Induction Programs in Independent Schools: A Qualitative Study on New Faculty Members' Experiences

Jamie N. Segraves
St. Stephen's and St. Agnes School,
Alexandria, Virginia

David B. Reid
Seton Hall University

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the experiences of newly-hired faculty members in the induction programs provided by four independent schools in the greater Washington, D.C. area and examine how each induction program influenced faculty job satisfaction. Data came from six administrators and 17 faculty members and were collected during the 2017–2018 academic year. Through the use of document review and semi-structured interviews, similarities across schools and individual participants emerged. The findings showed that a positive school culture and opportunities to build relationships with colleagues influenced the faculty members' overall professional satisfaction.

Teacher turnover affects public and private schools throughout the United States, where *turnover* refers to attrition combined with teacher migration. It is calculated that more than one million

teachers leave the profession (attrition) or migrate to other schools annually (Alliance for Excellent Education [AEE], 2014; Ingersoll, 2001, 2011; Ingersoll & May, 2012). Recent studies have shown that up to 17% of new educators do not complete their first year of teaching (Breaux & Wong, 2003; Hammer & Williams, 2005; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010; LoCascio, Smeaton, & Waters, 2016), while the number of teachers leaving the profession after completing their first year has increased by more than 40% over the past two decades (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014).

Researchers such as Smith and Ingersoll (2004), Brill and McCartney (2008), and Moore (2012) suggest that the principal reasons for the evolving crisis in teacher attrition have more to do with job dissatisfaction, changing careers (attrition), or moving to different teaching jobs (migration) in other schools to escape organizational conditions and less to do with teacher retirement. The primary complaints of job dissatisfaction include the following influences: inadequate preservice preparation, insufficient compensation, poor working environments (e.g., high-stakes testing, excessive and increasing workloads, and disruptive student behavior), absence of teacher support (e.g., ineffective administration or leadership), inadequate professional development and in-service preparation, and lack of voice in decision-making (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Dean, London, Carston, & Salyers, 2015; Johnson, 2011; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

The findings in these studies indicate that administrator retention and support efforts have implications for teacher retention (Johnson, 2011), teacher morale, student achievement, and school budgets (Miller, 2010; Sass, Bustos Flores, Claeys, & Pérez, 2012; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). The results also suggest that the development and implementation of effective and comprehensive faculty development, mentorship, and preparation programs are more cost-effective in teacher retention. These help to mitigate teacher attrition (Shockley, Watlington, & Felsher, 2013) through positively affecting teachers' perceptions of the level of support provided by the school and, therefore, the overall collaborative culture of the school (Dimatteo, 2014), and improve overall student and teacher experiences (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Dean et al., 2015). Furthermore, teachers who have been formally paired with a mentor have reported that they were supported, experienced greater job satisfaction, and wished to return to their present position (Britt-Stevens, 2014; McCamley, 2014) in addition to acquiring more classroom management strategies and learning about school and district culture (McCamley, 2014; Ogunyemi, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Although empirical evidence has shown that the utilization of comprehensive induction programs can positively impact teacher retention (Britt-Stevens, 2014; Eisner, 2015; Fletcher & Mullen, 2012; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; McCamley, 2014, Ogunyemi, 2013), several sources have cited that such studies were executed in a weak manner (Allen, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Glazerman et al., 2010; Gold, 1996; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Lopez, Lash, Schaffner, Shields, & Wagner, 2004; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Such limitations included lack of controlling for other factors affecting teacher retention, basic "yes/no" survey questions without soliciting further details on induction program components, and only surveying a subset of the new teacher population in a given cohort, for example, new teachers without any prior teaching experience (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Therefore, the results are inconclusive in determining the contribution of how participation in a comprehensive induction program improves teacher retention or effectiveness (Allen, 2005; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Lopez et al., 2004; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). It is also uncertain how induction programs influence novice teachers' competence, efficacy, or desire to continue in the profession (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Glazerman et al., 2010; Gold, 1996; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Additionally, a lack of continuity in induction program purpose (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), substance, quality, and superficial assistance (Gold, 1996), and

the length of the program (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2001; Wong, 2004) indicated that further research is needed to conclude that induction programs are effective in influencing teacher retention.

The current body of research on induction programs only presents the collection of data in Kindergarten (K) to Grade 12 (12) public schools, international schools, as well as public and private universities for newly-hired faculty members; empirical evidence on the effects of these programs regarding teacher retention in K–12 independent schools is lacking. Furthermore, the study of teachers' experiences in an organizational induction program and its influence on their satisfaction with their first year in an independent school is almost non-existent. According to recent reports run in the NAIS database – specifically *Data and Analysis for School Leadership* (DASL– http://dasl.nais.org/Public) – independent schools of various characteristics (e.g. student enrollment, number of full-time faculty members, grade levels served, day and boarding schools, single-sex or co-educational, religious affiliation or not) generally experience teacher turnover. This teacher turnover is attributed to various factors including teachers leaving their schools to: (a) go to another independent school (migration), (b) go to a public school (migration), (c) attend graduate school, (d) change professions (true attrition), (e) retire, or (f) another reason (these factors were reported in DASL). It has yet to be determined how organizational induction programs influence teacher turnover statistics in independent schools. The present study will fill the gap in the current literature on two fronts: (a) by providing empirical data on how teacher induction programs influence teachers' job satisfaction and (b) specifically showing how this phenomenon unfolds in independent schools, which as mentioned above, is an understudied population of schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of newly-hired faculty members in four independent schools – three day schools and one boarding school (as boarding schools represent 17.9% of all independent schools) – in the greater Washington, D.C. area. Of particular note is the use of the terminology "faculty," which is the expected and accepted term used when directly referring to "teachers" in independent schools. Therefore, any direct reference to "teachers" in independent schools in this study will be described as "faculty." The goal of this study was to gain a better understanding of the influence that these respective school communities' induction programs had on their experience as newly-hired faculty members and specifically how these programs influenced faculty members' decisions to stay in their school or in the profession. The study was guided by the following research questions: (1) What role do formal faculty organizational induction programs play in newly-hired faculty members' professional satisfaction and their integration into independent schools?, (2) What are the basic components of the organizational induction program?, and (3) How do newly-hired faculty members describe their experiences in the organizational induction program?

