2011

Fifth Year Teacher Perceptions of Induction Programs Upon Teacher Retention

Arleen Reinhardt
Virginia Commonwealth University

FIFTH YEAR TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS UPON TEACHER RETENTION

A prospectus submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

by

Arleen Norris Reinhardt
Master of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1980
Bachelor of Arts, James Madison University, 1977

Director: NORA ALDER, Ed.D.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
Department of Teaching and Learning

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
April 26, 2011

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my daughter, Chesney, and my son, David, for serving as my inspirations. Their love, support and understanding during the past few years helped my dreams come true. I would like to thank Eileen for her many pep talks and Hank for his computer skills. I would like to thank all of my past professors and teachers who instilled in me a work ethic, the desire to learn, confidence, and skills needed to be successful. I would like to thank my wonderful colleagues and administrators for their support, kindness, and encouragement. I would also like to thank my chair, Dr. Nora Alder, and my committee members, Dr. Susan McKelvey, Dr. Michael Davis, and Dr. Bryant Mangum for their help with this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract

FIFTH YEAR TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS UPON TEACHER RETENTION

By Arleen Norris Reinhardt, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2011

Director: Nora Alder, Ed.D., Associate Professor
Department of Teaching and Learning

Due to teacher shortages, school districts have offered incentives and alternative licensure programs. Recently, however, school districts have shifted the focus from recruitment to one of teacher retention which places an emphasis upon beginning teacher induction programs. These programs help teachers improve in their craft of teaching, help teachers remain satisfied with their jobs, help teachers enculturate into the districts in which they work, and help to improve student achievement.

This quantitative study examined fifth year teachers' perceptions of their induction programs in terms of teacher retention. The 280 eligible teachers from three different school districts were asked to participate by completing an electronic survey, which asked questions regarding their experiences and perceptions of their induction program, and by participating in a focus group session.

No statistical significance was shown between the different components of the induction program and teacher retention. However, by examining the means of responses given and the frequencies, reviewers may be able to glean information, indicating which

components were more positively perceived by teachers. Findings suggest that learning styles, attitudes, and professional growth needs have more of an impact upon teacher perception of the value of the different components. In order to retain good teachers in the classroom, staff developers need to offer a wide range of professional growth opportunities. For the staff developer, designing an induction program which meets the needs and learning styles of all beginning teachers becomes problematic.

Chapter I

Statement of the Problem

This study focuses upon the beginning teacher induction practices established by school districts in a Southeastern metropolitan area. One of the goals of such induction practices is the retention of classroom teachers so that districts can place less focus upon recruitment of teacher personnel, which is more expensive. Induction programs also help teachers improve in their craft of teaching, help teachers remain satisfied with their jobs, help teachers enculturate into the districts in which they work, and help to improve student achievement. Keeping more experienced teachers in the classroom increases the quality of teaching for students.

Teacher shortages exist nationally. Shortages in some subject areas and especially in high-needs public schools, typically located in urban and rural areas, began in the mid-80's. According to Ingersoll (2004), both student enrollments and teacher retirements have increased since that time period. As a corollary, the need for more teachers has increased as the student population and attrition rates, resulting from the increase in the number of teachers reaching retirement age, have increased.

In reaction to this shortage, school districts begin, according to Smith, Choy, Retallick & Sally (1994), to hire more inexperienced or first-time teachers. States offer alternative programs for licensure so that individuals working in the private sector can enter the teaching profession. This, however, does not fully resolve the issue of the teacher shortage. Darling-Hammond (2000) indicates that "about 60% of individuals who enter teaching through such programs leave the profession by their third year as

compared to about 30% of traditionally-trained teachers and only about 10-15% of teachers prepared in extended, five-year teacher programs" (p. 23). Thus, an examination of the reasons for this significant loss of teaching personnel becomes necessary if districts are to become proactive in dealing with the shortage issue. According to Tabs (2004), discontent with the profession continues and may be the corollary of higher salaries in the private sector, more intellectual stimulation in the private sector, more professional growth opportunities in the private sector, and/or the over-all conditions in the teaching environment. According to the Southeast Center for Teaching Quality (2002), educators want smaller class sizes, a strong, supportive administration, more time to plan, and instructional support personnel. In fact, Hirsch (2006) states in his findings for the Center for Teaching Quality that "non-financial incentives such as reduced teaching loads/class size, guaranteed planning time and additional support for teachers and students can provide the impetus to get qualified educators into hard-to-staff schools" (p. 20).

To deal with teacher dissatisfaction and to deal simultaneously with the staggering statistics related to teachers' leaving the profession, school districts reacted by implementing induction programs that include mentoring, colleague and buddy systems, peer coaching, pre-teaching sessions, workshops, and/or other induction components. Even networking or technological resources are part of induction programs, which have as their purpose to retain beginning teachers (Martinez, 2004). The data indicate that institutions prepare an adequate number of teachers yearly to meet the growing public school enrollment and to replace retiring teachers (Ingersoll, 2004). In spite of these data, school districts still experience shortages. Thus, districts begin to place much emphasis

upon induction programs that offer support to beginning teachers and focus upon teacher retention.

The induction programs attracted a great deal of attention; in fact, awareness of the concept of mentoring, one such induction program, increased in the past two to three decades (Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). Several types of programs referred to as induction programs exist. Some of these include mentoring, peer coaching, peer observation, workshops, and seminars. These programs may be single year programs or may be extended over several years. This study examines the types of induction programs that some of the public school districts in a Southeastern metropolitan area implement and examines district data regarding teacher retention of the participants in these programs. This chapter includes a brief summary of the literature and research background, as well as a summary of the research questions and methodology to be used in the study.

Overview of the Study

In order to gain insight into which induction programs public school districts in a Southeastern metropolitan area deem the most beneficial in teacher retention and which achieve the best results, an inventory of those programs will be created and examined. According to the National Education Association (NEA), new teachers that participate in an induction program such as mentoring are twice as likely to remain in the teaching profession (Brown, 2003). Thus, an intervention program, such as mentoring, provides teachers with both instructional and interpersonal support that results in successful professional development and teacher retention (Blair-Larsen, 1998). Much research

exists regarding mentoring programs that many school districts use; however, the programs adopted by these districts are quite different (Brown, 2003). For example, one mentoring program, Partners in Education (PIE), includes the "components of intensive mentoring, group networking, and ongoing inquiry into practice that Darling-Hammond, Huling-Austin and NCAF view as potential remedies for teacher attrition" (Kelley, 2004, p. 442).

This study examines the types of programs that these Southeastern metropolitan public school districts use in order to help retain teachers in the workforce and to meet the demands engendered by the increase in student population. Ingersoll (2003) notes that the mobility of the teacher workforce is extensive. Within the 1999-2000 school year, he indicates that more than a million teachers, which is approximately 1/3 of the teacher workforce, left from their present positions. Of interest when examining teacher mobility and turnover rates are the rates as they pertain to other occupations. However, because turnover figures usually include teacher rates, it is difficult to determine if the rates for teachers are in excess of those to other occupations. A report from the Bureau of National Affairs (BNA) indicates that during 2006, "the six-month turnover figure is equivalent to the separation rate of 1.1 percent observed during the first six months of 2005" (Cody, 2006). The BNA interprets this data as positive signs showing "relative stability" in terms of employment.

Because this stability is not applicable to the teacher workforce during this time, it becomes important to understand the reasons for this mobility, which Ingersoll believes puts schools in a tenable position because their staffing needs are not met. Also, it is

equally important to examine the programs used by school districts to prevent this mobility. In addition to retaining teachers in the workforce, many of these induction programs benefit the beginning or inexperienced teacher and offer a win-win situation to all stakeholders. For example, Stansbury and Zimmerman (2006) note that in districts that offer mentoring as an induction program, not only do mentors and mentees benefit from the program, but so do schools and school districts. These benefits include lower teacher attrition, high teacher morale, and, most importantly, improved teaching and learning. The NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education (1999) espouses the same claim that such programs as mentoring benefit the entire school system:

> For school administrators, mentoring aids recruitment and retention; for high institutions, it helps to ensure a smooth transition from the campus to classroom; for teacher associations, it represents a new way to serve members and guarantee instructional quality; for teachers, it can represent the difference between success and failure; and for parents and students, it means better teaching (p. 6).

To better aid teachers in their transition into the teaching profession, many public school districts establish mentoring programs that help retain teachers in a critical time period when attrition and student population growth make it less economical to recruit new teachers than to retain those already hired. Villani (2002) states that "we cannot afford to replace the forty percent who may leave the profession" in the next ten years (p. 19). Not only is there a monetary cost, which includes funding for the initial recruitment, staff development costs, and any other monetary costs associated with the offered induction

programs, but attrition disrupts school programs and goals for students. This is especially true when a teacher leaves the classroom during the school year or the teacher leaving developed a special curriculum or sponsored a particular extracurricular activity. According to Breaux and Wong (2003), the approximate cost per teacher loss is in excess of $50,000 if measured as human resource specialists in high-performance industries measure the loss. This is "nearly 2.5 times the employee's initial salary in recruitment and personnel expenditures and lost productivity" (p. 6). Therefore, it becomes necessary for school districts to use programs that focus upon retention. Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden (2005), proponents of strong mentoring programs, note that school districts that do not offer mentoring programs, lose an "average of $8,000 per recruit, dollars that could be more profitably spent on direct investments in the classrooms" (p. 53). However, induction programs differ from one school district to the next. Therefore, it becomes necessary to identify and to understand what components of the programs public school districts use. It also becomes necessary to explore the best practices used in these effective induction programs so that other school districts can avail themselves of these "best practices."

The survey of teachers will identify the types of induction programs instituted in these Southeastern metropolitan public school districts. Results from the survey will indicate whether or not these programs are used individually or in conjunction with other programs or components of other programs, and the beginning teachers will offer their feedback regarding the perceived value of each of the programs. The description of the program and feedback from the teachers are both important in determining which

programs or components of the programs are most beneficial to beginning teachers. Feedback from teachers may show that the efficacy of the chosen program is dependent upon the length of time allotted for the program.

Rationale for the Study

One main reason to become acquainted with the induction programs that the Southeastern metropolitan public school districts offer is to identify the programs that the systems invest in and research so that other districts have the opportunity to learn from their findings. Secondly, it is important to examine teacher feedback regarding the programs in which beginning teachers participate. Thirdly, the retention data that exist before the implementation of such programs and after the implementation of such programs help to evaluate the efficacy of each program studied.

This study contributes to the larger body of knowledge regarding the types of induction programs that teachers perceive are the most effective in retaining teachers. It is also possible that the data from the study will assist other school divisions and local and state policymakers when they make decisions regarding the allocation of funding to induction programs that have clearly demonstrated success.

Brief Overview of the Literature

Teacher shortage has become a concern for school boards throughout the United States. Some critics espouse the view that teacher expectations regarding the job description, support services, and classroom management compounded with the issue of accountability adversely affect the already growing problem. However, this problem is not a recent one; nor is it one that begins as a result of the No Child Left Behind Act,

passed into law in 2002, which places much emphasis upon teacher accountability. The shortage problems arose earlier; in fact, shortages in some subject areas and in rural and urban areas have existed since the mid-80's. Ingersoll (2004), however, states that colleges produce enough certified teachers yearly to meet the demand; thus, school districts should not experience difficulty filling all of their job vacancies.

If colleges are producing enough qualified teachers to meet the demand, why are school districts having difficulty filling their vacancies. Another question to examine is why teachers either leave the classroom or do not enter the teaching field at all. Some researchers believe that the central issue lies in job dissatisfaction. For example, by the fifth year of teaching, 40-50% of teachers leave the profession. The turnover rates, according to Ingersoll (2004), are also much higher in high poverty public schools and in urban public schools. For example, in The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1997, "some analysts found that in some metropolitan areas some schools have extensive waiting lists of qualified candidates for their teaching job openings, while other nearby schools have great difficulty filling their teaching job openings with qualified candidates" (Ingersoll, 2004, p.11). If these waiting lists exist, then the problem is not the result of the retirement and enrollment data, but with some other factors, especially within high needs schools. This becomes more obvious when Ingersoll's (2001) data show that teachers in public schools exit low poverty schools at a rate of 10.5% per year while teachers in high poverty public schools leave at a rate of 15.2%.

School districts reacted to the shortages in different ways. One consequence is that some school districts hired classroom teachers who do not meet the "highly qualified teacher" (HQT) category item under NCLB guidelines. For example, according to Provasnik and Dorfman (2005), in 1999-2000, "new hires were less likely to have both a major and certification in the field of their main teaching assignment" (p. 10). Thus, school boards accepted less qualified candidates to fill some of their vacancies. In addition to this change in hiring practice, some districts also offered pay incentives to attract qualified candidates. According to the Henke, Choy, Chen, Geis, & Alt (1997), some districts offered teachers cash bonuses and more teachers started at a higher level on the pay scale, or the districts offered some other form of salary increase in order to recruit them. This trend became more evident when school districts not only offered pay incentives but also offered free training or awarded funds for tuition and books (Bolich, 2001). Districts and states also offered alternative licensure programs to recruit those individuals who wanted to switch careers. Thus, districts reacted to the teacher shortage by focusing upon their recruitment techniques and the offering of incentives.

According to Bracey (2002), these institutional responses are not likely to solve the issues. Ingersoll (2001) and Bracey (2002) believe that an alternative solution for the problem is for districts to decrease the demand for teachers by reducing turnover. Many retention programs may be strong, well-intended institutional responses; but in some cases, they are directly tied to policies such as NCLB and high-stakes testing, which focus upon accountability, thus offering little autonomy to the classroom teacher. Ingersoll (2004) believes that although districts entrust teachers with the teaching of the

next generation—a prodigious responsibility—districts do not give teachers much power to make major decisions that directly affect their work. He states that the teacher wields little, if any control; "a close look at the organization of the teaching job shows, that although it involves the delegation of much responsibility, it involves little real power" (p. 23). Thus, the need arises for induction programs that offer support, provide motivation, and establish autonomy for the classroom teacher so that job satisfaction increases.

Research indicates that the induction programs used by districts differ. However, Breaux and Wong (2003) indicate that "an induction process is the best way to send a message to your teachers that you value them and want them to succeed and stay" (p. v). They also note that even though induction programs may differ, the most successful programs have some of the same components. One such trait is that training begins four or five days prior to the beginning of the school year. Secondly, the training is systematic and continues for two or three years. The administration's support of the induction process is also characteristic of these successful programs. To better train these new or less experienced teachers, mentoring is an important component of the process; and the structure of mentoring and modeling is inclusive. A successful induction process is one, according to Breaux and Wong (2003), that espouses the view that the better trained teachers are, the higher the level of student achievement. Thus, induction programs designed to help train beginning teachers help increase teacher confidence and competence, which can result in increasing student performance.

Research Questions

The main research question is whether teachers in the Southeastern metropolitan public school districts perceive their induction programs as being instrumental in retaining them in these schools. The research questions for this study are

1. What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the components of the induction program in retaining teachers?
2. How important a factor were the induction programs in 5th year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom?
3. Which components of the induction program do the 5th year teachers perceive to be the most valuable?
4. What difference, if any, according to 5th year teachers' perceptions, does the length of time of each of the components of the induction program make?
5. What difference, if any, do demographic variables, such as type of teaching certification, assignment in a high needs school, grade or subject area taught, gender, or ethnicity, make in terms of teacher perception regarding their induction program?

Design and Methods

To explore these questions and to test the hypothesis that the Southeastern metropolitan public school districts are using meaningful induction programs to offer beginning teachers support to help improve teacher retention in their districts, a non-experimental quantitative research methodology is the preferable choice. The sample for the study includes teachers who have four years of teaching experience and participated

in the induction program in their districts. After gaining the appropriate permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) panel to pursue the study, the researcher applied to the Director of Research in each of the districts to gain the necessary authorization to conduct the research study.

To ensure the quality of the teacher survey, the researcher sought the opinions of experts in the field of induction programs. Based upon this feedback, the researcher made the necessary amendments to the survey. After the researcher piloted a survey to be given to teachers who were involved in these programs, a survey was electronically submitted to teachers in each district who began their careers in the districts and were still teaching in the districts during their fifth year. The survey gave teachers sections where comments could be written, as well as a scale by which to evaluate their experience with each component of their district's program. After receiving the survey results, the researcher held focus groups with some of the teachers from each district who responded to the survey. During the focus group sessions, the teachers further elaborated upon or clarified the meaning of some of their responses. Teacher comments from the surveys guided the researcher's questioning of the participants. The face-to-face feedback enabled the researcher to gain a deeper understanding regarding the responses given on the survey. This qualitative research allowed the researcher to triangulate data. The researcher also examined district data that indicated whether or not the percentage of teachers leaving the district prior to the sixth year of teaching had decreased since the implementation of the district's induction program. These data would then be compared with the national trends data collected through the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Thus, the

research design of the study is descriptive, and the independent variable is the induction program implemented by each of the Southeastern metropolitan public school districts studied with the dependent variable being teacher retention for each of the teachers involved in the induction programs.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following operationalized terms are defined as follows:

Induction program: An induction program is any formal program which has as its goal to help inexperienced teachers better adjust to their role in the classroom. These programs may have components which vary in length of time or proceed in a hierarchical progression, but the program itself is typically a two-year program.

