables in the organizational processes of the schools are outlined by their presence in more effective, less effective, or, in some cases, in both more and less effective schools. Table 8 allows comparison across contexts of those findings from this study.

Table 7. Emerging Themes for Multiple Schools.

Pair	School	Status*	ROLE OF PRINCIPAL	ROLE OF MENTOR	ROLE OF PREP PROGRAM
1	Barnstorming	ME	Focus	Max	Dissatisfied
	Mir	LE	Floater	Min	Dissatisfied
2	Polar Flight	ME	Focus	Min	Dissatisfied
	Blackbird	LE	Frenzied	Min	Dissatisfied
3	Cargo	ME	Focus	Max	Satisfied
	Kamikaze	LE	Floater	Min	Dissatisfied
4	Concorde	ME	Focus	Max	Dissatisfied
	Tupelov	LE	Fractured	MIA	Dissatisfied
5	Stealth	ME	Focus	Max	Dissatisfied
	Tailspin	LE	Fractured	MIA	Dissatisfied

*ME = More Effective; LE = Less Effective

Table 8. Comparisons of Variables across Contexts.

VARIABLE	MORE EFFECTIVE	LESS EFFECTIVE	BOTH MORE AND LESS EFFECTIVE
Official mentors	Proactive and vigorous in their mentoring	Passive in their mentoring	
	Mentors the "whole person" of the new teacher, providing professional, resource, and social support	Views their role as one limited to LaTAAP paperwork and observations	
Principals	Frequently visits teacher's classrooms, both formally and informally	Carries out the minimum number of required observations for district and state compliance	

VARIABLE	MORE EFFECTIVE	LESS EFFECTIVE	BOTH MORE AND LESS EFFECTIVE
	Provides written feedback targeting both strengths and weaknesses, and often, in the form of reflection	Provides either no feedback or feedback which is limited to positive comments	
Principals	Views role as an instructional leader, open to new ideas and new instructional techniques, with the goal of student achievement.	Either takes a passive role in school operations or is so burdened by school pressures that external locus of control is the deciding factor in decision making.	
	Focus is on the mission of increasing student achievement in an orderly atmosphere	Focus is on management or, in some cases, has no articulated mission	
	Selects new teachers who are committed to the vision of the principal and the mission of the school	Selects new teachers based on who is sent from the central office to fill a position	
Interdisciplinary teaming	If no teaming, depended on official mentors or informal mentors for social support	If no teaming, depended on themselves or informal mentors for social support	If incorporated teaming, depended on team members for social support
	If incorporated, viewed as a means to professional development and effective instruction	If incorporated, viewed as a structural or scheduling concept	
Intent to stay	More likely to express an intention to remain in teaching	Less likely to express an intention to remain in teaching	
Components of instruction	New teachers demonstrated components of effective teaching in their instruction, particularly higher order thinking skills, high expectations for students, and expeditious transition times	New teachers, in their instruction, held low expectations for their students, were less likely to involve students in class participation, and relied on recall or comprehension type questions	
Challenges			New teachers more often reported classroom management

VARIABLE	MORE EFFECTIVE	LESS EFFECTIVE	BOTH MORE AND LESS EFFECTIVE
Successes			New teachers more often reported student successes as their own
View of the Profession			New teachers viewed t h e m s e l v e s a s professionals
University Teacher Preparation Programs			Programs fail to adequately prepare new teachers to successfully manage classrooms
			Programs fail to prepare new teachers for the "real world" of teaching
			Student teaching is not a profitable experience

Discussion and Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study. The first conclusion is that four year pre-service university programs are not adequately preparing student teachers for the realities of today's classrooms. Inadequate classroom management preparation leaves the new teacher struggling to survive the "real world" of teaching and learning. The gap between theory and practice is not adequately bridged by university professors or student teaching programs with the result that a new teacher is well versed in theories of learning but unable to translate these theories into effective classroom practice. In those schools which provide professional, instructional, and social support, members of the school community state that if novices were adequately prepared, the time and resources of the school could be used for other aspects of teacher socialization.

An additional conclusion from the study is that interdisciplinary teaming, if implemented to increase professional and collegial development, can substantially aid new teachers during the socialization process. If interdisciplinary teaming is viewed as a structural concept, new teachers, nonetheless, can benefit from the collegial support which is provided through teams. However, professional support and development, unlikely, will result from such a view. An extension of this conclusion is that schools across contexts which implemented teaming received some benefit, regardless of how the concept was viewed.