Overview of Theoretical Framework

The contradictory evidence found in the current body of knowledge demonstrated that further research was needed to conclude that induction programs are effective in influencing teacher retention across K–12 schools and in universities. Additionally, with the lack of research exclusively directed to retention in independent schools, this study aimed to build theory

specifically to address this gap in the literature. Ingersoll and Strong (2011) elaborated on the application of Zey's (1984) mutual benefits model, which is drawn from social exchange theory, as the foundational theory by which induction programs were initially created. The model is based on the premise that relationships are formed between parties and continue as long as they are beneficial (in this case, between teacher and school). It is, therefore, seen as necessary to develop such support programs for novice (teachers) to learn, advance, and prosper in schools (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Although not generalizable to all independent schools, one of the goals of this work is to begin to test this theory.

As is typical in qualitative research, Glaser and Strauss' (1967) *grounded theory* served as the foundational springboard in this study. With the implementation of a comparative case study approach, this study examined four schools as four individual cases in a within-case analysis and then cross-examined the cases with each other in a cross-case analysis. The application of codes in each analysis directly and inductively developed the emergence of themes that led to the building of theory. The findings and implications enhance our overall understanding of the components of induction programs, how faculty members experience these programs, and therefore faculty's subsequent job satisfaction, especially as it relates to independent school communities.

Review of Related Research and Literature

This section examines the recent research and current body of knowledge on teacher attrition rates and the factors that contribute to the annual teacher turnover rate. The study of independent schools' attrition, retention, and induction programs is lacking in the current literature, which is the foundational core for the design of the present study.

Attrition and Turnover

While some turnover is beneficial in avoiding complacency and stagnation (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), high levels of turnover are both a source and a consequence of these attributes. The development and maintenance of a learning community is halted when high rates of teacher turnover exist (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), which then becomes an issue due to the necessary replacement of these teachers (Boe et al., 2008; Carroll, 2007). Districts with low retention not only become fiscally irresponsible by spending millions of dollars to recruit and train new teachers, but at times the districts must also partake in the last-minute hiring of unqualified teachers (Heineke, Streff Mazza, & Tichnor-Wagner, 2014; Hunt & Carroll, 2003), which naturally contributes to the decline of the overall student and faculty experience. In Ingersoll's (2002) analysis of the Bureau of National Affairs' (BNA) and Boe, Cook, and Sunderland's (2008) limited comparative analysis of three versions of the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) (1990–1991, 1993–1994, and 1999–2000) along with 1-year longitudinal components with the Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) (1991–1992, 1994–1995, 2000–2001), the researchers excessively narrowed the scope of their investigations; they solely examined public school teachers, including statuses of full-time, part-time, or long-term substitute, and did not account for any teaching equivalencies in the private sector.

Retention

In an attempt to limit such teacher turnover and retain teachers, numerous initiatives and policies have included mandatory mentoring programs and retention bonuses. Springer, Swain, and

Rodriguez's (2016) study on a retention bonus initiative in Tennessee in *priority schools* (i.e., low-performing schools), the researchers studied the impact of a $5,000 retention bonus on Level 5 teachers to continue teaching in priority schools during the 2013–2014 academic year. While the researchers determined that these bonuses were successful in increasing teacher retention after the 2013–2014 academic year by about 20%, they did not state whether these bonuses continued to take effect in subsequent years. If the bonuses were not resumed, did teacher turnover return to its pre-bonus level?

In a study conducted by Mancuso, Roberts, and White (2010), the researchers modeled their statistical method after Ingersoll's (2001) analysis of SASS by collecting data from 22 heads of school and 248 faculty members in the Near East South Asia (NESA) region. The results of the data analysis showed that satisfaction with salary, the perceived effectiveness of the head of school, and the amount of faculty input in decision-making were significant predictors of teacher mobility in the international schools studied. If the researchers had also collected qualitative data through interviews, they may have gained a deeper understanding of these teachers' perceptions beyond their statistical analyses.

Comprehensive Induction Programs

Provided the impact of teacher attrition rates on student achievement and the financial costs associated with teacher turnover, policymakers have commonly applied two strategies to solve the problem, namely alternate route teacher certification and extensive and planned beginning teacher induction programs (LoCascio et al., 2016). Over the past decades, induction and mentorship programs have become a widespread practice in the teaching profession (Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Components and implementation. In Smith and Ingersoll's (2004) quantitative analysis of public and private school teachers in the 1999–2000 SASS, the outcome indicated that as the number of elements in an induction program increased, the likelihood of teacher turnover decreased. However, the questions and categories across public school and private school surveys were not synonymous, resulting in missed nuances in the data. In the mixed-methods study by LoCascio et al. (2016) on the effect that induction programs had on alternate route urban teachers' decisions to remain teaching in Northeastern New Jersey, the researchers used a "forced choice" survey with 53 participants, while only conducting six participant interviews. The researchers failed to describe why only six participants were interviewed.