Mentoring**:** This type of induction program or component of an induction program pairs an inexperienced teacher with a more experienced teacher. Mentoring is a process by which a long-term relationship between an experienced and a beginning teacher engenders the professional growth of the beginning teacher**.**

Networking: This term, often associated with induction programs, relates to teachers offering guidance and assistance to other teachers via computers and through web-based methods. Through these venues, an external network of teachers may form in order to assist other educators who may be in isolated situations.

Peer coaching: This strategy is often part of a comprehensive induction program. Teachers receive assistance from fellow teachers in order to improve classroom instruction. It is an approach used most frequently when implementing

instructional strategies which will make a direct impact upon student performance. It is a technique which differs from mentoring because both individuals may be equally experienced.

Professional development**:** This term typically refers to any and all learning opportunities provided for teachers from the beginning to end of their teaching careers. According to the United States Department of Education, high quality professional development "refers to rigorous and relevant content, strategies, and organization supports that ensure the preparation and career-long development of teachers and others whose competence, expectations and actions influence the teaching and learning environment" (cited in "What is meant by staff development?," n.d.). Hence, professional development is a term that encompasses any activity that helps teachers continue to grow in their professional skills and understandings.

Retention: Retention refers to a systematic attempt by the local school districts to create an environment that encourages present teachers to remain in the classroom and not to seek other employment. The school districts will foster positive work environments which meet the needs of the diverse teaching staff which results in job satisfaction.

Staff/Professional Developer**:** This term refers to the person responsible for developing and organizing activities or professional development opportunities to enhance the professional skills and understanding of each teacher.

Workshops: These are seminars or series of meetings regarding educational topics that emphasize both interaction among the participants and an open exchange of information to aid the participants in problem solving. The number of participants in a workshop is limited due to the need for interaction.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

This review of literature indicates the presence of a teacher shortage in high-needs schools and in some subject areas. It also explores the possible reasons for those shortages, especially in particular subject areas and in certain types of schools as noted by demographic characteristics. Secondly, the literature presented will discuss teacher dissatisfaction which aids in producing the teacher shortage. Because of these shortages brought about by dissatisfaction with aspects of the profession, school districts began to offer alternative licensure programs and to offer incentives to fill positions in areas of need. Thus, the third section of the literature review examines the literature related to alternative licensure programs and incentives offered by school districts to fill teaching positions. These programs and incentives focus upon recruitment of teachers. In addition to these recruitment techniques, school districts use induction programs that help in retaining beginning or inexperienced teachers. Thus, the literature reveals a shift from recruitment as a primary focus to one of retention, as well. This shift becomes apparent in the literature, and the final section of the literature review examines this focus upon retention. The last section of the literature review creates the context for this particular research study. An editor reviewed the source information and citations found in the chapter to insure availability, format, and accuracy.

Trends in the Teacher Shortage: Projected Need

Hiring a qualified teacher for every teaching position is a difficult task. According to Darling-Hammond (2000), the growing enrollment “caused by increased birth rates

and immigration coupled with a large wave of retirements and turnover of younger teachers, have created the largest growth in the demand for teachers in America's history" (p. 12). The literature shows that the demand for teachers will exist in the future, as well. For example, Hussar (2005) states that the "number of teachers in elementary and secondary public education increased 29% between 1980 and 2002 and is projected to increase an additional 13% between 2002 and 2014" (p. 17). Table 1 indicates the projected increase in student enrollment at all levels which necessitates an increased need for teachers in the future.

Table 1

Enrollment in Educational Institutions from 1987 to 2016 (in thousands)

Year	Total enrollment, all levels	Elementary and Secondary, total
Fall, 1987	58,253	45,488
Fall, 1990	60,683	46,864
Fall, 1993	63,438	49,133
Fall, 1996	65,911	51,544
Fall, 1999	67,667	52,875
Fall, 2002	71, 015	54,403
Fall, 2005	72,712	55,224
Fall, 2008	74,230	55,966
Fall, 2011	75,962	56,857
Fall, 2016	80,222	59,780

Note. From *Digest of Education Statistics, 2004*, 2004, National Center for Education Statistics. Copyright 2005 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Trends indicate that as the student population steadily increases, the need for teachers will rise proportionately. In fact, the National Center for Education Statistics (2008) indicates that the total number of elementary and secondary teachers "increased 27 percent between 1992 and 2005, a period of 13 years" and that the projected increase will be "an additional 18 percent between 2005 and 2017." Because of the trend—a steady increase in student population—the need for teachers will rise proportionately. In fact, the

National Center of Education Statistics (2008) estimate that the new teacher hires in public schools of 285,000 in 2005 would increase to 364,000 in 2007.

Teacher Shortage: Historical Evidence

Teacher shortage is not a new issue; the issue began as early as the 1980's. In 1987-1988, 92% of the teachers in public schools were working under a continuing contract, which means that they were granted tenure (Hammer & Gerald, 1991, p. iii). At that time, 95% of the teachers in public schools held the necessary credentials for state certification in their fields of expertise. Teacher shortages did not alarm public school districts until the late 1980's when it became more noticeable that qualified teachers in some fields were in shorter supply. Subject areas of teacher shortage were mathematics, social science, and business. Qualified teachers in these areas were not all applying for teaching positions. For example, of all qualified, trained teachers in the mathematics areas, only 39 percent applied for teaching jobs. In the social sciences area, only 31% applied; and in the business area only 20% applied to teach in 1993-94 (Henke, Choy, Shen, Geis & Alt, 1997). Because of the shortages in particular curricular areas, school districts began to offer incentives to teachers who were qualified to teach in those areas of shortage or to teachers willing to teach in less desirable locations. Table 2 shows that even though some school districts offered teachers cash bonuses, more frequently teachers started at a higher level on the pay scale or accepted offers in some other form of salary increase.

Table 2

Incentives Offered to Increase Workforce in Areas of Need in 1987 and 1993

	Less Desirable Locations			Fields of Shortage		
	Cash Bonus	Increase on Salary Schedule	Other Salary Increase	Cash Bonus	Increase on Salary Schedule	Other Salary Increase
1987-88	1.1%	3.3%	1.8%	1.1%	2.8%	1.8%
1993-94	2.1%	5.4%	3.6%	1.8%	4.8%	4.2%

Note. Adapted from *America's teachers: Profile of a profession, 1993-94*, by R.R. Henke, S.P. Choy, X. Chen, S. Geis, & M.N. Alt, 1997, National Center for Education Statistics. p. 131. Copyright 1997 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Not only did districts offer pay incentives as early as 1987, they still offered them in 2003-2004. According to the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), states offered pay incentives in 2003-04 to recruit or retain teachers to teach in a less desirable location or to recruit or retain teachers to teach in fields of teacher shortage. For example, in Alaska 15.4% of public school districts offered pay incentives due to the less desirable location and 4.6% of them offered incentives to teach in subject areas of shortage (National Center of Educational Statistics, 2004). According to this survey, this was also true in other states such as Louisiana where 21.2% of the public school districts used pay incentives to recruit or retain teachers to teach in a less desirable location and 12.7 % of the districts used pay incentives to recruit or retain teachers in certain subject areas. When districts offer teachers salary increases or bonuses in order to fill the teaching positions for a given year, this indicates a teacher shortage.

Another cue of the existence of a teacher shortage is that school districts not only offered pay incentives but also offered free training for those hired. Both private and public schools offered the same incentives and free training in order to fully staff their schools in 1993. In a study of over 9,000 public schools and 3,000 private schools, pay incentives are evident for recruits in the special education, mathematics, science, and English Language Learners (ELL) fields. Table 3 indicates that public and private schools not only offered pay incentives during that time, they also offered free training in order to fill their positions. This, too, was true especially in the fields of mathematics, science, and special education. Free training, according to Table 3, represented a more cost-effective means for both private and public schools to recruit teachers. However, the percentage of schools that offered free training for teachers in the ELL area was much higher in public schools than in private schools (see Table 3).

Table 3

Percentage of Public School Districts and Private Schools That Used Pay Incentives or Offered Free Training to Recruit or Retain Teachers in Various Fields of Shortage: 1993-94

	Percentage using pay incentives		Percentage offering free training	
Subject Areas	Public districts	Private schools	Public districts	Private schools
Any field	10.2	19.2	19.0	24.8
Special education	6.2	3.0	12.2	12.4
Mathematics	3.2	5.1	11.3	12.4
Computer science	1.7	3.3	9.5	11.8
Physical sciences	2.7	3.9	9.1	9.2
Biology or life sciences	2.8	3.6	9.1	9.2
ESL, ESOL, or bilingual education	3.2	1.2	10.1	2.6
Foreign languages	2.0	2.4	6.1	4.1
Vocational/technical education	2.5	0.5	6.6	2.7
Other	1.1	11.8	0.9	5.6

Note. Adapted from *America's teachers: Profile of a profession, 1993-94*, by R.R. Henke, S.P. Choy, X. Chen, S. Geis, & M.N. Alt, 1997, National Center for Education Statistics. p. 132. Copyright 1997 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Teacher Shortage: District Reactions

Pay incentives and free training were not the only means that districts used to staff their positions. Due to shortages of teachers in some subject areas and in some geographical areas, some districts began hiring teachers to teach subjects that they were not licensed to teach. For example, in 1999-2000, "new hires were more likely to be young and to teach out-of-field than continuing teachers" (Provasnik & Dorfman, 2005, p. 10). Also, according to Provasnik and Dorfman (2005), "new hires were less likely to have both a major and certification in the field of their main teaching assignments" (p. 10). Even more astounding is that this NCES study notes that "approximately 19% of both returning teachers and delayed entrants reported no certification" (p. 10). In fact, the study notes that a great number of delayed entrants were hired "without majors in their main teaching assignments and with either no certification at all or provisional/alternative certification" (Provasnik & Dorman, 2005, p. 10). Hence, even in 2000, the trend reflects the use of less qualified or less experienced teachers in the classroom due to teacher shortages in some subject areas and in some geographic areas.

Characteristics of the Teacher Workforce

An issue which Ingersoll (2004) raises is that according to "NCES's Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data system (IPEDS), the United States colleges produce more than enough prospective teachers each year" (p. 10). The question becomes whether or not universities produce enough teachers in each field, which IPEDS does not answer. For example, the data do not indicate if universities train enough teachers of special education, science and math. A second issue that Ingersoll (2004) raises is that some

school districts do not have the same staffing problems as other districts. He points out, for example, that in The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1997, that analysts found that some schools in some metropolitan areas have waiting lists of teachers qualified for the teaching vacancies, while other nearby schools' administrators have great difficulty filling their available teaching positions with qualified teachers. If these waiting lists exist, then the problem is not the result of enrollment data, but with other factors, such as job dissatisfaction. Ingersoll (2004) states that "most of the demand for teachers and hiring is simply to replace teachers who have recently left their teaching jobs, and most of this teacher turnover has little to do with a 'graying workforce'" (p. 11).

The data that cause school officials the greatest concern is that the highest number of teachers are leaving from two groups of experience. According to the 2000-01 survey, the highest percentage of teachers leave who have 1-3 years of experience or 25+ years of experience (Tabs, 2004). According to these data, there has been an increase each year since 1991 in the percentage of teachers who leave the profession who only have 1-3 years of full-time experience and are untenured. Although the percentage of teachers who leave after 25+ years has been consistent since 1988, that percentage, 11%, is fairly high. Another question that arises is how many of the teachers with 20-24 years of experience are preparing to retire. The data indicate an increase in the number of teachers with 20+ years of experience leaving the profession early. In fact, the trend shows an increase in this group from 2.2% in the 1980's to 11.2% in 2000. Another important consideration is the percentage of teachers who leave with only 1-9 years of experience. Fifteen percent of teachers leave the profession after only nine years of teaching. Table 4 shows that the

trend for teachers who leave after nine years of classroom experience is similar in 2005. In 2004-2005, approximately one-fifth of the classroom teachers left the profession before having 20 years of experience (see Table 4). Also, almost one-third of classroom teachers transferred to other schools.

Table 4

Number and Percentage Distribution of Public School Teachers Who Stay, Move, and Leave in 2004-2005

Teaching Experience	Stayers		Movers		Leavers		Total
Not Full Time	17,800	63.3%	4,800	17.1%	5,500	19.6%	28,100
1-3 Yrs.	461,100	77.1%	88,600	14.8%	48,600	8.1%	598,300
4-9 Yrs.	716,800	82.7%	81,600	9.4%	68,800	7.9%	867,200
10-19 Yrs.	717,000	88.2%	51,000	6.3%	44,700	5.5%	812,700
20 Yrs. or more	771,500	84.9%	35,200	3.9%	101,900	11.2%	908,600
Total	2,684,200	83.5%	261,200	8.1%	269,500	8.4%	3,214,900

Note. Adapted from *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004-05 Teacher Follow-Up Survey*, by J. Marvel, D. Lyter, P. Pelota, G. Strizek, & B. Morton, 2007, National Center for Education Statistics. p. 8. Copyright 2007 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

In order to fill these vacancies, recruitment becomes a major focus for school districts.

Private schools, as well as public schools, experience the same staffing difficulties due to the increasing number of teachers leaving the classroom. For example, Table 5 shows the increase in the percentage of teachers leaving both public and private schools from 1988-2001. In the private sector, the number of teachers leaving has been rather

consistent when looking for trends. However, a slight increase is clear in both the private and public sectors when comparing the 1994-95 school year to the 2000-01 school year (see Table 5). The need to produce enough new teachers to replace the teachers who are leaving the classroom and to accommodate for the growth in the student population is evident.

Table 5

Number of Teachers Staying, Moving, or Leaving the Profession from 1988-2005

Sector	Year	Total base year teachers	Stayers		Movers		Leavers	
Public	1988-89	2,386,500	2,065,800	86.5%	188,400	7.9%	132,300	5.6%
	1991-92	2,553,500	2,237,300	87.6%	185,700	7.3%	130,500	5.1%
	1994-95	2,555,800	2,205,300	86.3%	182,900	7.2%	167,600	6.6%
	2000-01	2,994,700	2,542,200	84.9%	231,000	7.7%	221,400	7.4%
	2004-05	3,214,900	2,684,200	83.5%	261,100	8.1%	269,600	8.4%
Private	1988-89	311,900	242,500	77.8%	29,700	9.5%	39,700	12.7%
	1991-92	353,800	287,100	81.1%	23,200	6.6%	43,500	12.3%
	1994-95	376,800	310,100	82.3%	21,700	5.8%	45,000	11.9%
	2000-01	448,600	354,800	79.1%	37,600	8.4%	56,200	12.5%
	2004-05	465,300	374,600	80.5%	27,600	5.9%	63,100	13.6%

Note. Adapted from *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004-05 Teacher Follow-Up Survey*, by J. Marvel, D. Lyter, P. Pelota, G. Strizek, & B. Morton, 2007, National Center for Education Statistics. p. 7. Copyright 2007 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Factors Attributing to the Shortage

If colleges are producing an adequate number of teachers and if, as Ingersoll (2003) notes that in 1999-2000, "well over a million teachers—almost 1/3 of this large workforce—moved into, between or out of schools," either "revolving door" policies are at fault or teachers are displaying dissatisfaction with their jobs (p. 12). According to researchers, dissatisfaction is the more probable reason for teachers to leave the profession. A 2001 survey of public and private school teachers indicates that 38% of the teachers who left the profession did so due to "dissatisfaction with administrative support and that 32% of those who were departing did so because of workplace conditions" (Tabs, 2004, p. 15). Ingersoll (2003) states that this discontent is the reason that just after the fifth year of teaching 20-50% of teachers leave the profession. If discontent is the reason for teachers leaving the profession, job satisfaction data warrant examination. There are several contributing factors which prevent teachers from entering the profession or prevent them from remaining in the profession. Table 6 reports the data that examine teacher satisfaction. The data indicate that those individuals who left the teaching profession to take another job are over-all more satisfied in their current job. The data reflect the views of teachers who left teaching in both public and private schools. The teachers surveyed note that in the teaching profession, there was less intellectual challenge and less professional prestige. There were also fewer opportunities for professional growth and less autonomy in comparison to those traits in their current positions (see Table 6).