A final conclusion drawn from the study is that effective teacher socialization is the result of the processes within the school, rather than the result of its individual components. In other words, the effective individual elements of assistance, monitoring, and team building are insufficient in providing effective socialization. Studies (NCES, 1997; Shen, 1998) point out that initial experiences in teaching and the conditions under which a new teacher works impact decision making on whether to commit to the profession. A positive socialization experience brought about from effective assistance, monitoring, and team building in an effective organization will likely increase a novice's desire to remain a teacher.

Recommendations

Data analysis from this study, along with the findings and conclusions drawn from the study, lead to the recommendations presented here. Recommendations are categorized by recommendations for research, recommendations for policy, and recommendations for practice.

Recommendations for Research

Future research should consider the following:

- Additional research at the middle school level is warranted to confirm or disconfirm the findings from this study. Studies which replicate this research or extend this research will add to the field of SER at the middle school level.

- Additional research at schools which implement interdisciplinary teaming is called for to further expand the findings from this study. Since only five schools in this study implemented interdisciplinary teaming, a study which includes a larger sample of schools incorporating this concept may yield more definitive results. Moreover, interdisciplinary teaming emerged from this study and was not initially a focus of the research. A study which is designed to primarily examine teaming will expand the field of research regarding the effectiveness of teaming as a middle school concept.

- Additional research in teacher socialization at the elementary and secondary levels is needed to broaden this area of school effectiveness research. As this study was limited to schools at the middle level, generalizations to the secondary or elementary level should be used cautiously. Research specifically targeting the secondary or elementary school level will yield teacher socialization research across a broader spectrum of SER.

- Additional research should be conducted on student teaching programs to determine the types of placements and experiences that best prepare student teachers to assume the responsibilities of being a teacher.

Recommendations for Policy

Future policy mandates should consider the following:

- State mandated assistance/assessment programs should be frequently monitored by state departments to ensure the program is being implemented as originally intended. Specifically, overseers of these programs should be certain that mentors are providing all types of assistance as covered in the mentor training manual and as recommended by research, rather than targeting only one aspect of mentoring, which is, in most cases, the final assessment.

- State mandated assistance/assessment programs should minimize paperwork associated with the programs so that the components of the program intended to support new teachers remain the priority. An audit of the required paperwork might reveal some extraneous demands which could be eliminated or merged with existing forms.

- District school systems should insure that new teacher inductions are extensive and profitable for the beginners. Districts might conduct follow up evaluations with new teachers to determine the needs for future inductions. These inductions might include more emphasis on professional development as well as the day to day routines of teaching, rather than singularly emphasizing assessment. Moreover, districts should implement an additional program to induct new teachers who begin employment after the first month of school. One new teacher induction per year is insufficient for the needs of teachers who are hired throughout the year.

Recommendations for Practice

Future school practice should consider the following:

- Principals should take an active role in the induction of new teachers, including frequent discussion, monitoring, and feedback regarding professional practice. Fulfilling the minimum requirements as mandated by the state will result in a minimally proficient staff. Principals who take seriously their role as instructional leader can do much to shape an effective teaching staff in a school climate geared to learning.

- Principals should refrain from relegating all aspects of new teacher induction to the mentor. Principals are a vital part of the socialization experience and should not remove themselves from the process. Brock and Grady (1998) point out that principal expectations of the new teacher is a vital component of the socialization process. Frequent and meaningful contact with the beginner will enable the principal to help the novice become a productive part of the school organization.

- When possible and/or notwithstanding a shortage of teachers in the area, principals should assign mentors to new teachers based on like subject matter and provide mutual time for the mentor and new teacher to meet. By doing so, mentors will have a closer working relationship with the novice throughout the initial year.

- Principals should refrain from assigning outside duties to mentors in order that the new teacher can become the priority for the mentor. Limiting outside duties will allow the mentor time which can be devoted to the new teacher.

- Mentors should provide assistance to the "whole person" of the new teacher; that is, professional, instructional, emotional, and collegial assistance. Targeting only the instructional components measured for the state assessment is insufficient in supporting the new teacher to the necessary growth and development as a teacher.