Westling, Herzog, Cooper-Duffy, Prohn, and Ray (2006) used open-ended response surveys and interviews in their qualitative study of a teacher support program for special education teachers in North Carolina. The study developed its own *bottom-up* support program, but the program lacked isolation to one school culture and did not account for the nuances of joining one particular community. Last, the study by Fenton-Smith and Torpey (2013) on inducting instructors of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Japan was a major source for this study. In their qualitative study using interviews, surveys, and focus groups, their focal point most similarly reflected the topic of this study – inducting faculty members to new workplaces and unfamiliar cultural surroundings to adapt to their new employment. The researchers collected data from participants using only surveys and focus groups, while interviews were solely used with management. Each of the aforementioned studies had limitations that the present study attempted to address.

The Case for Studying Independent Schools

The body of knowledge documented studies that focused on teacher attrition and retention in school settings including K–12 public schools and international settings with different populations of teachers, including teachers serving in urban school districts, special education teachers, and educators abroad. Although some of the researchers explored attrition and retention in private school settings, these studies were limited in scope simply to compare rates of turnover among public and private school teachers, and those studies that were conducted specific to private schools did not utilize a qualitative method to develop a richer understanding of several key questions.

Independent schools are unique in that they are designed as not-for-profit institutions and governed by a board of directors. They are also financially independent from public monies or religious subsidies, and, thus, the schools charge tuition, raise money, and accept charitable donations to operate (NAIS, n.d.). Furthermore, given that independent schools do not operate under the same state regulations that public schools do, they are not required to follow state mandates such as offering mandated teacher induction programs, as seen in the study by LoCascio et al. (2016). Last, independent schools also have the freedom to define teacher credentials; as defined on job qualifications, teachers are not required to have certification of any kind to teach at an independent school and therefore may not have completed any basic training in the art of teaching.

The importance for studying independent schools is critical, as the most recent report from the Council for American Private Education (CAPE) (n.d.) – which includes independent school statistics, with reference to the NCES, illustrates that of the 132,000 schools and 55 million students from pre-Kindergarten (PK) to grade 12 (or PK–12) in the United States, there were 33,619 private schools serving 5.4 million PK–12 students in the 2013–2014 academic year. These private schools account for 25% of all schools in the United States, and these enroll 10% of all PK–12 American students. Through examination of the research questions in independent schools, the present study contributed to the formerly lacking body of knowledge, where little representation of teacher job satisfaction and retention in K–12 independent day and boarding schools existed.

Research Design and Methodology

This study utilized a comparative case study approach to explore which factors of an organizational induction program influenced newly-hired faculty members' job satisfaction. To identify the participants, purposive sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Patton, 2001), in particular the technique of criterion sampling, was used. The reason for this was that the research questions required a sample of newly-hired faculty members in their first year at their current independent school. Each of the four schools was considered to be its own case; that is to say that each case's induction program and subsequent faculty experiences were first examined independently (within case analysis) and then compared across cases (cross-case analysis) to identify any emergent themes as is typically seen in case studies (Merriam, 1998) and grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Additionally, the inclusion of multiple cases enhanced the external validity of the findings (Merriam, 1998). Under the assumption that faculty members' experiences in their integration into a new environment were likely to individually fluctuate, an analysis of the words that narrated these experiences best addressed the study's research questions.

Participants

Four independent schools in the greater Washington, D.C. area were selected based on an increase

in student enrollment in this metropolitan area between 2013 and 2017 (Pruce & Torres, 2017), on the researcher's personal proximity, and on the schools' submission of teacher turnover statistics to DASL. Each participating school was assigned a letter code (A, B, C, and D) to identify the school and to ensure anonymity. These schools represented the majority of the various distinguishing characteristics of independent schools – that is, day vs. boarding, grades K–8, K–12, 9–12, and were all co-educational.

School A. School A is a Junior Kindergarten (JK; ages 4 and 5 years old) to Grade 8 co-educational day school with a total student enrollment of 207 students and approximately 36 faculty members whose main responsibilities are classroom teaching. Over the past three academic years, the school has only needed to hire three new faculty members: one in the 2015–2016 academic year, none in the 2016–2017 academic year, and two in the current 2017–2018 academic year. School A's teacher turnover has remained under 5.41% in the past three years.

School B. School B is a JK (age 4) to Grade 8 co-educational day school that follows a progressive approach to student learning by offering learning through experience and the outdoors. School B has a total student enrollment of approximately 300 students and 47 faculty members. Over the past three academic years, the school has hired 16 new community members whose main responsibilities are teaching: six were hired in 2015–2016, three in 2016–2017, and seven in 2017–2018. Teacher turnover at School B has fluctuated from 14.46% to 8.5% to 18.42%, respectively, over the course of three years. Two of the seven faculty members in their first year will not return to School B for a second year of service.

School C. School C is a JK (ages 4 and 5) to Grade 12 co-educational day school with a religious affiliation on two campuses, one for JK to Grade 5 and another for Grade 6 to Grade 12. For this study, the 6–12 campus was researched. The total student enrollment for JK–12 is approximately 1,000 students with 590 students and approximately 76 teaching faculty members on the 6–12 campus. Over the last three years, the 6–12 campus has hired 26 new faculty members whose main responsibilities are teaching: seven were hired in 2015–2016, 13 in 2016–2017, and six in 2017–2018. Overall, School C's turnover has remained between 16 and 20%.

School D. School D is a Grade 9 to Grade 12 co-educational boarding school with a religious affiliation. Total student enrollment is approximately 440 students (including international students) and approximately 55 full-time teaching faculty members. In the past three academic years, School D has hired 21 new faculty members whose main responsibilities include teaching: eight were hired in 2015–2016, 11 in 2016–2017, and two in 2017–2018. School D experienced an increasing percentage in teacher turnover from 2015– 2016 to 2016–2017 (14.63% and 20.3% respectively), with a drastic decrease in turnover in 2017–2018 of only 3.6%. One of the two new faculty members will not return for the 2018–2019 year.