Table 6

Percentage of Public and Private School Teacher Leavers Who Were Working That Rated Various Aspects of Their Current Main Occupation as Better Than Teaching, Not Better Than Teaching, or No Difference: 2000–01

	Better in teaching		Better in current position		No difference	
Occupation characteristic	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Salary	30.1	19.2	43.8	65.0	26.1	15.8
Benefits	39.6	22.4	20.3	53.9	40.0	23.7
Job security	31.0	23.1	19.2	32.9	49.7	44.0
Intellectual challenge	17.4	29.4	51.8	42.4	30.8	28.2
Opportunities for professional development	19.0	19.0	41.7	51.7	39.3	29.4
Professional prestige	15.8	21.1	57.7	55.8	26.5	23.0
General work conditions	4.3	11.2	50.9	54.9	44.8	33.9
Safety of environment	10.9	16.2	29.7	28.3	59.5	55.5
Manageability of workload	13.5	8.1	60.4	63.4	26.1	28.4
Procedures for performance evaluation	17.9	16.4	38.0	40.6	44.1	43.1
Autonomy or control over own work	13.7	24.1	65.2	45.5	21.1	30.4

(*table continues*)

Occupation characteristic	Better in teaching		Better in current position		No difference	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Influence over workplace policies and practices	17.5	22.8	49.0	40.7	33.4	36.5
Recognition and support from administrators	19.7	15.8	46.8	52.1	33.6	32.1
Professional caliber of colleagues	14.9	20.7	27.0	35.4	58.2	43.9
Opportunities for learning from colleagues	21.2	25.9	40.4	41.4	38.4	32.7
Opportunities for professional advancement	18.1	11.9	53.9	61.1	28.0	27.0

Note. Adapted from *Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results from the Teacher Follow-Up Survey, 2000-01* by E.D. Tabs, 2004, National Center for Education Statistics. p. 36. Copyright 2004 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

These were the same factors that teachers who left the classroom or left the profession note in the NCES teacher follow study of 2004-2005. Guarino, Santibanez, and Daley (2006) note that "schools that provided teachers with more autonomy and administrative support had lower levels of teacher attrition and migration" (p. 201). Their findings also indicated that "accountability policies might lead to increased attrition in low-performing schools" (Guarino et al., 2006, p. 201).

These accountability policies result from the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Hill and Barth (2004) state that teaching is stressful but "new and excessive stress has been generated by the No Child Left Behind Act" (p. 178). According to their research, "high stakes testing is having a negative impact on teacher retention" (p. 176). Justice, Geiner, and Anderson (n.d.) find "that teachers leaving the profession cite low teacher morale, enhanced by school and district pressure for high student achievement on standardized tests" as a rationale for why teachers leave the profession (p. 384). Further noting low morale and stress as factors that play a role in teacher shortage, Bentley (2008), a teacher for 38 years, states that NCLB contributes little of anything positive to the improvement of education while high-stakes testing narrows the curriculum, depresses teacher and administrator morale, increases stress on everybody, and results in a high turn-over rate of teachers and administrators.

Both Ingersoll (2002) and Justice et al. (n.d.) conclude that most of the teacher demand is due to teacher attrition. Ingersoll (2002) states that the attrition and shortages are attributable to teacher dissatisfaction. He also believes that "'well over 90% of new hires are simple replacements for recent departures'" (p. 21). Ingersoll espouses the view that school officials need to focus upon the factors that cause teachers to leave the classroom so that teacher retention becomes the focus.

Other Factors Causing Dissatisfaction

Another reason for dissatisfaction especially for teachers in subject areas of need is income. This economic factor impacts teacher retention because salaries for qualified individuals are higher in the private sector. For example, Oklahoma "has more than 700

certified math teachers who aren't teaching the subject" (Bradley, 1999, p. 3). The most probable reason for this situation is that "starting teachers in 1999 earn just $24,060, while math majors can earn $40,000 to $50,000 in the computer field fresh out of college" (Bradley, 1999, p. 3). In fact, "among teachers who left because they were dissatisfied, 45% said poor salary was an issue" (Bracey, 2002, p. 2). Ingersoll (2003) notes that "SASS data indicate that the average starting salary for a public school teacher in 1999-2000 school year was about $26,000 and the average highest possible salary was less than $50,000" (p. 24). For beginning teachers, this salary is not inviting. Beginning teachers made "almost 50% less than the average starting salary of classmates who took computer science jobs" (Ingersoll, 2003, p. 24). This may be one reason why the data show that "only about 60% of all new teachers enter the field upon graduation" (Darling-Hammond, 2000, p.12). Economic factors, consequently, contribute to teacher shortages.

The economic factors that cause dissatisfaction with teaching as a profession may be the result of cultural values. Guthrie (1999) believes that the values of the community impact the culture. As a result, the "problems must be challenged externally through empirical research results, elevated market expectations for teachers' performance, and public perception" (p. 2). "Until there is a greater school district and school demand for good teachers," just as there is in the business world, "there will be little prestige for good schools of education"(p. 2). Thus, the value that our culture places upon education "discourages larger numbers of more able individuals from entering the field" (p. 3). According to Guthrie (1999), to redress the retention problem, politicians need to offer more than a mediocre lifetime salary. An increase in the salary will increase the prestige

for the profession because the institutions are willing only to hire and retain well-qualified teachers who will help students meet the academic performance demands that are so important to "parents and policymakers" (Guthrie, 1999, p. 3).

Another factor resulting in teacher dissatisfaction is the feeling of isolation. Even though retention programs may be strong, well-intended programs, the need for such programs is directly tied to policies such as NCLB and high-stakes testing, which focus upon accountability. NCLB requires that a "highly qualified teacher" be in every classroom, which may negatively impact retention rates. This Act requires that all teachers in core areas—science, social studies, language arts, and mathematics-- have full certification. Because all students must "be able to perform at proficient levels by 2014, school boards, both local and state, will be intensely focusing on academic achievement and teacher accountability" (Ingersoll, 2003, p. 5). The politicians or policymakers will not alter the expectations because standardized testing is, according to Rose, Gallop and Elam, extremely popular (cited in Dorn, 1998). However, one study of standardized testing indicates that "while intended to motivate teachers and students to achieve optimal performance levels, the high-stakes nature of state testing programs can have quite the opposite effect" (Abrams, Pedulla, & Madaus, 2003, p. 4). These tests lead to the "de-professionalization of teachers, increase stress and decrease morale among teachers" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 4). In fact, "more than 77% of the teachers surveyed indicate decreases in morale, and 76% reported teaching was more stressful since the implementation of the North Carolina state program" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 4). Surveys in other states, such as Kentucky and Maryland, have similar findings. In Texas, "85% of

the teachers surveyed agreed with the statement 'some of the best teachers are leaving the field because of the TAAS'" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 4). In yet another survey conducted by the National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy in 2003, findings indicate that teachers who have high-stakes programs in their states (as compared with those teachers who did not) felt "pressure from district superintendents, principals, and, to a lesser extent, parents to improve student performance on the state test" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 9). Teachers in this survey indicated that there is "so much pressure for high scores on the state-mandated test that teachers had little time to teach anything not on the test" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 9). According to Hargrove, Walker, Huber, Corrigan, and Moore (2004), policymakers tend to focus more upon teacher accountability than upon finding the best means to measure student achievement. For those who choose the profession as a career, this pressure due to accountability may create anxiety which becomes a reason for teachers to leave the field. It also may establish low morale for teachers. According to Abrams, et al. (2003), a relationship exists between the feelings of pressure caused by either district superintendents or school principals and low teacher morale in schools. In fact, "38% of surveyed teachers in high-stakes testing programs wanted to transfer out of the grade in which the state-mandated test is administered" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 10).

Because of this focus upon accountability, teachers feel "trapped, unable to reach their full potential as educators," which is due to "test-based reform barriers that prevent teachers from implementing what they know is best practice in education" (Hargrove et al., 2004, p. 4). The tension that results due to this conflict creates frustration and stress

because "teachers want the autonomy to do what they know is right for students" (Hargrove et al., p. 4). A sense of helplessness is often the result of being "unable to reach unrealistic expectations" (Hargrove et al., p. 4). This feeling of helplessness increased due to the way in which high-stakes testing developed. Teachers were not always directly involved in the decision-making for the policies, increasing the level of anxiety. As Green and Dixon state, "because elected or appointed individuals control the 'purse string' of education, they view their perceptions more valuable than those of teachers" (cited in Barksdale-Ladd & Thomas, 2000, p. 2). Thus, educators feel isolated from the decision-making process even though they will be the ones most affected by the policies. This may lead to job dissatisfaction for teachers who seek autonomy. Luna and Turner (2001) find from their study that teachers in both an urban and a suburban school view high-stakes testing as an imposition on their professional autonomy. They also find that teachers view these high-stakes tests as a message that the state views them as incompetent. NCLB which has brought about high-stakes testing is viewed by these teachers in a negative manner. In fact, Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, and Aliaga (2004) note that North Carolina's accountability system makes it more difficult for low-performing schools to retain teachers.

Incentives and Alternative Licensure

When teachers leave the teaching profession, many of them choose other career options. This is a factor which results in a shortage of highly qualified teachers teaching in each classroom. The reaction of school districts to this situation is to consider several options. One means to deal with the shortage of teachers engendered by teacher

dissatisfaction with the profession is by the offering of monetary incentives. Another means that states use to meet the demand is the creation of alternative certification programs. This issue of needing highly qualified teachers becomes a central concern for schools that are difficult to staff due to the requirements set forth by NCLB. These schools are described as having 50% or more students functioning below grade level, having 50% or more students eligible for free or reduced lunches in elementary school or 40% at the high school level, having a 15-18% annual turnover rate, and having 25% or more of teachers with provisional licenses, emergency or temporary or probationary teachers (Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2002).

Not only are teachers difficult to recruit for "difficult to staff schools in the Southeast states, but the data from California are even more alarming" (Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2002, p. 5). Because California leaders and decision makers reduced the pupil-teacher ratio without taking teacher supply and demand into consideration, "over 14% of the 291,000 teachers in California lack full teaching credentials. In fact, the percentage of teachers who had completed a teacher preparation program had dropped from 78% in 1991-92 to 52% in 1998-99" (Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2002, p. 5). Therefore, in a time period when high-stakes standardized testing is in place, the decision makers who voice the educational truth that "teachers are the most powerful determinants" of whether students are able to meet high standards must also provide the means to counteract this situation. Monetary increases, offering of scholarships or forgivable loan programs, or other perks such as the payment of signing bonuses, housing subsidies, or relocation expenses are viable options accepted by

policymakers to solve the staffing dilemma. Research indicates, however, that without proper preparation, teachers are less likely to stay in education anyway (Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2002).

Further evidence is available to show that another education system's response to teacher shortage is to offer alternative certification programs. For example, according to Feistritzer and Chester, in "1983, eight states allowed alternative certification; by 1999**,** 40 states and the District of Columbia had 117 state-approved programs" (Huling, Resta, & Rainwater, 2001, p. 1). "Most of these alternative programs were operated by school districts, educational service agencies, universities, and collaboratives of these entities" (Huling, Resta, & Rainwater, 2001, p. 1). Darling-Hammond (2000) notes, however, that "sometimes states and districts respond to shortfalls in their hiring pools by creating back-door routes into teaching or short-term training programs that provide only a few weeks of preparation before placement in a classroom as a teacher of record" (p. 23). When this is the response of the institution, the problem of supplying each classroom with a highly qualified teacher increases due to the fact that the students of these teachers "learn less than those taught by traditionally prepared teachers" (p. 23). Also, according to her research, Darling-Hammond (2000) indicates that "about 60% of individuals who enter teaching through such programs leave the profession by their third year as compared to about 30% of traditionally trained teachers and only about 10-15% of teachers prepared in extended, five-year teacher education programs" (p. 23). Thus, the offering of alternative programs may not resolve the issue of teacher retention.

In addition to alternative certification procedures, some school districts are looking at pay incentives to recruit teachers (Huling et al., 2001). For example, from 1987-88 to 1993-94, the number of school districts that used pay incentives to recruit or retain teachers for less desirable locations or in fields of shortage nearly doubled, changing from 8% to 15% percent (Levine, Christenson, & Hammer, 1998). Although pay incentives for recruiting teachers was unheard of prior to the 1980's, a "compensation pattern" exists that not only is reflected in the institutional loop of the system but also in the economic loop, for these "patterns reflect the forces of supply and demand and local labor markets" (Levine et al., 1998, p. 61). Because "teachers offer a variety of characteristics to their employers," the school district--the employers—"offer a variety of working environments, conditions of employment, and compensation programs that reflect the values that districts assign to different personal traits" (Levine et al., 1998, p. 61). Hence, this solution also reflects the cultural values because the values of the community determine the amount of compensation.

The educational system also responded to the shortages by implementing mentor programs or by offering other types of financial incentives. Many states, according to Bolich (2001), "have established formal training for those who will serve as mentor teachers" (p. 8). Also, many states "provide scholarships and forgivable loans to attract and retain teachers" (p. 12). Typically, "for each year of assistance, the student commits to teaching a certain number of years" (p. 12). For example, Georgia offers the PROMISE scholarship which provides college juniors and seniors with $3,000 for living expenses. The PROMISE II scholarship assists instructional aides and paraprofessionals

in completing their bachelor's degrees in education by awarding up to $3000 per year for tuition and books (p. 12).

Other states that offer similar programs are Louisiana and Maryland. Even the "Virginia's Teaching Scholarship Loan Program forgives a $3,000 loan for a student who teaches for three semesters in one of Virginia's critical shortage fields" (Bolich, 2001, p. 12). At least seven other states offer similar programs to these in order to defray living expenses or to forgive loan debt (Bolich, 2001, p. 12).

Even more interesting is the political response to the institutional issue of teacher shortage in Mississippi. "In 1998, the Mississippi Legislature passed House Bill 609" (Chamblese, Sweeney, & Thompson, 1999, p. 5). This bill provides "for the University Assisted Teacher Recruitment and Retention Program"(Chamblese et al., 1999, p. 5). The goal is, of course, to attract teachers to areas of Mississippi where critical shortages exist. Each of the 75 participants "receives a full-time teacher's salary and benefits package through his/her school district" (Chamblese et al., 1999, p. 5). The state of Mississippi addresses the teacher shortage not only through political and economic incentives but also by forming a partnership with institutions of higher learning.

Another means used to staff schools in less desirable locations is through the offering of salary incentives to teachers willing to work in the schools. The North Carolina Excellent Schools Act of 1997 raised salaries to the 23rd highest in the nation; however, 14 of the state's districts still have teacher shortages, most of which are in the urban or rural environments (Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2002). Studies indicate that while salary is important for effective recruitment, effective administration

and teacher leadership are important for long-term teacher commitment. The results of a 2000 survey of 14,000 educators in the North Carolina Association of Educators indicate that only 30% would accept the challenge of working in a "low-performing" school. Salary bonuses are not sufficient incentives for them to teach in a low-performing school, for their priorities are "smaller class sizes, strong administrative support, extra planning time and instructional support personnel" (Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2002, p. 6). Thus, politicians who look only at the "power of money" for recruitment measures do not consider the institutional and cultural workings of this complex system where teacher working conditions play an important role.

Not only are direct salary incentives offered, but due to the pressures imposed by NCLB, school districts consider other incentives, as well. Some states, such as Nevada, made political decisions in order to meet the demands of this act and to counter the shortage. In Nevada, the state Senate considered "a bill that would offer teachers an extra year of retirement credit for every five years they taught in schools classified as needing improvement" (Bradley, 1999, p. 3).

In summary, the research reviewed indicates that a shortage in the number of teachers began in the 1980's. This shortage is due to increasing student enrollment which creates a greater need for teachers. However, not all licensed teachers join the teaching profession, and some highly qualified teachers leave the profession. The two groups of teachers that leave the profession that are most alarming are those with 1-3 years of experience and those with 20 or more years of experience who are taking early retirement. The number of these teachers that are leaving, coupled with the natural need

for teachers due to an increase in student enrollment, creates a difficult situation for school districts. Positions in the area of science, mathematics, and business are difficult to fill; and vacancies in less desirable locations are difficult to fill. According to Guarino et al. (2006), science and math teachers are the most likely to leave the teaching profession. With the demands of No Child Left Behind which legislates that a highly qualified teacher be in each classroom, school districts have to create means by which to fill those positions. Many districts choose to offer pay incentives and to offer alternative licensure in order to fill those vacancies. Thus, school districts focus primarily upon the recruitment of teachers when using these measures.