- Colleges of Education should examine their teacher preparation programs to ensure that students are receiving adequate preparation in instruction and classroom management to prepare them for the realities of the classroom and the needs of students.

- Colleges of Education should consider expanding the student teaching experience to one year, with the second semester to include a "real world" experience. A possible experience might be work as a school substitute for college credit. This will provide experience for the teacher/intern and provide budget relief for systems who pay for substitutes.

Summary

As previously stated, a school which is more effective or less effective breeds itself. Principals, mentors, and the naive beginning teachers did not set out to poorly lead, poorly mentor, or poorly teach. The abilities of the children and the academics in the classroom played only a minuscule role in the overall effectiveness of the middle schools in this study. The health or illness of the school culture in which they found themselves transferred that health or illness to the members of the community who work there. In the cases of the schools in this study, the healthy atmosphere or the sick building syndrome had a direct impact on the socialization experiences of these beginning teachers.

Results from a priori themes included the level and quality of mentoring assistance, administrative monitoring, collegial team building, effective instruction, intent to stay, challenges and successes of the new teacher, and new teacher perception of interdisciplinary teaming. Emerging themes focused on the roles played by elements of the new teacher experience, including the role of the principal, the role of the mentor, and the role of the new teacher's university preparation program. Conclusions resulting from this study are as follows: (1) pre-service university programs are not adequately preparing student teachers for the realities of today's classrooms, particularly in classroom management; (2) interdisciplinary teaming, if implemented to increase professional and collegial development, can substantially aid new teachers during the socialization process; (3) effective teacher socialization is the result of the organizational processes within the school, rather than the result of the individual components of mentoring assistance, administrative monitoring, and collegial team building.

Practitioners and policy makers can benefit from the knowledge which help to bridge the gap between school effects and teacher effects. Closing this gap in knowledge will support school districts in their school improvement efforts, specifically in the area of teacher induction. This study, while addressing constructs related to teachers, also has implications for students. The primary concern for schools is the promotion of the child's growth and development, and academic achievement, all which are stunted by frequent changes in the teaching staff, by teachers who teach out of their field because of shortages, or by teachers who are too emotionally and physically exhausted to be effective in the classroom. Understanding the school contexts which provide a beneficial socialization experience for the new teacher can help principals and district office personnel focus on those elements in the school improvement process.

References

Angelle, P. (1999). Retaining Teachers in the Profession: Interpersonal and Organizational Factors Predicting Intent to Stay. Unpublished manuscript.

Blair-Larsen, S. M. (1998). Designing a mentoring program. Education. 188 (4), 602-605.

Eisner, E. W. (1998). The Enlightened Eye. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Erb, T. O. (1997). Meeting the needs of young adolescents on interdisciplinary teams: the growing research base. Childhood Education. 73, 309-311.

Freeman, J. (1997). A Methodological Examination of Naturally Occurring School Improvement in Louisiana Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Fox, S. M. and Singletary, T. J. (1986). Deductions about Supportive Induction. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (2), 12-15.

Gratch, A. (1998a, January). Growing Teaching Professionals: Leassons Taught by First Year Teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on Qualitative Research in Education, Athens, Georgia.

Gratch, A. (1998b). Beginning Teacher and Mentor Relationships. Journal of Teacher Education. 49 (3), 220-227.

Gravetter, F. J. and Wallnau, L. B. (1996). Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Fourth Edition. New York: West Publishing Company.

Hawkey, K. (1997). Roles, Responsibilities, and Relationships in Mentoring: A Literature Review and Agenda for Research. Journal of Teacher Education. 48 (5), 325-335.

Hope, W. C. (1999). Principals' Orientation and Induction Activities as Factors in Teacher Retention. Clearing House. 73 (1), 54-56.

Jordell, K. (1987). Structural and personal influences in the socialization of beginning teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education. 3 (3), 165-177.

Kirby, P. C. (1993). Teacher Socialization in Effective and Ineffective Schools. In C. Teddlie & S. Stringfield. Schools Make a Difference. (pp. 202-215). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kirby, P. C., Stringfield, S., Teddlie, C., & Wimpelberg, R. (1992). School Effects on Teacher Socialization. School Effectiveness and School Improvement. 3 (3), 187-203.