As noted, to identify the faculty participants, purposive sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) was used, in particular the technique of criterion sampling. The choice of criterion sampling permitted identification of only those faculty members new to their independent school to better understand the participants' perceptions of the organizational induction program's influence on their professional satisfaction (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Fenton-Smith & Torpey, 2013; Heineke et al., 2014; LoCascio et al., 2016; Westling et al., 2006). All 17 new faculty members in their first year of teaching in the 2017–2018 academic year, as well as all six administrators (School C and School D, had both an administrator and a lead induction program coordinator) at each of the four participating schools agreed to participate.

Each individual faculty participant received an assigned letter *I* (denoting *interview*) and a number code (ex. 1, 2, 3, etc.) within the participant's school code to ensure confidentiality. Administrator participants were referred to as "Admin" from each school, with an additional "1" or "2" attached to "Admin" if there were two or more people associated with the running of the

induction program. The codes associated with each school or participant were maintained in an electronic file, and this key was stored away from the data so as to not compromise confidentiality or anonymity. Table 1 shows a visual representation of all 17 faculty participants and the six administrators across schools in the study.

Table 1

Participants

Participants	Number of Participants from School A	Number of Participants from School B	Number of Participants from School C	Number of Participants from School D	Total Number of Participants in Study
Administrator	1	1	2	2	6
Faculty	2	7	6	2	17

Specific sample characteristics of faculty members' demographic information are not included here as the data analysis did not reveal any themes across demographic information.

Data Sources and Data Collection

Data sources included an official document review and semi-structured interviews for administrators, as well as for newly-hired faculty members, to as part of the data collection.

Official document review. Administrator(s) in charge of developing, implementing, and overseeing the organizational induction program at each independent school were asked to provide the researcher copies of official school documents for review. Such documents included materials provided to candidates during the recruitment and interview phases prior to their offer of employment; general school policy documents; statement of philosophy and mission statement; documents describing the purpose, audience, duration, intensity, and components of the induction program (e.g., whether mentorship is a part of the program, how mentors are assigned to new faculty, or whether they receive training or compensation); and materials related to all phases of the induction program itself, along with any other documents the administrator deemed important in understanding the nuances of the induction program at the school. These official documents were collected at the time of the administrator interviews.

Semi-structured interviews. Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with the same administrator(s) who provided official documents for review and with new faculty members. These interviewed were conducted in the 2018 Spring semester after employment agreements for 2018–2019 were offered, so as not to influence faculty participants' decisions to return to their school for a second year of service or not. Interviews were conducted with all participants in their natural work setting and environment and all participants signed an *Informed Consent Form*. Two semi-structured interview protocols were developed and followed during each interview to ensure continuity across schools and participants: one specific to induction program administrators and another based on the researcher's own experiences as an independent school educator having participated in induction programs for faculty members. The topics covered in the faculty interviews included asking participants to describe the components of the induction

program, provide clarity on if it helped them to integrate into their new school environment, and mention whether there were any detractions from the integration. Additionally, participants were asked whether the induction program contributed to their overall job satisfaction in their first year at the school.

Before faculty interviews began, faculty members were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. Follow-up questions were asked and elaboration of responses was encouraged as administrators described the components of the induction program and as faculty members narrated their experience in the induction program and new themes emerged. Each interview took place solely with the researcher and each participant from each school. For schools that had more than one administrator, separate interviews were conducted with each administrator. Interviews were audio-recorded to reflect accuracy in analysis and transcription, and written notes of any non-linguistic observations were made during these interviews.

Data Analysis

Analyses conducted. As this study was a comparative case study, the within-case analysis for each school, A, B, C, and D, respectively, was performed first by following an open-coding procedure. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggested, the researcher read through all data points (i.e., documents and interview transcriptions) without taking notes to get a sense of the data as a whole, then read through the documents while coding, and identified specific codes along the way, in alignment with the research questions and using ATLAS.ti as a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS). Afterwards, the codes were grouped into larger categories as they emerged, with the assistance of ATLAS.ti. There were 135 total codes applied across the 23 transcriptions imported into ATLAS.ti. Emergent themes were noted at the time of each analysis. The four within-case analyses were then followed by a cross-case analysis to build abstractions across schools as Merriam (2009) suggested.

Within-case analyses. Each of the following four cases (Schools A, B, C, and D) was analyzed as its own comprehensive case by understanding the elements of each school's induction program and the faculty experiences within that program. A summary of each induction program was developed from open-coding the interviews conducted with administrators and the summaries were sent to those individuals at each school to ensure accuracy. Any necessary edits were made at that time in collaboration with the participating schools and the researcher. Summaries of each school's program were sent to participating schools *prior* to conducting individual faculty semi-structured interviews, with the exception of School A (due to all interviews being scheduled on the same day), to ensure understanding of the induction program from the administration's perspective was correct.

Once individual faculty member interviews were completed, transcriptions of participant interview responses within each school were open-coded, starting with the first participant to add to each school's baseline coding scheme. Revisions to the coding scheme were made as necessary as themes emerged. Coding was applied in ascending order by participant code within each school (I1, I2, etc.) until each participant within a school had been coded. All participants in School A were coded before moving to participants in School B and so forth. A summary of each faculty member's experience was drafted and a list of the codes applied with their frequency was created. Once all participants' summaries were drafted for each school, an aggregate summary for each school was generated to ensure participant anonymity and confidentiality. Abstractions were built across participants to contribute to the understanding of the aggregate experience within the program, and these allowed for themes to emerge across participants. Each school had a list of emerged themes and faculty experience responses that were uploaded into ATLAS.ti for data

analysis and storage. Table 2 shows a visual representation of the programs offered by Schools A, B, C, and D, respectively.