Rationale for Induction Programs

According to the United States Department of Education, "an estimated two million new teachers will be hired over the next ten years" (cited in Brown, 2003, p. 1). As a result, these new teachers will need additional support so that they, too, will not be among the nation's six percent who leave the profession in a typical year nor number among the twenty percent of the new teachers hired who leave within the first three years (Brown, 2003). In fact, one third of beginning teachers quit within the first three years of their career (Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2006). Even though this figure is extremely high, the United States Department of Education notes a more staggering report that indicates that approximately fifty percent of new teachers hired to teach in urban districts leave within their first five years of teaching (Brown, 2003). These figures show that too many beginning teachers do not consider teaching as a career of choice after acquiring three to five years of experience.

Because of these challenging figures, Stansbury and Zimmerman (2006) state that "we can no longer afford this kind of dropout rate in our teaching ranks" and suggest the implementation of programs to prevent this exodus (p. 1). Ingersoll (2001) further supports Zimmerman's views by emphasizing the importance of decreasing the number of teachers demanded by decreasing the number of teachers who are leaving the classroom. In order to prevent attrition and thereby lower the demand for teachers, some school districts adopted programs that include mentoring in order to support beginning teachers. The National Education Association (NEA) reports that new teachers who participate in induction programs like mentoring are nearly twice as likely to stay in their profession (Brown, 2003). In fact, according to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2006), "there is also evidence that induction programs save money for school districts. It has been estimated that for every $1.00 invested in induction, there is an estimated payoff of nearly $1.50" (p. 2).

According to Ingersoll (2001), the past institutional responses are not likely to solve the issues. He states that an alternative solution to increasing teacher supply for school districts is to decrease teacher turnover which would, in turn, decrease teacher demand. In other words, he suggests that the districts' staffing problems result from the organization's working conditions for teachers. Thus, understanding why the large number of teachers leave the classroom within the first five years of teaching helps districts shift their focus from recruitment to retention. Studies of job dissatisfaction factors help to explore reasons for these teachers leaving the profession. These studies help school districts determine the means by which to retain teachers. Retention becomes

essential because "a conservative national estimate of the cost of replacing public school teachers who have dropped out of the profession is $2.2 billion a year" (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005, p. 1). According to the Alliance for Excellent Education, the cost is $4.9 billion every year if the cost for replacing teachers who transfer to other schools or to other districts is added. Thus, based upon these data, "it is critical that efforts be concentrated on developing and retaining high-quality teachers in every community and at every grade level" (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005, p. 1). This is especially true if school districts are to meet the national goal of "providing an equitable education to children across the nation," which is the objective of NCLB (p.1). Therefore, retention, not recruitment, becomes the focus of the school districts in order to meet this objective.

Types of Induction Programs

Because retention is the more cost effective means to deal with the teacher shortage issue, many school districts institute induction programs. These programs strive to retain beginning and less experienced teachers since the percentage of these teachers leaving is so great. Not all induction models are the same, however. Some offer more components than others and some induction programs last longer than one year. Wong (2001) defines induction as

> the process of systematically training and supporting new teachers, beginning before the first day of school and continuing through the first two or three years of teaching. Its purposes include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) easing the transition into teaching, (2) improving teacher effectiveness through training in

> classroom management and effective teaching techniques, (3) promoting the district's culture, its philosophies, missions, policies, procedures, and goals, and (4) increasing the retention rate for highly qualified teachers. (para. 10)

The three main types of induction models are the basic orientation model, the instructional practice model and the school transformation model. The most effective programs have mentoring as a major component. The transformation model is more rarely used than the other two models because "this model helps new teachers engage in school reform and connect their professional growth to challenging goals for student learning" (NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 2002, p. 2). The basic model helps new teachers understand and address classroom management issues and to understand the expectations. A mentor may be assigned but has more informal duties than helping the teacher develop sound instructional practices. The instructional model helps new teachers with the help of "skilled, well-trained mentors bridge theory and practice by using research-based classroom strategies" (NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 2002, p. 2). According to Johnson, Birkeland, Kardos, Kauffman, Liu and Peske (2001), the basic orientation model falls short of guaranteeing quality teachers, but the instructional practice and transformation models offer the support needed to improve the quality of teaching and to help districts retain teachers. Typically, mentoring is the main component of any successful model.

In response to the fact that "'approximately 20% of first year teachers flee the profession after their first year of service and over 30% leave within the first five years,'" one strategy being used to help retain these educators is the use of mentoring programs

(Easley, 2000, p. 4). According to Martinez (2004), "as external standard demands have increased, the work of mentoring newcomers in their on-going learning must now be seen as equally demanding and complex and must be seen to be an economically prudent investment of public money" (p. 6). In the United States, efforts are being made to recognize and reward those experienced teachers who are trained and prepared to work as mentors. In fact, the "Recruiting New Teachers (RNT) organization, in their guide to developing teacher induction programs, states that a key requirement is adequate funding for mentoring" (Martinez, 2004, p. 6). They go even further to recommend that mentors "be rewarded by release time, course vouchers, cash and recognition as 'master' teachers" (Martinez, 2004, p. 6). Hence, the need for mentoring programs has not only become obvious, but pressure by organizations to fund these programs has begun. To exemplify this need, California offers cash bonuses of $4000 for teacher mentors; and Florida, "under its Excellent Teaching Program Act, is paying a 10% bonus to teachers who mentor a newly hired teacher" (Martinez, 2004, p. 6). Although the response shown for support for mentoring is strong, "research, however, consistently reveals that even though principals are conscious of the difficulties faced by beginning teachers," there is "only about a 50 percent chance of eventuating in structured support for beginning teachers" (Martinez, 2004, p. 9). Therefore, the research coupled with the reduction of school budgets does not indicate a shift in the trend of teacher shortage.

A second means developed to support both mentors, mentees, and other teachers is to offer teaching resources such as "unit plans and assessment-task sheets which are readily available to new teachers" on websites (Martinez, 2004, p. 7). In addition, school

boards can offer "communication by email and chat board which can offer new teachers intra- and interschool networking support to counteract the isolation that many new teachers experience (Martinez, 2004, p. 7). Thus, mentoring and technological support are both means to change the experiences of new teachers to more positive ones, to eliminate the frustration expressed by one veteran teacher when she remarks, "'In my first year of teaching, I was lost. I really didn't know what I was doing'" (Easley, 2000, p. 5).

To ensure that these teachers do not quit when they feel "lost," districts have developed successful induction programs. Research exists on several of these programs, and each uses mentoring as the central component of the program. According to Brown (2003), because accountability has "shifted the focus from improving teacher learning to student testing, mentoring programs that focus on individualized support and those that integrate student learning with adult learning, while phasing in assessment as beginning classroom planning skills are mastered," are recommended (p. 3). In order for student learning to occur, teacher learning is essential (Brown, 2003). Therefore, testing/assessment for accountability does not take precedence over teacher mentoring.

One such mentoring program is Partners in Education (PIE), which Colorado school districts in 1987 implemented. The PIE program includes the "components of intensive mentoring, group networking, and ongoing inquiry into practice" which offer solutions for teacher retention (Kelley, 2004, p. 442). Beginning teachers receive "classroom assistance from clinical professor mentors a minimum of one half day each week" (Kelley, 2004, p. 439). These mentors go through a highly selective process and are chosen for their "demonstration of teaching excellence, disposition toward

collaboration and inquiry, commitment to professional growth and change, and expertise in specific district and university priority areas such as literacy, mathematics, or classroom assessment" (Kelley, 2004, p. 442). Because of the additional time needed for success, the mentors "are fully released from their own classrooms to concentrate on the needs of their protégés" and their additional district and university duties (Kelley, 2004, p. 442). One role they never play for the beginning teacher, however, is that of evaluator. They are not in any way responsible for performance evaluation. The mentors also "meet biweekly with the goal of forming a professional learning community that encourages mentors to reflect on their practice and improve their own mentoring skills" (Kelley, 2004, p. 442). These mentors help beginning teachers set up classrooms, review curriculum, and develop routines prior to the start of classes. They also observe, coach and provide feedback. They might even model lessons for the beginning teacher. Each year the principal is responsible for developing a summative evaluation of the program. Through interviews with the beginning teacher, the principal is able to judge how reflective the teacher is about his/her strengths and weaknesses. Surveys given to both the mentors and beginning teachers and the reflective journals and university course work are further means of assessing the success of the program. However, the mentor develops no documentation which would assess the beginning teacher. Reflection by the beginning teacher is the focal point of this program.

Another goal of the PIE program is to encourage networking for the beginning teacher. To develop cohort networking which reduces the feeling of isolation for the teacher, PIE teachers attend seminars two times per month (Kelley, 2004). These

meetings foster collaboration and address specific concerns that the beginning teachers have. Thus, the objective is for beginning teachers to learn by participating in meaningful tasks with other beginning teachers and to form learning communities (Kelley, 2004).

Ongoing inquiry into practice which is the objective of the three courses PIE teachers take during the induction year is also a goal for this program. The activities which include video-taping, keeping a reflective journal and the study of education topics foster this inquiry. A sharing of methodology and continuity of dialogue regarding instructional issues create a culture of learning within the schools (Kelley, 2004). A ten-year study of this program indicates that "146 of 147 teachers and 132 of 132 principals surveyed and interviewed expressed satisfaction with mentor support" (Kelley, 2004, p. 445).

Massachusetts is home to a second program, the Dover-Sherborn Public Schools Teacher Leaders Program. This state-mandated mentoring program for new teachers has two main goals which are "to attract and retain quality professionals and to improve the quality of instruction" (Villani, 2002, p. 45). Not only do the beginning teachers who are each assigned a mentor progress, but mentors also grow through professional development activities (Villani, 2002). Mentors in this program typically volunteer; but from the list of volunteers, the building principal, after consulting with the teacher leaders to insure that the volunteers meet the criteria for the program, chooses the mentors. The mentors, who volunteer, are paid $750.00 per year; and teacher leaders who are effective teachers and who have a background in coaching are selected by the principal and paid $1000.00 per year (Villani, 2002). The four criteria for being a mentor are that mentors

have “five years of experience, demonstrate excellence in teaching, demonstrate leadership in the school community, and have strong communication skills” (Villani, 2002, p. 48). The mentors who volunteer and participate in this program are trained at the end of August for two days by teacher leaders (Villani, 2002). These mentors are then assigned to a beginning teacher whom they meet with daily and then weekly as the year progresses. The pairs attend five after-school workshops during the year, and mentors observe and coach a minimum of three times per year (Villani, 2002). To provide continuity of the program, the mentors are typically chosen again for the following year; and the teacher leaders design and plan the program for the following year. Thus, even though the program provides the beginning teacher with a mentor for only one year, participation for mentors and leaders in the program is ongoing (Villani, 2002).

Although data regarding the success of the program are not present, administration and teachers believe that the culture of the school system has changed in a positive manner in the four years following the program’s implementation (Villani, 2002). The teachers feel that there is a camaraderie present that did not exist prior to the program. Villani (2002) notes that this camaraderie also benefits the entire faculty of the school, not just those directly involved. Because teachers are working more closely together, encouraging beginning teachers to visit their classes and requesting substitutes so that they may observe peers, there is a more trusting, accepting, and helpful environment. It is a program that nurtures first-year teachers.

The Rochester City School District Career in Teaching Plan model is not state mandated. Each first-year teacher in this program is assigned a mentor who is tenured

and has at least seven years of experience (Villani, 2002). The mentor must have "references from five colleagues, including the supervisor and union representative" (Villani, 2002, p. 108). Unlike most programs in which mentors are not evaluators, the mentor in this program "coaches, evaluates and even makes a recommendation to the Career in Teaching (CIT) panel regarding the teacher's continued employment" (Villani, 2002, p. 106). It is this panel of teachers and administrators that reviews the performance of both first-year teachers and mentors and arranges appropriate training (Villani, 2002). Thus, this program differs from many others because mentors are also evaluators. This program differs from most mentoring programs because of this factor.

Mentor training takes place prior to the start of the school year and further meetings and training take place during the year. For the beginning teacher, a four-day orientation takes place the week before school starts (Villani, 2002). During this four-day orientation, the beginning teacher and mentor are introduced to each other, handbooks and other materials explaining the program's guidelines and expectations are discussed, and mentors help the beginning teachers prepare for the school year. Because the mentors in this model are classroom teachers, the model is practitioner-based (Villani, 2002). These teachers observe as many as thirty to forty times, conference with the beginning teacher or intern, demonstrate lessons, coach, "write reports about the intern's performance, and recommend whether the intern should be rehired" (Villani, 2002, p. 108).

In the Massachusetts model, mentors have full teaching responsibilities, but "substitutes were hired by teacher leaders to provide new teachers and their mentors the

opportunity to do peer observations and cognitive coaching" (Villani, 2002, p. 49). However, mentors in the Rochester model teach 50% of the contractual time and job share if they have four beginning teachers and have full class loads if they have fewer than four beginning teachers. Substitutes provide coverage, and mentors "are released on a per diem basis" (Villani, 2002, p.108). A comparison of the two models is shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Comparison of Dover and Rochester Models

	Dover	Rochester
Do mentors have full or part – time teaching responsibilities?	Full time	Part-time
Do mentors receive monetary compensation?	$750.00 per year	Additional 5% of base salary
Do mentors evaluate interns?	No	Yes
What is the cost of the program?	$38,500 (state grant, local education fund)	$4.8 million (District, state, and grants)
Is mentoring mandated?	Yes	No

Note. Adapted from *Mentoring programs for new teachers: Models of induction and support*, by S. Villani, p. 44, 105. Copyright 2002 by Corwin Press.

Similar to the Massachusetts model, in the Rochester model, "mentors are lead teachers and are paid an additional five percent of their base salary" (Villani, 2002, p. 109). However, unlike the Massachusetts model, there is evidence to support the success of the program. For example, in 1986, before the program was started, sixty-five percent

of new teachers remained in the district. After the start of the program, the average retention rate is 86.6% (Villani, 2002). Because the Rochester program is referred to as a career in teaching plan, the goal of the implementers is to focus upon retention. Not only has the teacher retention rate improved, but evidence of student success is present. For example, because the English Language Arts (ELA) scores of fourth graders placed with first year teachers were comparable to the scores of students placed with tenured teachers, "the Education Testing and Research Department in the school district concluded that 'in short, the ELA longitudinal study offered tantalizing evidence that the mentor program is an effective intervention in improving student performance'" (Villani, 2002, p. 112). In fact, having multiple inductions in place, reduced beginning teacher turnover after the first year. The data as shown in Table 8 note that there is a direct correlation between the number of induction supports that are offered to the beginning teacher and the number of those teachers retained in the classroom. According to Table 8, the more support that is offered to the beginning teacher, the more likely the teacher is to remain in the teaching profession.

Table 8

Percentage of Beginning Teacher Turnover after the First Year, According to the Amount of Induction Support: 2000-01.

Amount of support	Turnover
No induction support	40% moved or left
3 induction supports	28% moved or left
6 induction supports	24% moved or left
8 induction supports	18% moved or left

Note. Adapted from *Schools and Staffing Survey*, 2004, by the National Center for Education Statistics.

The NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education (2002) stresses the importance of data collection and analysis of the induction programs used by school districts in order to determine the results regarding these programs. As the number of induction programs have grown, more school districts are trying to determine the effectiveness of these programs. Glazerman, Isenberg, Dolfin, Bleeker, Johnson, Grider, and Jacobus (2010), who conducted a controlled study of teachers in districts with comprehensive two-year induction programs, note the average students' scores increased by "4 percentile points in reading and 8 percentile points in math" which demonstrates that the "impacts on reading and math scores were positive and significant for the third year" (p. 92). Although this controlled study offers positive results, most districts find it difficult to collect and analyze all but program satisfaction data" (NEA Foundation for

the Improvement of Education, 2002, p. 3). This is because many districts lack the necessary tools with which to analyze the data. As a result, data regarding the effectiveness of some induction programs are not available. Data regarding the length of time each component is in use with the beginning teacher are not always documented.

Summary

The review of literature indicates a need for teachers in some geographical areas and in some fields of study. For example, shortages exist in the areas of mathematics, sciences, and business; and schools with high needs populations have more difficulty filling their vacancies than other schools. Ingersoll (2004) believes that enough qualified teachers are produced each year to meet the growing demand for teachers which results from attrition and steadily increasing enrollment figures. However, not all qualified teachers enter the profession. Henke, Choy, Shen, Geis, and Alt (1997) noted that only 39% of those qualified to teach mathematics, only 31% of those qualified to teach social sciences and only 20% of those qualified to teach business apply for teaching jobs.