Lang, M. (1991). Effective schools status: a methodological study of classification consistency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Lee, V. E. and Smith, J. B. (1993). Effects of school restructuring on the achievement and engagement of middle-grade students. Sociology of Education. 66, 164-187.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lomax, R. G. (1992). Statistical concepts: A second course for education and the behavioral sciences. New York: Longman.

Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program. (1997). Mentor Training Manual. Baton Rouge: Louisiana Department of Education.

Manning, M. L. and Saddlemire, R. (2000). Ten guidelines for effective interdisciplinary teams. NASSP Bulletin. 84 (20), 83-8.

Nigris, E. (1988). Stereotypical Images of Schooling: Teacher Socialization and Teacher Education. Teacher Education Quarterly, 15 (2), 4-9.

Odell, S. J. & Ferraro, D. P. (1992). Teacher Mentoring and Teacher Retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 43 (3), 200-204.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. London: Sage.

Peterson, B. E. & Williams, S. R., (1998). Mentoring Beginning Teachers. The Mathematics Teacher. 91 (8), 730-734.

Purkey, S. C. & Smith. M. S. (1983). Effective schools. The Elementary School Journal. 83, 427-452.

Sammons, P. (1999). School Effectiveness: Coming of Age in the Twenty-first Century. Lisse: Swets-Zeitlinger.

Scheerens, J. (1992). Effective schooling: research, theory and practice. London: Cassell.

School Effectiveness and Assistance Program. (1999). Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching. Baton Rouge: Louisiana Department of Education.

Starr, L. (1999) Speaking of Classroom Management: An Interview with Harry K. Wong. Education World. [On-line]. Available: http://www.education-world.com

Stringfield, S. (1994). Outlier Studies of School Effectiveness. In D. Reynolds, B.P.M. Creemers, P.S. Nesselrodt, E.C.Schaffer,S.Stringfield, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), <u>Advances in School Effectiveness Research and Practice</u> (pp.73-83). UK: Pergamon Press.

Su, J. Z. X. (1992). Sources of Influence in Preservice Teacher Socialization. <u>Journal of Education for Teaching,</u> <u>18</u> (3), 239-59.

Teddlie, C. & Reynolds, D. (2000). Current Topics and Approaches in School Effectiveness Research: The Contemporary Field. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), <u>The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research</u>. (pp. 26-52). New York: Falmer Press.

Teddlie, C., Reynolds, D. & Sammons, P. (2000). The Methodology and Scientific Properties of School Effectiveness Research. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), <u>The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research</u>. (pp. 55-133). New York: Falmer Press.

Teddlie, C. & Stringfield, S. (1993). <u>Schools Make a Difference</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Thompson, B. (1995). Stepwise regression and stepwise discriminant analysis need not apply here: A guidelines editorial. <u>Educational & Psychological Measurement, 55</u> (4), 525-535.

Wells, K. (1984, February). <u>Teacher Socialization in the Educational Organization: A Review of the Literature</u>. Paper presented at the Convention of the Western Speech Communication Association, Seattle, Washington.

Wong, H. K. and Wong, R. T. (1998). <u>First Days of School: How to Be an Effective Teacher.</u> Menlo Park, California: Harry Wong Publishers.

Yee, S. M. (1990) <u>Careers in the classroom: When teaching is more than a job</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Yuan, S. (2000). [Linear regression analysis of school effectiveness index]. Unpublished raw data.

Zeichener, K. M. and Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, and J. Sikula (Eds). <u>Handbook of Research on Teacher Education</u>. (pp329-348). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Zimpher, N. L. & Reiger, S. R. (1988). Mentoring Teachers: What are the Issues? <u>Theory into Practice, 27</u> (3), 175-182.

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Socialization Experiences of Beginning Teachers in Differentially Effective Schools

Author(s): Pamela S. Angelle

Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 4-1-02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____Sample_____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____Sample_____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____Sample_____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [✓]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: *Pamela S. Angelle*	Printed Name/Position/Title: Pamela S. Angelle / DoE Coordinator / Dr.
Organization/Address: Louisiana Dept. of Education Region IV Education Service Center 1405 W Pinhook, Suite 102 Lafayette, LA 70503	Telephone: (337)262-1025 FAX: (337)262-2510 E-Mail Address: pangelle@doe.State.la.us Date: 4-2-02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)