Table 2

Program Components

Component	School A	School B	Adult Weekend	School C	School D	Move to Campus
Orientation	Previous Closing Meetings; Summer	Summer; Orientation Opening Meetings	Responsive Classroom Training; Collaboration Time	Orientation Opening Meetings	Summer; Orientation Opening Meetings	Professional Development
Induction	Meetings with Administrator; Mentorship; Evaluation	Progressive Education Course; Mentorship; Meetings with Administrator; Evaluation		Mentorship; Weekly New Faculty Cohort Meetings	Weekly New Faculty Cohort Meetings; Professional Development Opportunities; Mentorship; Meetings with Administrator; Drop-by Meetings	

Cross-case analysis. A cross-case analysis comparing all induction programs and faculty experiences within those programs was warranted in order to make generalizations across cases (Merriam, 1998) and to fully answer the research questions. The researcher compared each school's induction program with the other participating schools in the study to analyze the different components of each program to see whether any similarities emerged across schools. Similarly, emerged themes from faculty experiences in the induction program within schools were compared to each other and analyzed across schools as suggested in qualitative data analysis (Bazeley, 2013). Both the comparison of induction program components and faculty experiences were achieved by comparing each school's list of emerged themes and faculty experiences across schools through tracking codes in ATLAS.ti and noting each code's use across schools.

Findings

The cross-case analysis revealed six similarities across induction programs and seven themes across faculty experiences, with the concept of mentorship emerging from both.

Similarities Across Programs

Four of the similarities across programs were shared between three of the four schools: summer (A, B, D), meetings with administrators (A, B, D), meeting as a cohort (B, C, D), and evaluation (A, B, C), while all four schools shared orientation and mentorship as components of their respective induction programs.

Similarities 1–4. *Summer*, *Meetings with administrators*, *Meeting as a cohort*, and *Evaluation*, respectively, are not shared by all four schools and therefore are not elaborated upon here.

Similarity 5: Orientation. All four schools had orientation for their new faculty members. All schools covered essentially the same topics, including reviewing the mission or philosophy of the school and distributing school-issued laptops with some technological-specific training. The orientation in Schools B, C, and D was conducted in the same manner: specific days were dedicated to solely working with new employees prior to the entire faculty returning for the next academic year. School A's orientation was individualized to the new faculty member's needs.

Similarity 6: Mentorship. All four schools placed an emphasis on having a mentorship program. Each school's approach to the development of its mentorship program is as follows:

School A: Mentors did not receive training, a stipend, or a reduction in duties. New faculty members were paired with people they would naturally see each day.

School B: Mentors did not receive training nor a reduction in duties, but they did receive a modest stipend and a checklist of actions to complete with their mentees. Mentors and mentees were paired through a common trait, such as personality, stage in life, or department. Mentors were expected to check-in with their mentees at least biweekly.

School C: Mentors received a job description, training, checklist of actions to complete with the mentees, and a stipend. They did not receive a reduction in duties. Mentor-mentee pairings were either done within departments or within divisions. Mentors were expected to meet with their mentees weekly.

School D: Mentors did not receive a job description, training, stipend, reduction of duties, or specified requirements as to the frequency or duration of meeting with their mentees. Mentors were paired with mentees based on "fit" and the mentees' perceived needs.

Themes Across Experiences

Three of the themes across faculty experiences were shared by Schools B and C and the remaining four themes were shared by all four schools' faculty members. No themes emerged across faculty participants' demographic information. It is worth noting that Schools B and C had the highest number of faculty participants – seven and six respectively – which may have contributed to the emergence of the three preliminary themes.

   Themes 1–3. *Previous connections to the school*, *Observations as professional growth*, and *Bottom-up approach*, respectively, were not shared by all four schools and therefore are not elaborated upon here.

   Theme 4: Belief of intended purpose. Faculty members from across all four schools felt strongly that the purpose of the induction program was to become a part of the school community and for the most part they thought their respective experience was effective in matching their school's intended purpose. For instance, *Interviewee 10* described the intended purpose as: "I think they want staff to feel a part of the community…. I feel like it's to make us part of a better team, a better community."

   Theme 5: Positive school culture. Faculty members in all four schools described the nature of the school culture as being so supportive and positive that they had the sense that they could ask anyone – including mentors, veteran teachers, department members, and administrators – questions they might have had in order to continue their integration into the school community. *Interviewee 16* stated: "I feel like I've been a part of the community even though it is my first year, I feel like I've been a part of it for longer and people make me feel very welcome as well." This type of school culture contributed to faculty job satisfaction.

   Theme 6: Mentorship. Faculty members across all four schools described mentorship as being helpful in their integration into the school community. However, some faculty members described their formal mentorship pairing as being the most helpful part of the induction program, while others stated that if the formal mentor was located outside of their respective department, the informal mentorship relationships they developed with department members or department chairs were the most helpful part of their integration. Of those who found formal mentorship to be most effective, *Interviewee 3* stated:

> Yeah, so I'm really lucky and my mentor is in my department, she's also an [subject] teacher… So, that has been so fantastic because, I mean, not only has she been great in, every morning she touches base, like, How you doing? and How you feeling?…. So, having someone in my department has been so great, so helpful…. Having the mentor aspect has been so, so good. It's really been such a valuable resource.

Conversely, others preferred the informal mentorship relationships developed: "I think it's that. Our department, I'm very pleased. There's a lot of informal mentorship going on in the [subject] department. I feel like I can turn to them for so many things that the formal mentor program hasn't been as big of a need for me…." (Interviewee 4). Informal relationships developed through shared content, approach to teaching the same subject, or physical geographic proximity to each other during the school day. These relationships soon replaced the formal mentorship relationship, and consequently the formal mentorship meeting frequency quickly declined.