If there are enough teachers qualified to fill the vacancies, the reason for the shortages merits exploration. This is especially necessary when data indicate that 20-50% of teachers leave the profession just after their fifth year of teaching (Ingersoll, 2003). The research shows that two of the main reasons that teachers leave the profession are discontent with workplace conditions and lack of administrative support. Accountability policies are also contributing factors to high turnover (Hill & Barth, 2004).

Because of the shortage of teachers, states and localities reacted by offering pay incentives, by offering cash bonuses and by offering free training. States and localities

also developed alternative licensure for those individuals who wanted to teach. “By 1999, 40 states and the District of Columbia had 117 state-approved programs” (Huling, Resta & Rainwater, 2001, p.1). These solutions have been reactive means from the school districts to fill their positions, but they focus upon recruitment.

To shift the focus to retention of teachers, induction programs which offer support to beginning teachers need to be examined. This research study of schools in a Southeastern metropolitan area will explore the induction programs used by the school districts. Research shows that having multiple supports in place reduces beginning teacher turnover (Villani, 2002). This study will examine the particular supports or the particular components which comprise each district’s induction program. However, the goal of this study is to gain an understanding of teacher perception regarding the value of each of these components in relation to teacher retention. Results obtained will help to determine the impact of certain demographic factors, such as age, gender, school assignment, ethnicity, subject area taught and level taught, in relation to teachers’ perceptions of each of the components of the induction program. This research study will add to the present research regarding induction programs for beginning teachers.

Chapter III

Methodology

This chapter examines the purpose and design of the research study in the first section. A description of the participants chosen for the study follows. The third section presents the measurement used for the research study. A discussion of the procedures the researcher will use follows the section which describes the measurement. Proposed data analysis follows this section regarding measurement and procedures. The final section presented in this chapter is a discussion of the delimitations and limitations of this research study.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify the components of each of the induction programs used by the public school districts in the Southeastern metropolitan area and to gain an understanding of teachers' perceptions regarding the impact of these programs in making their decision to remain in the teaching field. The sample in the study were teachers who participated in the components of the induction program of each of the districts in the metropolitan area and are presently in their 5th year of teaching in each district. The specific research questions for the study were as follows:

1. What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the components of the induction program in retaining teachers?
2. According to teacher perception, how important a factor were the induction programs in 5th year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom?

3. Which components of the induction program do the 5th year teachers perceive to be the most valuable?
4. What difference, if any, according to 5th year teachers' perceptions, does the length of time of each of the components of the program make?
5. What difference, if any, do demographic variables, such as type of teaching certification, grade or subject area taught, teaching in high needs schools, gender, or ethnicity, make in terms of teacher perception regarding each component of their induction program?

Table 9 shows each of these five research questions and the statistical analysis used to examine the data.

Table 9

Question and Analysis Chart

Research Question	Variables	Statistical Analysis
What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the components of the induction program in retaining teachers?	IV—Each component of the induction program DV—perception of effectiveness of induction program	ANOVA: 1 IV with 3 or more levels (each of the components of the program) and 1 DV (effectiveness) Triangulation with focus groups' responses
According to teacher perception, how important a factor were the induction programs in 5th year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom?	IV—multiple components of the induction program DV—decision to remain in the classroom	Descriptive data (mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentages) Triangulation with focus groups' responses
Which components of the induction program do the 5th year teachers perceive to be the most valuable?	IV—individual components of the induction program DV—perception of value of each component of the induction program (Likert scale)	Descriptive data (mean, standard deviation, and percentages) Triangulation with focus groups' responses
What difference, if any, according to 5th year teachers' perceptions, does the length of time of each of the components of the induction program make?	IV—length of time DV—each component of the induction program	ANOVA: 1 IV with 3 or more levels (length of time) and 1 DV (effectiveness) Triangulation with focus groups' responses
What difference, if any, do demographic variables make in terms of teacher perception regarding each component of their induction program?	IV—demographic variable (gender, age, certification type, placement in high needs schools, subject, grade, level, ethnicity) Categorical scale DV—perception of value	Factorial MANOVA: Multiple independent variables and multiple levels of the DV

The induction program, the independent variable used by the districts, had several levels which were the individual components that comprised the program. The dependent variable, teacher perception regarding each of the individual components, was analyzed. In order for the researcher to know how important each of these components was in retaining teachers, the independent variable was each individual component of the induction program, and the dependent variable was the teacher's decision to remain in the classroom into the 5th year. Confounding variables such as a need for job security, budget issues, or personal issues and decisions could be present and could impact a teacher's decision to remain the classroom. For example, the metropolitan area in this study had a population of approximately 905,020 in 2009, according to U.S. Census Bureau. During the time of this study, the metropolitan area's school districts were experiencing budget deficits that caused school boards to cut or reduce the number of student programs and student services and to reduce the number of employees. In this economic climate, teachers may have decides to remain in the classroom because other job opportunities were unavailable.

Question three explores the components teachers thought were most valuable in the induction program and the components teachers perceived were least valuable in helping teachers decide to remain in the classroom. The results of this particular analysis may be important to school districts that are making decisions about budget cuts during a time of financial crisis. The independent variable used to answer this question was again the individual components of the program, and the dependent variable was teacher perception regarding the value of each of the components.

Question four will help to determine if the length of time allocated by the district for each component had an impact upon teacher retention. For example, did it make a difference if the mentoring component was one or two years, or did it make a difference if an orientation program lasted an entire day or if it was only one hour long.

The fifth question examined whether or not teacher responses differed due to teacher differences in gender, age, ethnicity, grade or subject area taught, placement in high needs schools, and type of teacher certification. Teacher perception of the induction program was the dependent variable and demographic variables were the independent variables used to analyze the data.

Although the Southeastern metropolitan school districts were the focus of this study, the statistical information obtained from analysis of the data could generalize to other metropolitan area public school districts.

Design

The research design used for the study was a nonexperimental quantitative design which used inferential statistics to analyze data. This type of design describes certain phenomena and answers the research questions without changing or manipulating a particular condition that would alter or affect a participant's response in any way. McMillan (2004) states that this choice of design will investigate the current situation regarding induction programs and teacher retention. This descriptive research study investigated the characteristics of the induction programs used by Southeastern metropolitan public school districts. For this study, the term induction program referred

to any formal program designed to aid beginning and/or inexperienced teachers in their adjustment to their teaching assignment.

By using a nonexperimental descriptive research design, no manipulation of variables occurred and minimal risk to the participants existed. The nature of this design is to determine what teachers in the districts are doing and thinking and to describe teacher perception regarding the programs (Mitchell & Jolley, 2007). The researcher first requested the expertise of experts in the area of teacher induction. These individuals were asked to review and offer feedback regarding the teacher survey. These experts included researchers at the university level who were familiar with teacher induction programs and staff developers who worked directly with teacher induction programs in their school districts. Snowball sampling was used to acquire the names of the final two experts from the district level. This form of sampling, also known as network sampling, is used when the researcher begins with a few participants and then asks them to recommend others who would have the same qualifications as the first few who were given the surveys to review (McMillan, 2004). The purpose of gaining feedback from experts was to insure the construct validity and reliability of the survey. Validity is "a judgment of the appropriateness of a measure for specific inferences or decisions that result from the scores generated" (McMillan, 2004, p. 137). Because the chosen individuals work or have worked within the districts and have been or are presently directly involved with teacher induction programs, they were able to offer the necessary feedback regarding the degree to which the survey measured each of the components of the induction programs.

The experts offered the researcher feedback necessary to indicate the appropriateness of the survey's content and to insure instrument quality.

A pilot test was also given to insure test-retest reliability. According to Mitchell and Jolley (2007), "reliability is a prerequisite for validity" (p. 112). McMillan (2004) states that "a stability estimate of reliability is obtained by administering one measure to one group of individuals, waiting a specified period of time, and then readministering the instrument to the same group" (p. 142). The consistency of the participants' responses is then measured to determine reliability. With the same participants taking the same test at two-week intervals, the researcher will be able to note the extent to which the scores are free from error (McMillan, 2004). If the scores on the two tests are consistent, high reliability results. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), correlation coefficients which demonstrate the instrument's reliability fall between the acceptable range of .70 and .90.

After feedback from the experts who reviewed the survey was acquired, I made the necessary changes to the teacher survey so that it adequately reflected the components of each of the districts. The teacher survey, Appendix D, was the instrument used to aid the researcher in identifying and examining teacher perception regarding the characteristics, components, and value of the induction program offered to teachers in this metropolitan area. From this survey I gained an understanding of the components in which teachers participated, the format used for each component, and the frequency of their participation. Also, I gained an understanding of whether or not teachers applied the

information learned in each component directly to their teaching, and whether they perceived the components to be instrumental in helping them to remain in the classroom.

After gaining approval for electronic dissemination to teachers, the survey was sent to teachers, asking only those who were in their 5th year of teaching in the same district to respond. One district sent the survey electronically to all teachers, and the individual teachers determined if they were presently in their fifth year of teaching in the district. One of the districts sent the survey electronically only to teachers the district identified as meeting the criteria. The third district required me to make a flyer which was put in teacher mailboxes in each of the schools. It was left up to the teachers who met the criteria to contact me so that I could send the survey electronically.

The survey used yes/no questions, Likert questions, and open-ended questions to collect information from these teachers who responded only to those questions that directly pertained to components of the induction program in which they participated. Responses from the teacher survey were used to find out what teacher perceptions were with regard to the meaningfulness or value of the different components of their induction programs. Most importantly, however, the survey showed the teachers' perceptions regarding which components were most and least important in their decision to remain in the teaching field.

On the survey was a space requesting teachers to participate in a focus group. From the list of teachers who agreed in each district to participate, the researcher contacted five or six of them who taught in "high need" schools or "high need" subject areas. These teachers may have needed more support from their induction programs, and

this difference would be indicated by their responses. Of those teachers who volunteered to participate in the focus groups, the researcher chose participants of different genders because male and female perceptions could differ. Also, teachers from different grade levels were chosen to participate to determine whether or not grade level impacted perception. The purpose of each of these focus groups was to gather more specific information and in-depth details regarding the responses and comments on the surveys. Probing questions, Appendix F, were based upon the comments reported on the surveys. The elaboration upon the information regarding the components and the value of the components were used to triangulate information gained from the surveys. Thus, the focus groups helped the researcher gain a richer, clearer understanding of teachers' perceptions of the induction programs.

After I analyzed the data collected from the surveys and examined the responses gathered from the focus groups, I then explored data which indicated how many teachers remained in their districts into their 5th year of teaching after their involvement in the district's induction practices. My intent in this step was to compare these data to the national trend data obtained via the National Center for Education Statistics which collects data regarding teacher mobility.

Participants

The sample for this study was teachers with completion of four years of teaching experience in the Southeastern metropolitan public school districts. Responses and data collected from this sample should be representative of other metropolitan public school districts, as well. Because the largest group of teachers to leave the classroom have only

one to three years of experience and the second largest group leaving the classrooms are those with fewer than five years of experience, I chose to survey those who had completed four years of teaching and remained in the classroom in the same district to begin their fifth year of teaching. The sample is comprised of approximately 275 teachers who have completed four years of teaching and have begun their 5th year in the district. The teachers who completed the survey were indicative of the demographic factors of gender and ethnicity found in the larger teacher populations of the districts. Because these teachers have remained in the same districts for their first four years of teaching experience, they were better able to identify the induction programs in which they have participated and could more clearly respond to questions asking their perspective regarding such programs.

Experts from the university who use their expertise in the area of teacher induction programs were recommended by members of the researcher's dissertation committee. Other experts were chosen from the districts being studied. These individuals offered their expertise regarding the content and format of the teacher survey. The researcher's intent in gaining the assistance of these experts was to help the researcher gain accurate and meaningful data from a valid and reliable instrument.

School division contact information was acquired through each of the districts' websites. After the researcher received IRB approval, a research study proposal was sent to the Director of Research in each of these districts in order to gain permission to move forward with the study. Not only was this a requirement of each district and the ethical responsibility of the researcher, but gaining the support of the district was imperative if

teachers within the district were contacted. This proposal included a cover letter describing the study, a copy of the teacher survey, and the application form which explained the design of the study and showed the benefits of the study for the district. A pilot study of the teacher survey was given to 20 teachers who completed five years of teaching in the same district. These 20 individuals had similar traits to those of the participants in the study, but had completed five years of teaching and were now in their sixth year of teaching. They, too, participated previously in the induction programs. In order to attain the highest level of reliability, the pilot survey was given a second time two weeks later to the same participants. A pilot test was critical in order to evaluate the clarity and appropriateness of the format of both the survey and the directions. The pilot test gave the researcher an idea of the likely pattern of participant responses and indicated "whether or not revisions needed to be made to avoid ceiling or floor effects" (McMillan and Schumacher, 2001, p. 307). A pilot test also gave the researcher a more appropriate estimate of the time that completion of the survey would take for each teacher.

The researcher used purposeful sampling. The participants would be informative about the topic of induction programs, the topic of this study, and were readily accessible to the researcher. Because many teachers leave the profession prior to their fifth year of teaching, participants who have entered into the fifth year of teaching would be the participants. Thus, an at-risk group was chosen for the study so that the effect of induction programs upon retention could be examined more closely. Due to the number of teachers who began their teaching career in the districts and who have now completed their fourth year, the sample size was large. The researcher estimated about 20% of the

total number of teachers could participate in the study because they met the two criteria, remaining in the same district for all four years of their teaching experience and having only four years of experience. However, it was more likely that only about 15% of the teachers who could participate would willingly do so. The sample included teachers teaching at all grade levels—kindergarten through twelfth grade. It also included teachers of all subjects. A large sample size, approximately 280, such as this helped to minimize the threats to validity in this nonexperimental study due to the fact that accumulated data would be collected directly from the teachers. The letter of confidentiality, instructions, and the survey was sent electronically to the participants in two of the districts after ensuring construct validity through the pilot study. In the third district, a flyer was used to solicit candidates to take the electronic survey.

To ensure high response rates from the teachers, a reminder was sent using Appendix B, to those eligible to participate one week after the initial survey had been sent electronically. This reminder was sent by the districts that had sent the electronic survey directly to the participants.

Three separate focus group sessions, one per district, were held. Participants in each of the focus groups had expressed a willingness to participate by providing contact information on the survey. One teacher from the urban district volunteered to participate in a focus group session. Two teachers from the smaller of the two suburban districts participated in a session, and one teacher from the third district volunteered. These four individuals from the districts enhanced the research study by helping the researcher develop a broader understanding of the induction programs offered by the districts and

teacher perceptions of them. These participants clarified any data that was collected and gave more extensive information about the district's teacher induction program.

During this interactive inquiry with teachers from each of the districts being studied, detailed descriptions of the participants' perspectives were written in note form. I also asked if the participants would allow the conversations to be tape recorded so that I could validate information at a later time. Permission for the tape recording of the conversations was obtained from each participant and confidentiality was stressed. I was required to receive the completed IRB form, Appendix E, from each participant. The notes from the focus groups were examined for common themes in the responses regarding individual components of the induction programs. I also looked for common themes regarding the length of time allotted by each district for the individual components of the induction program. The use of focus groups allowed the triangulation of data and offered me a better understanding of comments reported on the surveys and of teacher perception regarding induction programs.

Measures/Data Sources

The pilot study demonstrated construct validity which is the extent to which the instrument, the survey, measures the construct being studied. In this study the induction programs offered by the districts were the constructs being studied. I gained a better understanding of induction programs from the experts who provided informative feedback regarding the survey.

The independent variables in this study included the components of the induction programs implemented by the school districts, the length of time allotted for each

component of the induction programs, and demographic variables which could affect teachers' perceptions of their induction programs. The induction program offered by each district might have multiple levels, referred to in this study as components of the induction program. The dependent variables in the study included teacher retention for each of the teachers who were involved in the induction program, teacher perception regarding the effectiveness of the induction program, and teacher perception regarding the value of each of the components of the induction program. I collected data on the number of teachers who remained teaching into their fifth year in the same district at the district level. However, I collected all other data directly from these individuals through use of a teacher survey sent electronically to those individuals meeting the criteria. Information obtained through the survey helped me to understand teacher perception related to induction programs. Data were validated and complemented by information obtained through focus group interviews with teachers from each of the districts. As a result, the study could possibly aid staff developers in the assessment of their district's induction programs and in making budget decisions.

The survey used to gather information from individual teachers had multiple types of questions. For example, one aspect of the survey asked participants to assess each of the components of the induction program in which they participated. The participants not only identified components they had experienced but also assessed the helpfulness of the component. This section of the survey included a Likert scale asking participants to quantify their experiences. Comment sections were also offered to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' experiences. Demographic information such as gender,

age, ethnicity, placement in high needs schools, type of teaching certificate and subject areas taught was requested, as well. This information proved useful in looking at whether or not gender, ethnicity, placement in high needs schools, course or grade level taught, or type of teacher preparation played any role in teacher retention or in the responses given to the questions. This demographic information proved important in the researcher's being able to answer research question five, what difference, if any, do demographic variables make in terms of teacher perception regarding their induction program.

To retain anonymity, each participant in the survey was assigned a number. It was critical to stress the anonymity of the participants in order to engender honest, accurate, and generalizable results. By using electronic surveys which were returned directly to the researcher, not the districts, anonymity was ensured. Also, the districts were given no information regarding which teachers volunteered to participate in focus groups since that information came from the survey. Focus group participants were also assigned numbers to replace teacher names.

To help determine information about teacher retention, the researcher only used information obtained from teachers who filled out the survey. Only teachers involved in each component of the induction program offered by the school districts participated in the study. From the district generated list of teachers presently in their 5th year of teaching in the same district, the exact numbers of teachers retained by the district were reflected. Thus, conclusions about retention was based upon an examination of the data regarding how many teachers involved in each component of the program remained in the district into their 5th year of teaching. Data gathered from page 18 of the survey aided

the researcher in answering research question two, according to perception, how important a factor were the induction programs in 5th- year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom.

Data were cleaned prior to final analysis. The detection of missing data was coded as a zero. Any blank responses were coded as zero, and the typing of data was reviewed for error. Using an electronic survey reduced typing error because data was downloaded directly into the SPSS software for analysis. Through the use of descriptive statistics, means and standard deviations were examined. The standard deviation was used to identify the "extent that individual scores differ from the mean" (Mitchell & Jolley, 2007, p. 181). Distribution of scores was noted to indicate that the mean and median scores were the same; thus, a normal curve results. Scatterplots helped to identify outliers, which are values that are quite different from those expected and fall outside the general pattern.

Procedures

The researcher submitted formal applications describing the study to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Virginia Commonwealth University. This organization is responsible for reviewing all research related to human subjects to ensure that all federal, state, and local guidelines have been met. For this particular study, however, I had extremely limited or nonexistent direct contact with the individual participants in the study. Because this study was based upon data gathered predominantly through teacher surveys and teacher data held at the district level and because all information was anonymous, there was minimal risk to the participants. Once permission to conduct the study was granted by the IRB, I submitted formal applications describing

the study to each of the school districts involved. It was critical that IRB and the districts approved the study before the researcher proceeded.

Prior to IRB approval and district level approval, experts in the field of induction programs offered feedback regarding the teacher survey, Appendix D. I made amendments to the survey and conducted a pilot study with 20 participants who had similar characteristics to those in the study in order to establish the validity of the teacher survey and to examine the clarity of the survey content and instructions. Thus, the purpose of the pilot was to examine the readability of the survey and the clarity of directions; it was not piloted for scale development. The survey was given a second time to the same participants two weeks after taking the survey the first time. The purpose was to ensure reliability of the instrument.

Teacher cover letters, instructions and surveys were sent electronically to participants. The data resulting from these surveys was entered into the statistical software program SPSS for data analysis. Information gathered from the districts regarding the number of teachers who met the criteria for the study were examined in relation to national trend data gathered through the National Center for Educational Statistics regarding teacher mobility.

Analysis

In order to gain an understanding of induction programs and to have the teacher survey provide the researcher with meaningful data, expert opinions at two levels were sought. The data gained from these university level and district level experts determined whether a revision to the teacher survey was necessary prior to sending the survey to

participants in the study and prior to piloting the survey. Once validation of the survey took place, teacher surveys were sent electronically and collected in order to answer the five research questions.

Descriptions of the formal induction programs included the length of time each component of the program lasted. For example, did each component extend beyond one year, beyond two years, or beyond three years. Also, Likert questions aided the researcher in determining teacher perception regarding the value of the components of the program and whether or not the components of the program were instrumental in teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom. Descriptive statistics were used and the means compared and analyzed in order to answer this question. According to Field (2009), ANOVA "tests the null hypothesis that all group means are equal" (p. 349). Thus, an ANOVA (analysis of variance) was used to statistically analyze the data which would answer the first research question. ANOVA produces an F statistic "which compares the amount of systematic variance n the data to the amount of unsystematic variance (Field, 2009, p. 349). As a result, the ANOVA determined if there was a difference between the means. If differences in the means were found, a post hoc test would be applied to determine where the differences lie. The post hoc tests to be used were the Bonferroni and the Tukey which were applied after the ANOVA. According to LaPier (1999), "this procedure lowers the alpha level used for the t-tests based on the number of comparisons to correct for family-wise errors." According to Field (2009), Bonferroni guarantees "control over Type I error rate" (p. 375). Thus, the ANOVA tested for significant

differences between the means, and the post hoc test determined where those differences lay.

In order to answer the second research question, descriptive statistics were used. A study of means, frequencies, and standard deviations helped the researcher explore teachers' perceptions of each component of the induction program and the teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom. Both variables, the components of the induction program and the teacher's decision to remain in the classroom, were categorical. One variable, total years of participation, was manually created for each component of the induction program. Because participants could choose multiple years in which they participated in each of the induction components, the scale for each of the new variable values was 1 for one year of participation, 2 for two years of participation, 3 for three years of participation, 4 for four years of participation, and 5 for multiple years of participation.

To gain an understanding of teacher perception regarding the value of the individual components of the induction program, descriptive statistics were applied to the data. Descriptive statistics were applied to enable the researcher to answer research question three because they were necessary if conclusions were to be made about which components of the induction program teachers perceived to be the most valuable. Frequency distributions, according to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), "indicate the number of times each score was attained" (p. 210). Frequency distributions showed very quickly the most frequently and least frequently chosen response, and they also showed the shape of the distribution. Frequency distributions showed scores that were isolated

from the others. Histograms provided a visual image of the results. Examining the means of the scores "is the most frequently used measure of central tendency because every score is used in computing it" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 215). These descriptive data indicated which components of the induction program teachers found most valuable.

To determine whether or not length of time for each of the components made any difference according to teacher perception, a one-way ANOVA was used to offer results. The independent variable was the length of time in which the teachers participated in each of the induction programs, and the dependent variable was teacher perception regarding the value of each of the components of the induction program.

In order to answer research question five to see is there was any correlation between demographic variables and teacher perception regarding the induction programs, the researcher examined the data through applying a factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). This enabled the researcher to determine the interactions and relationships between certain types of demographic information and the responses given regarding each component of the induction program in which teachers participated. Interactions between the seven demographic factors and the components of the induction program were examined by using the MANOVA. According to Field (2009), "MANOVA has greater power to detect an effect, because it can detect whether groups differ along a combination of variables" (p. 586). Hence, MANOVA analyzes the interactions between each of the independent variables, demographic characteristics, and the dependent variable, teacher perception of the induction program, which has multiple

levels. This statistical analysis is robust to the violations of assumptions. One of these assumptions made in MANOVA is that the sample is entirely random, that no pattern exists in sample selection. This assumption existed due to the fact that the collected data were gathered electronically from the individual participants. A second assumption was that the independent variables, demographic traits, were categorical variables; whereas, the dependent variables were continuous. Moderate correlation of the dependent variables, the individual components of the induction program, was necessary so that the power of the analysis, "which shows the probability of accepting the null hypothesis," will not decrease because the degrees of freedom will be sacrificed ("MANOVA," 2009). Another assumption made in MANOVA is that multivariate normality is present and the variance between the groups is equal. To ensure this assumption, at least 20 cases must be in each cell. Even with an unequal n, the test is robust to violations of multivariate normality" if at least 20 cases are in each cell (Ainsworth, n.d.). Levene's test will be applied to ensure there was no significance with alpha set at .05 for any of the dependent variables (Field, 2009, p. 604). Box's test compared the variance-covariance matrices. Field (2009) states that "this test should be nonsignificant if the matrices are the same." According to Pallant (2007), this assumption holds true if "the significance value is larger than .001" (p. 286).

The Wilks' lambda F value determined the significance of the demographic factors in relation to teacher perception of their induction programs. The F statistic "is the test statistic needed to evaluate the hypothesis that there are over-all differences between groups" with the level of significance set at the alpha level of .05 (Salkind, 2000, p. 224).

Hotelling's T was used to determine how great the difference between group means on the independent variable was (Ainsworth, n.d.). If a significant difference between the groups was found, then a post hoc test would determine where those differences lay. Data from the questions were triangulated with responses given to the probing questions asked by the researcher of the focus group participants. These questions are shown in Appendix F.

I also explored district-level data to determine what percentage of teachers remained teaching in these districts into their fifth year after the implementation in induction programs. This information was obtained from state and, when available, district-level, databases regarding employee information. This helped me to explore whether or not the induction program had any impact upon teacher retention.

After the examination of district data, I compared the percentages of teachers returning after their 4th year in these districts to the percentages shown in the national trends data. I compared the retention figures of teachers who had completed their 4th year of teaching with national trends data acquired from the National Center of Education Statistics. Examining the numbers of teachers who are retained by the three districts as classroom teachers into their 5^{th} year of teaching and comparing that percentage to the national percentage enabled me to determine whether the three Southeastern metropolitan public school systems' data were similar to the nation's data regarding teacher retention.

Delimitations/Limitations

Because the teacher shortage data indicate that the group with the lowest retention rates has only 1-3 years of experience, this study restricted the number of participants in

the study by only exploring retention rates and responses regarding induction programs to participants who are in their 5th year of teaching. This was a positive attribute because the participants have had time to reflect upon their experiences and to assess them; however, it is a limitation because 5th year teachers were asked to reflect upon experiences they had in their first two or three years of teaching. The choice of participants also posed a limitation to the study because the second most at-risk group of teachers are those with 1-5 years of experience. Hence, some of the teachers surveyed may leave teaching after their present year of service. Another restriction would be that only participants who began teaching in each of the districts where they have remained were included in the study. This was done so that only the induction programs of the districts in the study were examined. These restrictions were used so that other variables would not cloud the data, causing the researcher to gain inaccurate retention data. Another means by which the researcher narrowed the scope of the study was in the number of districts examined. The number of school districts included in the study were restricted to three public school districts in a Southeastern metropolitan area.

The greatest limitation, outside of my control, was that participation in the study was voluntary for those individuals asked to participate by completing the survey. Because the survey was not time-consuming and because it was a means by which participants could offer honest feedback by nonthreatening means, I reduced this limitation. Also, because the Likert scale asked for judgments, subjective ratings, on the part of the participants, subject effects and other factors may have posed a threat to internal validity. Teacher perceptions and attitudes can always pose threats to the

accuracy of the findings. Another threat was that the pilot study was done in order to test readability of the questionnaire and clarity of directions, not for scale development. Other limitations on the study would be the accuracy of the data supplied by the districts and the effect of the present education budget crisis which may have impacted data results. Because data were supplied by the districts regarding the numbers of teachers who were in their 5th years of teaching in those districts, I could not check for accuracy.

Also, because of the present budget crisis, other factors besides the induction programs may have redounded to teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom. According to Dillon (2010), the federal stimulus money helped school districts avoid cuts or reductions in the past year. However, Dillon notes that 20 states intended to spend 100% of these funds in the 2008-2010 school years. As a result, the school districts in this Southeastern metropolitan area face a budget crisis. In fact, the state education budget which increased from $11,204,596,493 in 2005 to $14,178,317,557 in 2008, fell from $14,856,683,149 in 2009 to $14,666,494,217 in 2010 (State Department of Planning and Budget).

The individual districts in this Southeastern metropolitan anticipate shortfalls for 2010 and in future years. In District C of this metropolitan area, the "total operating revenues are slated to decline by $9.7 million" (City Public Schools, 2009, p. 20). This is a 3.59% from the 2009 budget. This district receives most its revenue from both city or county sources and state sources. The total decline in this district "includes a decrease of $7.8 million from the state (City Public Schools, 2009, p. 21).

Just as District C is receiving reduced funding from the states, so are the other districts in this area. These districts also face a shortfall of approximately $40-$50 million for the 2010 school year (Martz, 2010). One district "indicates a 7% reduction in revenue" and is reducing programs and "raising fees to make up an $18.6 million budget shortfall" (Martz). The superintendent of yet another of the districts "expects a net reduction of $40 million in the system's budget over three years" (Martz). It is in this context that this study of beginning teacher induction programs took place. Therefore, these confounding variables posed threats to internal validity.

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to gain an understanding of 5th- year teachers' perceptions regarding their induction programs. A nonexperimental descriptive research design was used to examine teachers' perceptions; hence, there was minimal, if any, risk to those teachers who volunteered to participate. Expert opinion ensured construct validity and reliability of the survey which was piloted by 20 participants who had similar characteristics to those participants in the research study. The consistency of responses on the piloted survey which was given at two-week intervals indicated test-retest reliability. The pilot also ensured clarity of directions and readability of the survey.

After the IRB grants approval for the research study, district approval was obtained. Following these prerequisites of the study, participants who were 5th-year teachers received an electronic survey comprised of yes/no and Likert scale questions regarding their induction programs and their perceptions of the individual components of their induction program. From the comments made on the surveys by those who

participated in the study, the researcher developed focus group questions. Participation in the focus groups was voluntary. From the list of teachers who agreed to participate, teachers were chosen from each district who best reflected a variety of demographic factors, such as age, gender, ethnicity, school placement, subject levels and grade levels taught. The information obtained from participants in the focus group triangulated the data gathered from the surveys. After all data were collected, retention rates from the districts were compared to national data regarding teacher retention. Chapter four will present the data gathered and an analysis of the data.

Chapter IV

Findings

This study's purpose was to examine the relationship of the components of beginning teacher induction programs offered by school districts and teacher retention. The objective of this study was achieved by first acquiring data via an electronic survey from teachers presently in their 5th year of teaching in their districts. These data showed not only the common components in which teachers participated, but also showed teachers' perceptions of the value of each of the components of the induction program. Further information was obtained through the three focus group sessions which were held on different days in each of the three districts. One or two teachers from each of the districts offered more detailed responses related to the survey questions and helped me to gain a deeper understanding of the district's induction program.

Descriptive statistics are first reported, and these results are followed by data analyses for each of the research questions. Descriptive statistics include means, standard deviations and percentages which are presented in tables.

Descriptive Statistics

Sample population.

The school districts studied had 280 teachers eligible to participate in the survey because they were presently in their 5th year of teaching in the district. Seventy-nine teachers volunteered to participate by taking the electronic survey; however, only 72 of those who met the criteria for the study answered the questions pertaining to demographic information such as gender, age, ethnicity, subject area taught and type of

school, type of teacher certification, and job level taught. Because responses to each of the questions were voluntary, some participants declined to answer some questions. Thus, the number of responses on one question may be different from the total number of responses to another question. Also, some teachers provided demographic data but did not respond to questions regarding the components of their induction programs.

The seventy-two teachers answering some or all of survey questions represent approximately 26% of the 280 eligible teachers. However, when comparing two groups, such as males and females, the minimum sample size should reach 128 for the results of this statistical test to be reliable. If three levels of the variable exist, as is the case when comparing ethnic groups, 52 participants should be in each group. This was not the case. The sample size was too small to obtain a power of the 80% necessary to avoid Type II errors. The probability that the statistics would have Type II errors was likely; thus, the probability that unwarranted assumptions and threats to validity were present was also likely. In other words, the power analysis indicated that the sample size should be 128 teachers. Although subject bias was a threat to validity, the participants do reflect the total population of the three public school districts surveyed. Only a total of four teachers, representing the three districts surveyed, participated in one of the three focus group sessions. The focus group responses, however, were used to triangulate the data found in the survey results, and to provide a deeper understanding of the induction programs offered in their districts. The participants in the focus groups gave me a richer view of why they chose to teach, the type of support they felt they had had, and the type of support they felt they needed. Because of the depth shown in these teachers' comments,

their insightfulness, and their candor, I felt the lack of participation did not have a negative impact upon reliability.

Demographic responses.

The majority of the respondents were female and Caucasian. Table 10 shows these data. In one of the districts studied, Caucasian females with undergraduate degrees represented 42% of the sample population. Only nine percent of the teacher population with undergraduate degrees were male. In this district 45% of the teachers held MA degrees and 54% held BA or BS degrees. In the second district studied, data were not available. However, 94% of the teachers with BA or BS degrees were Caucasian; whereas, five percent of teachers with BA or BS degrees were African American. Ninety-three percent of the teachers with MA degrees were Caucasian, and six percent were African American. Data were not available regarding teacher demographics for the urban district in this study. In the two districts where demographic information was available, the population was represented by the sample.