   Theme 7: Building relationships. Faculty members in all four schools described that although mentorship was helpful and contributed to their successful integration into the community, it was the school's overall culture and the relationships they built among new faculty members within their cohorts, veteran teachers, and administrators that contributed to their overall job satisfaction. A statement from *Interviewee 2* helped to highlight this theme: "Yeah, I think getting solidarity with colleagues is key, and this has a healthy colleague community so that I feel pretty empowered and like we have each other's backs."

Across all four schools, a positive, supportive, and collaborative culture, coupled with the opportunities to build relationships with other new faculty members, mentors, colleagues, and administrators, contributed to faculty members' overall job satisfaction. However, these factors cannot be separated completely from school contexts in general, where school culture and the opportunities within that culture to build relationships are not synonymous with the induction program. According to several faculty responses, the specific details of the induction program offerings did not play a significant role in overall job satisfaction, including the three faculty members (two from School B and one from School D) who are not returning to their schools for a second year of service in the 2018–2019 academic year. For example, *Interviewee 15* stated: "…I think that just my experience with different teachers and how helpful they've been and how open they've been is part of what has contributed to my overall job satisfaction, but I don't know if that's specific to the induction program." Induction programs, however, provided the avenues and formal structure for faculty members to begin their integration into the school's community.

Discussion

The previous section described the six similarities in induction programs and seven themes that emerged from faculty responses across schools revealed through within-case and cross-case analyses. This section discusses the study's findings and revisits the known literature.

Similarities Across Programs

Across schools, the two overlapping elements were orientation (as part of induction) and mentorship. The participating schools each approached mentorship from a similar purpose, however, each school's development of the mentorship program varied across schools. In delving deeper into the issue, it was questioned whether the mentorship program existed simply to develop the mentee (new faculty member), or whether it was seen as a reciprocal relationship where both mentor and mentee were able to grow together professionally as seen in *Interviewee 5*'s comment from a previous experience as a mentor in a former school:

> I was a mentor later, but you work less hours and you really work with being a mentor, it's not a side thing. It's a very, very central thing for your day, in your day…the mentor needs to have the time to put into actually helping that new teacher to transition to school… It's working, it's being prepared, it's like being a teacher for a teacher.

The topic of mutual benefit was not elaborated upon greatly during the interviews. A lack of investment in the training of mentors, along with compensation for mentor *and* mentee, a reduction in typical responsibilities, and the formal opportunity for both the mentor and mentee to provide feedback upon completion of the mentorship, restricted the effectiveness of the mentorship programs at these schools.

Themes Across Experiences

Faculty members in all four participating schools expressed both school culture and building relationships as factors contributing to their overall job satisfaction. However, defining these conclusions as solely pertaining to the induction program the schools offered would be inaccurate. Even though school culture must be an element of the induction program according to LoCascio et al. (2016) and Fenton-Smith and Torpey (2013), it is not strictly and uniquely only found in the induction program. One element that could truly be separated from general contexts – the element of mentorship, which was intricately associated with the induction program – was identified by

faculty members as being helpful in their integration into the school community.

Job satisfaction and school culture. Faculty members expressed that the crux of their overall job satisfaction came from a supportive school culture and the relationships built across their first year at the school through: having supportive co-workers and administrators, having the opportunity to professionally grow from observations (Schools B and C specifically), having the opportunity to contribute to determining what was covered during new teacher weekly cohort meetings and the progressive education course on a limited basis, and the opportunity to network with each other. These experiential elements align closely to what current research already says is obligatory to meet teachers' professional needs and overall job satisfaction: (1) creating policies demanding a culture that shares responsibility and supports learning (Shockley et al., 2013), (2) collaboration and trust (Miller, 2010), and (3) opportunities, especially for new teachers, to observe others, be observed, and analyze their own practice and network (Darling- Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Elmore, 2002; Kelley, 2004). Through the present study, however, school culture in and of itself was revealed as a far more complex topic that is not easy to separate from general school contexts and will require further research.

Mentorship. Based on this study's findings, teachers who developed a relationship with colleagues, whether formally or informally, and who were supported in that relationship through school culture tended to have more overall job satisfaction. It appears that programs offering mentors training or a modest stipend did not make a difference in new faculty's experiences with their mentors, however, the number of participants limited this takeaway, and therefore a generalization on this point could not be made. Additionally, without mentors' narratives describing their experiences within the mentorship program which formed part of this study, it could not be concluded that training or a stipend were helpful or not in experiences within the mentorship program from either the perspectives of the mentors or mentees.

The current faculty members' experiences slightly contradict previous literature that stated how teachers who have been formally paired with a mentor have reported being supported, having more job satisfaction, and wishing to return to their present position (Britt-Stevens, 2014; McCamley, 2014), in addition to learning more classroom management strategies and about school and district culture (McCamley, 2014; Ogunyemi, 2013). Although faculty members described learning classroom management strategies through the induction program components (e.g., observations and weekly new teacher cohort meetings), based on this study's findings, teachers who developed a relationship with colleagues, whether formally or informally, and who were supported in that relationship through school culture tended to have more overall job satisfaction.

Implications for Practice

The following implications for practice are intended for schools to preserve or encourage modifications to their induction programs and retain them for future years of service were made based on the emerged themes from the study and faculty participants' suggestions.

School Culture

Schools should create an open, supportive environment for all employees, encourage trust and collaboration across faculty and administrators, and create time in the paid work day to connect with each other (Darling- Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Elmore, 2002; Kelley, 2004; Miller, 2010; Shockley et al., 2013).

Induction Program Components

Summer. Schools should be mindful of what they ask new teachers to do before the contractual year has begun and consider an appropriate way of recognizing their time and effort.

Meetings with administrators. Contact time with administrators is important for new faculty members to feel supported as they transition into the community.