Table 10

Gender and Ethnicity of Respondents (N = 72)

	Ethnicity			
	Hispanic	White, non-Hispanic	African America	Native America
Female	2	53	4	1
Male	0	11	1	0

Of the 72 teachers who responded to age and ethnicity questions, males represented a smaller proportion of the sample (*n* = 12; 16.7%) than women (*n* = 60; 83.3%). Responses regarding ethnicity indicated that the majority of the participants were Caucasian (88.9%), followed by African Americans (6.9%), Hispanic Americans (2.8%), and Native Americans (1.4%).

Most of the participants were under 40 years in age. Table 11 shows these demographic data.

Table 11

Gender and Age of Respondents (N = 72)

	Age			
	25-28	29-34	35-39	40+
Female	18	14	7	21
Male	1	2	4	5

The largest group of respondents were at least 40 years in age, representing 36.1%; and the fewest number of participants were between 35 and 39 years in age (15.3%). The percentage of males (41.6%) who are at least 40 years old contrasts the greatest gap between males who responded (8.3%) that are between 25 and 28 years in age. For females, the greatest age discrepancy between participants exists between the 40 year-in-age group (35.0%) and females who responded who are between 35 and 39 years in age (11.6%).

The largest group of participants taught in elementary schools, grades kindergarten through fifth grades (36%); but the number of male participants teaching in grades 9 through 12 (50%) was greater than the number of males teaching in kindergarten through grade 5 (16.6%). These data, shown in Table 12 indicate the number of male and female participants who taught in each grade level grouping.

Table 12

Gender and Grade Level Taught by Respondents (N = 72)

	Kindergarten - Grade 5	Grade 6 – Grade 8	Grade 9 – Grade 12
Female	24	20	16
Male	2	4	6

The table shows that 50% of males taught in the high school grades compared to 26.6 % of females who taught in these grade levels. Twenty-nine of the 71 teachers noted that they had taught in a high needs schools, where over 40% of the students were eligible for free or reduced-lunches, during their first four years of teaching. The mean for number of years teaching in a high-needs school was 2.44 (*SD* = 1.857).

The subject areas in which the participants taught are noted in Table 13.

Table 13

Gender and Subject Areas Taught

	Special Education	All Subjects	English	History	Science	Math
Female	11	17	8	3	6	8
Male	1	*0	2	4	*0	2

*A *0* means there were no responses in the subject area.

Teachers of physical education and electives, as well as support and resource teachers, checked the *other* category (*n* = 29). However, some respondents may have checked multiple subject areas.

Most of the teachers acquired their degrees and teacher certifications by attending a four-year university which had a teacher preparation program, and approximately the same number of teachers, 36, possessed a Masters degree as the 34 teachers who had a BA/BS degree. Fifty percent of females, 30 of the 60 who responded, and 50% of the males, six of the 12 who responded, had Masters degrees. More of the participants acquired their teaching certification from a four-year university teacher preparation program (*n* = 51) than those who obtained certification via an alternative route for career professionals (*n* = 19). These data were similar to those of the population. In one of the districts, 54% had BA or BS degrees, and 45% had MA degrees.

The second district reported that approximately 44% had BA or BS degrees, and 56% had MA degrees. No data was available from the third district.

Induction program participation responses.

Participants responded to questions regarding the components of their beginning teacher induction program. They were first asked whether or not they were offered a particular component; then they were asked the period of time in which they participated. Following these background questions regarding their participation, respondents were asked more specific questions about their experiences regarding each of the components of mentoring, orientation programs, workshops or professional development, peer observations, and peer coaching. After being asked questions, participants were next asked to judge the value each of the components had for them as a classroom teacher. Lastly, participants were asked to assay the value of each of the components in terms of retaining them as classroom teachers.

Table 14 displays the frequency data which shows how many of the 72 teachers participated in each of the components of the induction program. These data are based upon responses given to the survey questions regarding the components of their programs.

Table 14

Teacher Participation in Each Component

Component		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	*Multiple Years
Mentoring	*n*	53	1	1	1	3
	Percent	89.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	5.1%
Orientation	*n*	48	1	0	0	3
	Percent	92.3%	1.9%			5.8%
Workshops	*n*	6	1	0	2	51
	Percent	10.0%	1.7%		3.3%	85.0%
Peer Observations	*n*	7	2	0	3	9
	Percent	33.3%	9.5%		14.3%	42.9%
Peer Coaching	*n*	4	1	0	2	3
	Percent	40.0%	10.0%		20.0%	30.0%

Note. Multiple years refers to teachers who participated in a component for more than one year.

Although mentoring and orientation components were provided most frequently for first-year teachers, workshops or professional development opportunities and peer observations occurred over multiple years. All but one of the respondents who had participated in peer coaching had also participated in mentoring. Also, three teachers who had participated in peer coaching had also participated in peer observations.

Of those teachers who had mentors, 52 of them had mentors who had full-time teaching responsibilities. Although mentors were full-time teachers, the mentees felt that their mentors were readily available to them. In fact, 30 of the teachers responded that they met with their mentors whenever they or their mentor felt the need to meet. Responses from the survey indicated the topic areas in which mentors worked with the beginning teachers. Table 15 shows these results.

Table 15

Topics Discussed During Mentoring

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Lesson Planning and Curriculum	33	55.9
School Expectations and Policies	50	84.7
Classroom Management	32	55.2
Creation of Student Assessments	24	41.4
Reflection upon Teaching Practices	30	51.7
Professional Goal Setting	23	39.0

The data displayed shows the importance of the role of the mentor in helping the inexperienced teacher with understanding school expectations and policies.

After identifying which topics were discussed during mentoring, teachers were asked to reflect upon how valuable the mentor's help was in each of these areas. These results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Teacher Perception of Value of Mentor's Help In Each Topic Area

Topics	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Lesson planning and curriculum	55	2.62	1.298
School expectations and policies	56	2.02	1.168
Classroom management	53	2.51	1.339
Creation of student assessments	51	2.76	1.380
Reflection upon teaching practices	51	2.65	1.354
Setting of professional goals	49	2.71	1.258

Note. Teachers who responded as not applicable or who did not respond are not reported. Scale refers to 1 as strongly agree to 5 which is strongly disagree.

Since normal standard deviation scores fall between -3 and +3 standard deviations from the means, the results are within the normal range for each group of responses to teacher perception of the value of mentoring (Salkind, 2000). In regards to each of the topics that teachers reported that mentors discussed with them, most of the responses were positive or neutral in response to the value of the mentors' efforts. Responses to the question of teacher perception of the value of mentoring in helping teachers decide to remain in the classroom indicated a standard deviation of 1.391 and mean of 2.79, as well, with 52% of the teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing that their mentor helped them to remain in the teaching field. Teachers did strongly note that it was valuable to have a mentor that taught in the same subject area or on the same grade level. Of the teachers who responded

to this question, 53 (M = 1.85; SD = 1.262) either agreed or strongly agreed that this was a true statement.

In addition to teachers participating in mentoring during the first four years of their teaching careers, most teachers also participated in some form of orientation program. Topics presented during these orientation programs are reported in Table 17.

Table 17

Topics Discussed During Orientation Programs

Topics	Frequency	Percent
School environment	25	48.1
School procedures	28	53.8
School expectations	30	57.7
Contact personnel and support personnel	40	76.9
School community	18	34.6
District expectations	45	86.5
Introduction to inexperienced teachers in the school	38	74.5
Introduction to inexperienced teachers in the district	41	83.7

The responses indicated that the purpose of the majority of these orientation programs was to acclimate teachers to their schools or to their districts and to introduce them to contact personnel or to other inexperienced teachers with whom they could network.

After giving information regarding the topics or purpose of the orientation programs, the surveyed teachers were asked to offer value judgments regarding the information presented during the orientation programs. These data are reported in Table 18.

Table 18

Teacher Perceptions of Value of Orientation Topics

Topics	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
School environment	48	2.92	1.302
School procedures	48	2.92	1.302
School expectations	47	2.85	1.215
Contact personnel and support personnel	47	2.51	1.159
School community	48	3.15	1.130
Professional growth opportunities	48	2.85	1.072
Introduction to inexperienced teachers in the school	48	2.27	.984
Introduction to inexperienced teachers in the district	50	2.16	.792
Introduction to expectations of the district	50	2.18	.850

Note. Teachers who responded as not applicable or who did not respond are not reported. Scale refers to 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree.

Orientation programs, according to the participants' responses, acclimated teachers to their schools or districts, introduced them to contact personnel, or introduced them to other inexperienced teachers. Due to the means of 2.16 and 2.18, teachers agreed with the statements that it was of value to be introduced to other inexperienced teachers in the districts and in their schools. Most teachers were in agreement that aspects of the orientation program were valuable to them; however, the number who said that they strongly agreed that the topic was valuable was never as strong as the response of those who just agreed with the statement and had no strong feelings. However, there was slightly more agreement in the perception of the value of being introduced to other inexperienced teachers in the school and district and to awareness of district expectations. Thirty-four of the 50 teachers who participated in the survey noted that the orientation program took place in the school in which they taught.

Workshops/professional development opportunities.

Another aspect common to many induction programs is the offering of workshops. Teachers reported that they participated in both school and district-led workshops. In fact, 54 teachers stated that they had experienced workshops in their schools, and 52 teachers noted that the districts offered workshops. With both school and district-led workshops, attendance was typically mandated. Forty-three teachers stated that attendance was not voluntary for school-offered workshops, and 40 teachers indicated that attendance was required for district-offered workshops. The frequency of these workshops varied depending upon whether they were school or district-led. Most of

the 72 teachers surveyed did, however, participate in some form of workshop as part of their induction program. This information in shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Frequency of Teacher Participation in Workshops/Professional Development

Frequency of Workshop Offerings	District	School
1 or more per month	7	10
1 bi-monthly	2	5
1 quarterly	16	17
1 per semester	26	16
1 per year	5	5

Note. N = 60 for school workshops and n = 59 for district workshops. Numbers do not reflect not applicable responses

A scale ranging from 1 meaning *strongly agree* to 5 meaning *strongly disagree* was used to show whether or not teachers perceived the workshops to be interactive in nature. The means ranged from 2.83 to 4.10, and standard deviations ranged from 1.115 to 1.123. Whether or not teachers felt that the workshops were interactive in nature may or may not have had an impact upon teacher perception regarding the value of these particular workshops. Table 20 reports the data concerning teacher perception of the value of each of the topics offered in workshop form.

Table 20

Teacher Perception of Value of Workshops/Professional Development

Workshop Topics	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Classroom Management	38	2.29	.984
Student Assessments	29	2.38	1.049
Lesson Planning	30	2.53	.973
Teacher Reflection	23	2.78	1.166
Special Needs Students	37	2.14	.855
Instructional Strategies/ Differentiated Instruction	49	2.10	.872
Special Education and General Education Teacher Collaboration	32	2.19	.965
Reading and Writing Strategies	39	2.21	.894
Setting Professional Goals	25	2.76	1.052

Note. The number of teachers responding to each topic varies according to participation. On the scale, 1 = strongly agree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

The data indicate that teachers felt that some of the workshops were of great value to them. For example, 39 of the teachers felt that the instructional strategies workshop was valuable to them (M = 2.10, SD = .872). Twenty-nine teachers agreed and ten teachers strongly agreed that it was valuable. Another workshop that teachers felt positively about, according to frequencies, was the one which focused upon reading and writing strategies. Thirty of the 39 teachers who participated agreed that it was valuable. The value of this

workshop topic was also commented upon by a teacher in one of the focus groups who said that she still used some of this information in her teaching although she does not hear much about these strategies anymore.

The manner in which the workshops/professional development opportunities were presented to beginning teachers as part of their induction program may have affected their perception of the value of the experience. Teachers were asked if the workshops they experienced were interactive in nature. Teacher responses are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

Extent of Interaction during Workshop/Professional Development Presentations

Workshop Topics	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Effective classroom management	38	2.61	.790
Creating student assessments	28	2.93	.761
Effective lesson planning	29	2.86	.581
Teacher reflection	21	2.90	.625
Working with special needs students	35	2.80	.833
Instructional strategies/differentiated instruction	45	2.49	.757
Collaboration with a special education teacher	30	2.53	.730
Reading and writing strategies	35	2.63	.646
Setting professional goals	23	2.96	.825

Note. The number of teachers responding to each topic varies according to participation. The scale used is 1 = all of the time, 2 = most of the time, 3 = sometimes, and 4 = never.

As shown by the means, most teachers felt as if the workshops were not predominantly interactive in nature. Teacher responses indicated that most workshops were only sometimes presented in an interactive manner. By examining the frequency of responses, however, a majority of teachers perceived three of the workshop topics to have been presented in a more interactive manner. For example, 16 of the 38 teachers that responded stated that the classroom management workshop was interactive most of the time. Through an examination of the means, the workshop on the topic of collaboration between a general education teacher and a special education teacher was interactive, as well. Also, 18 of the 45 teachers felt that the workshop on instructional strategies was interactive. With the exception of the workshop on classroom management, the largest number of teachers chose *sometimes* as a response.

Peer observations and peer coaching.

Two other common components of induction programs are peer observations and peer coaching. Fewer teachers surveyed experienced these two components of the induction program than the other three components of mentoring, orientation programs, and workshops. Nine of the 21 teachers (42.9%) indicated that their schools mandated peer observations, with 16 of the 21 teachers (76.2%) stating that they observed teachers in their subject area or in their grade level. When asked about the frequency of observations, results showed that three teachers (14.3%) were involved in peer observations at least once per grading period, but the more frequent response, noted by 13 of the participants (61.9%), was that peer observations occurred once per semester. At least 45% of the survey participants did not respond to the questions related to peer

observations because they did not participate in peer observations as part of their induction program. Of those teachers who did participate, 15 (71.4%) stated that some form of feedback was encouraged after each observation. These results are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Frequency of Peer Observation, Assignment, and Follow-up Requirement

	Number	Frequency of *yes* responses	Percentage
At least once per grading period	20	3	15.0%
Twice per year/once per semester	21	13	61.9%
Teachers were self-chosen	19	12	63.2%
Teachers were in the same subject area or on the same grade level	20	16	80.0%
Feedback was encouraged	19	15	78.9%
Feedback was required	18	9	50.0%

Scale used was 1 = yes and 2 = no.

Although a fewer number of teachers participated in peer observations during their first four years of teaching, the positive responses regarding the value of the observations by those who did participate is obvious by the number of teachers who felt these observations aided them in their growth as a practitioner (M = 2.00, SD = .725). The scale used ranged from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. None of the

participants had negative feelings regarding peer observations as noted by the lack of responses in the disagree category. The range of means from 2.00 to 2.16 (*SD* range from .686 to .875) in responses to the questions about peer observations indicates a similarity in teacher perception regarding this component's value by those teachers who participated.

Peer coaching is another of the components of some induction programs. Like peer observations, however, very few participants (nine) surveyed had the opportunity to experience peer coaching. In fact, 63 of the responses were *0*, indicating missing data. For those who did participate in peer coaching, over-all responses were positive. These responses are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations on the Value of the Workshop on Peer Coaching and the Peer Coaching Experience

	Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Mean	*SD*
The workshop on peer coaching provided by the district was valuable to me as a teacher.	6	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	*	*	1.83	.408
The workshop on peer coaching provided by teachers in my school was valuable to me as a teacher.	5	1 20.0%	3 60.0%	1 20.0%	*	2.00	.707
Peer coaching was valuable in helping me to set professional growth goals.	9	4 44.4%	2 22.2%	2 22.2%	1 11.1%	2.00	1.118
Peer coaching was valuable in helping me improve in my effectiveness as a classroom teacher.	9	3 33.3%	5 55.6%	1 11.1%	*	1.78	.667

Note. No responses of *strongly disagree* were chosen. The scale used ranges from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree.
*means there were no responses.

Although few teachers had the opportunity to participate in peer coaching, those who did

mostly agreed that the experience had value for them as a classroom teacher. The scale used ranged from 1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*. The mean pertaining to the value of peer coaching's helping beginning teachers to set professional growth goals (*M* = 2.00, *SD* = 1.118) and the mean for the value in helping to improve their effectiveness as classroom teachers (*M* = 1.78, *SD* = .667) indicate that peer coaching was a valuable experience for teachers who participated. None of the teachers who participated in the focus groups had experienced peer coaching, but one teacher had positive views about peer observations.