Meeting as a cohort. Cohort meetings need to be seen as protected time not only to learn more about the school's culture, but also for new faculty members to share in the experience they are all having. Faculty members appreciate the opportunity to contribute to or develop the agenda of these meetings; a bottom-up approach can go a long way at times. If meetings are to happen outside of the paid workday, schools should ensure the effectiveness and productivity of the time spent together where faculty members are missing time in other aspects of their life. These meetings should also be a safe-space.

Evaluation/observations. Schools should make observations valuable to new faculty members by both observing and being observed by their peers, mentors, and administrators and provide feedback in a constructive, approachable way so that the faculty members learn from the process rather than resent it. Schools should also consider implementing peer observation as a tool for professional growth that all faculty should participate in doing.

Orientation. Schools should frontload school-specific terminology (words or abbreviations used at the school) during new faculty orientation so that there is a common understanding of references from the beginning of the faculty member's tenure. Schools should ensure revisiting the mission and philosophy of "how we do things here" annually with *all* faculty members, not only with new faculty members. Schools should remember that the information received at the beginning of the year by new faculty members is a bombardment of information that can cause a "cognitive overload" and that revisiting the same information periodically throughout their first year might be warranted.

Mentorship. Schools should consider the value placed on mentorship within the induction program. To do this, they should consider the following basic requirements needed to develop an appropriate mentorship program, which include (1) defining the purpose and goals of mentorship within the school's culture (including the professional growth that both mentor and mentee should gain), (2) articulating the mentor's role, 3) providing mentors with appropriate training and a curriculum, (4) compensating mentors either financially or with a reduction in other work-related duties, (5) pairing mentors and new faculty appropriately, and (6) including both mentors and new faculty members in the evaluation process at the official close of the mentorship. However, building this type of program has its costs monetarily, in both time and energy.

General. Schools should reflect on all the existing components of the current induction program. Is the school providing enough to fully integrate new faculty members? Schools should give new faculty members the ongoing opportunity to honestly evaluate the induction program. Schools should ensure that each individual is receiving what he or she needs, not just what the entire new faculty cohort needs as a group. While there might be several points of contact available to new faculty members, schools should consider the communication happening across support systems. For instance, does the mentor know what information is being disseminated in weekly meetings as a cohort and vice versa?

Attrition

Schools should not ignore high levels of teacher turnover; such behavior is not fiscally responsible, and it inhibits the development and maintenance of a learning community (Smith & Ingersoll,

2004).

Implications for Continued Scholarship

The results of the study indicate that novice integration into school culture and the building of relationships within that culture contributed to faculty job satisfaction, although mentorship has been repeatedly mentioned as a helpful resource in a faculty member's integration into the school community. Therefore, it remains inconclusive that induction programs alone contribute to faculty job satisfaction.

Additional Instruments

While official documents and semi-structured interviews were used in the present study, future researchers should employ observations as an additional instrument in an effort to separate general school contexts (e.g., school culture) from faculty experiences in the induction program and consider applying a mixed-methods approach to deepen the understanding of faculty experiences in induction programs.

Further Considerations

The following further considerations are offered to researchers to continue to understand the true influence of induction programs on faculty job satisfaction in their experience to a new school:
(1) Researchers should consider studying schools in the public and private sectors that have induction programs offered on a voluntary basis so that data can be collected from both participants in the program and non-participants. New insights can be gained if it is possible to compare the influence that a program has on an individual who chooses to participate voluntarily versus mandatory participation.
(2) Mentors should have the opportunity to share their experience as mentors within the induction programs: this can be done either as an additional participant pool in a similar study as the present study or a separate study. In fact, all persons who form part of the support system for new faculty should be included in another iteration of this study in order to have a fuller and multi-faceted view of the induction programs.
(3) Further and more accurate statistics and documentation on teacher turnover in independent schools are needed to determine the real severity of teacher turnover and its subsequent impact on the independent school world.
(4) Further research should be conducted on the impact or influence induction programs may have on student engagement and/or achievement by studying the effects of adults integrating into school communities and how students are affected.
(5) Further research should be conducted on isolating the influence of induction programs from general school contexts as they relate to faculty's overall job satisfaction.

Conclusion

While this study sought to determine whether induction programs in independent schools played a role in newly-hired faculty's overall job satisfaction and integration into the school community, more was revealed than induction programs playing a role. Faculty members emphasized that school culture and the opportunity to build relationships in that culture contributed to their job satisfaction, although the topic of school culture is much more complex than originally anticipated;

the latter only further highlights the need for continued investigation on the influence of school culture on job satisfaction. Faculty members also mentioned mentorship – either formal or informal – as a component that assisted them in their integration into the school community. These results are a small step to gaining a better understanding of why teachers stay, migrate, or leave the teaching profession all together. The more schools can understand the reasons for which teachers are dissatisfied with the profession, the more schools can provide in efforts to attract, support and retain educators. Further research should be conducted on the impact or influence induction programs may have on student engagement and/or achievement and students' experiences in school may be greatly affected by the experiences of the adults in their school.

References

Allen, M. B. (2005). *Eight questions on teacher recruitment and retention: What does the research say?* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED489332.pdf

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2014). *On the path to equity: improving the effectiveness of beginning teachers*. Retrieved from https://all4ed.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/07/PathToEquity.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2001). *Beginning teacher induction: The essential bridge.* Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/pb_teacherinduction_2001.pdf

Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: practical strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H., & Sunderland, R. J. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. *Exceptional Children*, *75*(1), 7-31.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Breaux, L. A., & Wong, K. H. (2003). *New teacher induction: How to train, support, and retain new teachers*. Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications.

Brill, S., & McCartney, A. (2008). Stopping the revolving door: increasing teacher retention. *Politics & Policy*, *36*(5), 750–774. doi:10.1111/j.17471346.2008.00133.x

Britt-Stevens, N. (2014). *Effects of mentoring programs on new teachers' retention in selected rural schools*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Order No. 3616793)

Carroll, T. G. (2007). *The high cost of teacher turnover*. Retrieved from https://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/NCTAFCostofTeacherTurnoverpolicybrief.odf

Council for American Private Education. (n.d.). Facts and Studies. Retrieved from: http://www.capenet.org/facts.html

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. M. (1996). Who teaches and why: Dilemmas of building a profession for twenty-first century schools. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 67–101). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dean, Y., London, C., Carston, C., & Salyers, V. (2015). Who assists the faculty? The need for mentorship programs for faculty undertaking global education initiatives. *International Journal for Leadership in Learning*, *1*(4), 1–34.

Dimatteo, K. (2014). *The effects of a mentoring program on teacher retention rates at Tashkent International School*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Order No. 3667519)

Eisner, S. (2015). Onboarding the faculty: A model for win-win mentoring. *American Journal of Business Education*, *8*(1), 7–22.

Elmore, R. F. (2002). *Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.

Fenton-Smith, B., & Torpey, M. J. (2013). Orienting EFL teachers: Principles arising from an evaluation of an induction program in a Japanese university. *Language Teaching Research*, *17*(2), 228–250.

Fideler, E., & Haselkorn, D. (1999). *Learning the ropes: Urban teacher induction programs and practices in the United States*. Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers.

Fletcher, S. J., & Mullen, C. A. (2012). *The SAGE handbook of mentoring and coaching in education*. London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Pscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study*. Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104027/pdf/20104027.pdf

Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support: Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 548–594). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Hammer, O. M., & Williams, P. (2005). Rejuvenating retirees: Mentoring first year teachers. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *71*, 20–25.

Heineke, A. J., Streff Mazza, B., & Tichnor-Wagner, A. (2014). After the two-year commitment: a quantitative and qualitative inquiry of Teach for America teacher retention and attrition. *Urban Education, 49*(7), 750–782.

Hunt, J. B., & Carroll, T. G. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Retrieved from http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/no-dream-denied_full-report.pdf

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(3), 499–534.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). The teacher shortage: a case of wrong diagnosis and wrong prescription. *NASSP Bulletin*, *86*(631), 16–31.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2011). Do we produce enough mathematics and science teachers? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(6), 37–41.

Ingersoll, R. M., & May, H. (2012). The magnitude, destinations, and determinants of mathematics and science turnover. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *34*(4), 435–464.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Merrill, L. (2010). Who's teaching our children? *Educational Leadership*, *67*(8), 14–20.

Ingersoll, R. M., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). *Seven trends: the transformation of the teaching force*. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/sites/default/file/workingpapers/1506_7trendsapril2014.pdf

Ingersoll, R.M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(2), 201–233. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323

Johnson, D. G. (2011). *Why are they leaving: A collective case study of teacher attrition during the first five career years*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Order No. 3489820)

Kelley, L. M. (2004). Why induction matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*(5), 438–448. doi:10.1177/0022487104269653

LoCascio, S. J., Smeaton, P. S., & Waters, F. H. (2016). How induction programs affect the decision of alternate route urban teachers to remain teaching. *Education and Urban Society*, *48*(2), 103–125.

Lopez, A., Lash, A., Schaffner, M., Shields, P., & Wagner, M. (2004). *Review of research on the impact of beginning teacher induction on teacher quality and retention*. Retrieved from https://www.teachers.net/wong/APR10/ResearchontheImpactofInduction.pdf

Mancuso, S. V., Roberts, L., & White, G. P. (2010). Teacher retention in international schools: The key role of school leadership. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *9*(3), 306–323.

McCamley, S. L. (2014). *The effectiveness of an induction program component, mentoring, on first-year teacher retention in Arizona*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Order No. 3682122)

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, S. B. (2010). *The revolving door: How leaders push teacher turnover* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Digital Archive @ GSU. (Paper 68).

Moore, C. M. (2012). The role of school environment in teacher dissatisfaction among U.S. public school teachers. *SAGE Open*, 1–16.

National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) – About NAIS. (n.d.). Retrieved February 14, 2018 from https://www.nais.org/about/about-nais/

New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.). Certification & Induction. Retrieved from: http:www.state.nj.us/education/educators/license/alternate.htm

Ogunyemi, O. O. O. (2013). *The effect of mentoring on beginning teacher retention in Bossier Parish (Louisiana) School* System. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses

database. (Order No. 3577723)

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.

Pruce, C., & Torres, A. (2017). The enrollment outlook. In S. Hunt, M. McGovern, & K. Taylor (Eds.), *2017–2018 National Association of Independent Schools Trendbook* (pp. 43–54). United States of America.

Sass, D. A., Bustos Flores, B., Claeys, L., & Pérez, B. (2012). Identifying personal and contextual factors that contribute to attrition rates for Texas public school teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *20*(15), 1–30.

Shockley, R., Watlington, E., & Felsher, R. (2013). Out on a limb: The efficacy of teacher induction in secondary schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, *97*(4), 350–377. doi:10.1177/0192636513510595

Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(3), 681–714.

Springer, M. G., Swain, W. A., & Rodriguez, L. A. (2016). Effective teacher retention bonuses: Evidence from Tennessee. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *38*(2), 199–221.

Westling, D. L., Herzog, M. J., Cooper-Duffy, K., Prohn, K., & Ray, M. (2006). The teacher support program: A proposed resource for the special education profession and an initial validation. *Remedial and Special Education*, *27*(3), 136–147.

Wong, H. K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(638), 41–58.

Zey, M. G. (1984). The mentor connection. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.