Focus Groups

Teachers were asked on the electronic survey to volunteer to participate in a focus group with other teachers in their districts. If they chose to do so, they entered their contact information. The ideal scenario for a focus group would have been to have a pool of teachers from each district from which to choose four or five participants based upon demographic information such as gender, type of teacher certification, ethnicity, and grade level to get a diverse group of individuals. However, no more than two teachers from each of the districts responded by volunteering their contact information.

After the focus group meetings, the taped comments and notes were combined to type an accurate depiction of the content of the meetings. Comments were recorded verbatim. I then highlighted in different colors the responses given for each of the guiding questions that were asked. Common ideas or themes were noted and used to support the findings from the survey.

The four teachers who participated in the three focus group sessions held were extremely caring individuals who stressed that the reason that they chose to teach and continue to teach is because of their students. They expressed that teaching was a "calling," and they knew that they had much to offer to their students. In spite of budget cuts, lack of administrative support, and negative publicity concerning the profession, they smiled and all stated that what was important were the students in their classes. In fact, one of the teachers who was quite vocal and clearly frustrated with the lack of support and monetary concerns became more positive as the session continued. The teacher in the urban district who was a career switcher was frustrated with the lack of support and the focus upon accountability which she thought unfair and unreasonable; yet when she spoke of her students, she referred to them as her children. She even stated that she worked with her children during the summer months if they needed her and that she frequently visited their homes if a parent was experiencing difficulties. Because her students were special education students who often came to school hungry, she had cabinets of food that she readily gave them so that they were not hungry. The participation of these dedicated teachers enhanced my understanding of the support systems they had, the induction programs they had experienced and how they felt about their jobs and students.

Research Questions

The five research questions in the study were examined using descriptive and inferential statistics. To investigate research question one, an ANOVA (a one-way analysis of variance) was used with the variables of teachers' perception regarding each

of the components in relationship to teacher retention and the number of years in which the teachers participated in each of the components of the induction program. Survey responses were combined to create a variable for total years in which teachers participated in mentoring if participation was for more than one year. Separate variables were created to indicate the total years of participation in an orientation program or peer observations if multiple years of participation were marked. A variable was also created for multiple years for peer coaching if teachers had experienced the program for more than one year. During the focus groups, participants responded to questions regarding their perceptions of the induction program in relation to their decision to remain in the classroom. These responses were for the triangulation of data.

In order to answer questions two and three, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to investigate relationships. For question two, the relationship between those teachers who are presently in their fifth year of teaching and the perceived value for each of the components is explored. For question three, the perceived value of each of the components is investigated. To answer question four, a chi-square, nonparametric test, followed by an ANOVA, was used to determine if the length of time in which teachers participated in each of the components had an impact upon teacher perception of the value of each of the components. The final question, investigated by use of a MANOVA, explored the relationship of certain demographic characteristics and teacher perception of the different components of their induction programs. The level of significance .05 was used for all statistical analyses.

Research Question One

Question 1: What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the components of the induction program in retaining teachers?

Teachers were asked in what years they were assigned each of the components of their induction programs. The single number of years or multiple years was entered as one variable; whereas, the other variable was teacher perception regarding the amount of influence that having a particular component had made in their decision to remain in the classroom. A one-way ANOVA was used to test for differences among perceptions of those teachers who participated in mentoring during years one through four of their teaching career. No significance across the between and within groups was shown, F (2, 43) = 1.567, p = .220. As a result, no post-hoc test was necessary. Results from the ANOVA weren't strongly reliable due to having so few participants who participated in some of the components of beginning teacher induction programs.

Focus group comments indicated the importance of mentoring. For example, one teacher stated, "I think the mentor program that they set up—that really helped me. Maybe it was the mentor I was with. She gave me the confidence, knowledge and hands-on experience, and I know she really helped me." Another teacher stated that although she is no longer assigned a mentor, she goes to the mentor she was assigned during her first year of teaching who is still helping her with situations that arise. "I still worked with her my second year, and I still went to her with questions." Another teacher in another school district also believes that she would not have grown as much professionally without her mentor. She stated, "I think it all comes down to mentors; I

really do." This comment is reiterated by a teacher in one of the districts who is a career switcher. She stated, "I did have a mentor my first year who was very helpful; I would probably not have made it without her."

For examining teacher perception regarding the value of their orientation program in which they participated in years one through four, an ANOVA was used to test for differences among perceptions. No significance between and within groups was shown, F (3, 38) = .661, p = .581.

One of the teachers during the focus group stated that the orientation program she had been involved with was a positive experience. At that school "they had an entire week for anyone new to the school and they did everything from telling you how to get your email to a tour around the district so that you had a good idea about that." She noted that the administrators of the orientation program presented even the smallest details that were important to teachers; "they made it that word by word and to the letter exactly what you needed to do."

A one-way ANOVA applied to the variables of teachers being offered workshop or professional development opportunities and their perceptions of the retention value of this component noted no significance between and within groups, F (2, 46) = 2.451, p = .097. Post hoc tests were not applied because no significance was shown.

During focus group sessions, teachers discussed some of the workshops in which they participated. One of the teachers stated that she only goes to the required workshops as a result of the quality of the workshop. She declared that "I went to it having high expectations. Just never went again after that." She believed that the topics were

repetitive and too subjective. However, she did comment that "every once in a while they'll have a jewel." She spoke positively in terms of technology workshops, stating that "a technology expert comes in and does a workshops once a month; those are good little workshops." Teachers in the other two districts focused their comments upon technology workshops, as well. One stated that the district "offers a lot of training….and they do listen to our input on training that we'd like more of." Another district's teacher was greatly interested in attending a technology workshop, but too many people had already signed up for it. A math teacher noted that "I still do a couple things, like the CRIS strategies and the VENN diagram. That was a basic CRIS strategy but it was still something we use to figure out things." A special education teacher from the same district chimed in that she too still goes back to the book that she acquired in that workshop because "it has good printables."

Only 16 of the respondents participated in peer observations as part of their beginning teacher induction program. No significance is noted by teacher perception of the impact of peer observations upon teacher retention, F (3, 13), p = .952. A post hoc test could not be applied because no significance was present and because there were fewer than two cases in at least one of the groups.

During the focus group sessions, only one teacher mentioned involvement in peer observations. She stated that "it is wonderful just for the interpersonal part. Even if you aren't teaching the same subject, it's nice to see how another person is relating to the kids and how the kids react to a teacher in another room."

A post hoc test was not applied to the perception of the value of peer coaching in relationship to teacher retention because no significance was shown. When comparing these two groups, F (2,5) = .227, p =.805. During the focus group discussions, no teachers had had direct involvement with peer coaching as part of their induction programs.

Research Question Two

Question 2: According to teacher perception, how important a factor were the induction programs in 5th year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom?

Descriptive statistics were used to answer this question, using the variables of the teachers who were presently in their fifth year of teaching and the multiple components of the induction program. These results are reported in Table 24.

Table 24

Strength of Influence of Each Component in Teachers' Decisions to Stay

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mentoring	2.84	1.113
Orientation	2.96	.903
Workshops	2.54	.939
Peer Observation	2.83	1.000
Peer Coaching	3.15	1.120

Note. The scale ranged from 1 = strong influence to 4 = no influence. Missing value is noted as a 5.

Orientation programs had a minimal to moderate influence upon the teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom.

According to one teacher during the focus group discussions, the school's induction program for beginning teachers "decides if you stay or not…whether or not you can get the help you need in that school and whether or not the environment is conducive to staying." The teachers never stated that components other than mentoring helped to retain them in the classroom. However, in a personal communication with a staff developer in one of the districts studied, she was glad, but yet not surprised, that several of the teachers during the focus group sessions indicated that although they were no longer assigned a mentor, they still went to the mentor that they had been assigned in their first year of teaching. She noted that the research stated that the mentor-mentee relationship is important and stressed the importance of making a good match, one that matches teachers of the same grade level or subject area (when possible) and one in which the teachers are in close proximity in their buildings (personal communication, March 2, 2011).

Research Question Three

Research Question 3: Which components of the induction program do the 5th year teachers perceive to be the most valuable?

Descriptive statistics were used to explore the value, according to teacher perception, of each of the components and specific aspects of each of the components. Participants were asked to judge the value of mentoring for them as classroom teachers. Table 22 gives these results. The scale range was from 1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly*

disagree. When asked about the value of the mentor's help with lesson planning and curriculum, $M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.298$. Regarding the value of the mentor's value in helping the teacher understand school expectations and policies, $M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.168$. Teacher perception regarding the value of the mentor's aid in the area of classroom management ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 1.339$), the mentor's aid in helping to create student assessments ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.380$), the value of the mentor in helping teachers to reflect upon their teaching practices ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.354$), the value of the mentor in helping teachers set professional goals ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.258$), and the value of mentor in helping teachers make the decision to remain in the classroom ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.391$) are reported in Table 25.

Table 25

Frequencies and Percentages of Teacher Perception Regarding the Value of Mentoring (n = 57)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Lesson planning and curriculum	13 22.8%	15 26.3%	13 22.8%	8 14.0%	6 10.5%	2 3.5%
School expectations and policies	21 36.8%	24 42.1%	5 8.8%	1 1.8%	5 8.8%	1 1.8%
Classroom management	14 25.5%	17 30.9%	10 18.2%	5 9.1%	7 12.7%	2 3.6%
Student assessments	12 21.1%	12 21.1%	10 17.5%	10 17.5%	7 12.3%	6 10.5%
Reflection upon teaching practices	12 21.1%	15 26.3%	10 17.5%	7 12.3%	7 12.3%	6 10.5%
Setting of professional goals	8 14.0%	17 29.8%	11 19.8%	7 12.3%	6 10.5%	8 14.0%
Decision to remain in the classroom	10 17.5%	17 29.8%	8 14.0%	8 14.0%	9 15.8%	5 8.8%

Note. *n*= 55 for responses regarding the value of classroom management. Scale ranged from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree.

Having a mentor was a valuable experience according to the participants. The data shown indicated that more teachers agreed or strongly agreed with each of the statements regarding the help of the mentor in comparison to those teachers who disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, a strong tendency for neutrality was evident except in the

areas of school expectations and policies. Not applicable responses were selected by teachers whose mentors did not broach the topic of the question.

The number of participants judging the value of teacher orientation programs ranged from 47 to 50. Teachers were asked to assay the value of their orientation program in introducing teachers to the school environment (M = 2.92, SD = 1.302), in helping teachers get acclimated to school procedures (M = 2.92, SD = 1.302), in introducing teachers to school expectations (M = 2.85, SD = 1.215), in introducing teachers to contact personnel and support personnel (M = 2.51, SD = 1.159), in acclimating teachers to the community the school serves (M = 3.15, SD = 1.130), in apprising teachers of professional growth opportunities (M = 2.85, SD = 1.072), in introducing teachers to others in the school who also have no teaching experience (M = 2.27, SD = .984), in introducing teachers to other teachers in the district who have no prior teaching experience (M = 2.16, SD = .792), and in the value to them as classroom teachers (M = 2.51, SD = 1.101). The response results are given in Table 26.

Table 26

Teacher Perception of the Value of Orientation Programs

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Introduction to school environment (*n* = 50)	6 12.0%	16 32.0%	10 20.0%	8 16.0%	8 16.0%	2 4.0%
Acclimation to school procedures (*n* = 50)	5 10.0%	19 38.0%	7 14.0%	9 18.0%	8 16.0%	2 4.0%
Introduction to school expectations (*n* = 49)	4 8.2%	20 40.8%	8 16.3%	9 18.4%	6 12.2%	2 4.1%
Introduction to contact personnel and support personnel (*n* = 49)	7 14.3%	23 46.9%	7 14.3%	6 12.2%	4 8.2%	2 4.1%
Acclimation to the school community (*n* = 50)	3 6.0%	13 26.0%	11 22.0%	16 32.0%	5 10.05	2 4.0%
Knowledge of professional growth opportunities (*n* = 50)	3 6.0%	17 34.0%	17 34.0%	6 12.0%	5 10.0%	2 4.0%
Meeting teachers in school with no experience (*n* = 50)	8 16.0%	27 54.0%	7 14.0%	4 8.0%	2 4.0%	2 1.8%
Meeting teachers in district with no experience (*n* = 50)	9 18.0%	27 54.0%	11 22.0%	3 6.0%	*0 0.0%	*0 0.0%
Value as a teacher (*n* = 48)	5 10.4%	26 54.2%	7 14.6%	5 10.4%	4 8.3%	1 2.1%

*No participants responded. Scale range from 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.

If a participant chose *not applicable* for a response, the orientation program did not broach that particular topic.

Between 23 and 49 participants responded that they had attended some or all of the workshops and rated them on a scale from 1 which is *strongly agree* to 5 which is *strongly disagree*. These teachers rated each workshop by its perceived value. Fifty-five respondents rated the workshop on the topic of instructional strategies and/or differentiated instruction ($M = 2.10$, $SD = .872$). Other focus areas for workshops which the teachers rated were classroom management ($M = 2.29$, $SD = .984$), student assessments ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 1.049$), lesson planning ($M = 2.53$, $SD = .973$), teacher reflection ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.166$), students with special needs ($M = 2.14$, $SD = .855$), special education- general education teacher collaboration ($M = 2.19$, $SD = .965$), reading and writing strategies ($M = 2.21$, $SD = .894$) and professional growth goals ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.7052$). Table 27 displays the results of the data regarding teacher perception of the value of each of these workshops.

Table 27

Teacher Perception of the Value of Workshops

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Classroom management (*n* = 38)	7 13.5%	19 36.5%	7 13.5%	4 7.7%	1 1.9%	14 26.9%
Student assessments (*n* = 29)	5 9.6%	14 26.9%	5 9.6%	4 7.7%	1 1.9%	23 44.2%
Lesson planning (*n* =30)	3 5.7%	14 26.4%	8 15.1%	4 7.5%	1 1.9%	23 43.4%
Teacher reflection (*n* = 23)	2 3.85	10 19.2%	4 7.7%	5 9.6%	2 3.8%	29 55.8%
Students with special needs (*n* = 37)	8 15.4%	19 36.5%	7 13.5%	3 5.8%	*0 0.0%	15 28.8%
Instructional strategies (*n* = 49)	10 18.2%	29 52.7%	6 10.9%	3 5.5%	1 1.8%	6 10.9%
Teacher collaboration (*n* = 32)	7 13.5%	16 30.8%	6 11.5%	2 3.8%	1 1.9%	20 38.5%
Reading and writing strategies (*n* = 39)	6 11.3%	24 45.3%	5 9.4%	3 5.7%	1 1.9%	14 26.4%
Professional goals (*n* = 25)	2 3.8%	10 19.2%	6 11.5%	6 11.5%	1 1.9%	27 51.9%

Many of the participants agreed that the workshops pertaining to instruction for special needs students, classroom management, instructional strategies, and reading and writing strategies were of positive value.

Only 18-20 of the respondents had participated in the fourth component of many teacher induction programs--peer observation. These participants were asked to reflect upon their experiences with peer observation and to judge the usefulness of what they observed or their skill improvement as a result of observing their peers. Questions were asked that would have teachers reflect upon whether the observations helped them to improve their own skills, helped them to set their own goals, or were valuable to their growth as a professional. The final question regarding peer observations, however, asked teachers to judge the value of the component in relation to their growth as a practitioner (M = 2.00, SD = .686). Table 28 reports the value teachers perceived that they gained from peer observations. The n for each question is 20 with the exception of the question that asked teachers to respond to whether or not they believed that peer observations improved their use of instructional strategies in the classroom (n = 19) and the question that asked if the observations were valuable to their growth as a practitioner (n = 18). No participants chose a response of *strongly agree*.

Table 28

Teacher Perception of Their Improvement due to Observations

	M	*SD*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Peer observations helped me improve my own classroom management skills.	2.00	.725	4 20.0%	13 65.0%	2 10.0%	1 5.0%
I used classroom management techniques I observed.	2.10	.852	4 20%	12 60.0%	2 10.0%	2 10.0%
Peer observations improved my use of instructional strategies in the classroom.	2.16	.765	3 15.8%	11 57.9%	4 21.1%	1 5.3%
I used instructional strategies that I observed.	2.10	.788	4 20.0%	11 55.0%	4 20.0%	1 5.0%
Peer observations helped me to set my own professional growth goals.	2.15	.875	4 20.0%	11 55.0%	3 15.0%	2 10.0%
Peer observations helped me improve my classroom practice.	2.05	.686	3 15.0%	14 70%	2 10.0%	1 5.0%
The observations were valuable to my growth as a practitioner.	2.00	.686	3 16.7%	13 72.2%	1 5.6%	1 5.6%

Note. Scale range is from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree.

Teacher perception was particularly similar in the two areas—teacher perception of improvement of their own class management skills and their growth as a practitioner—due to their participation in peer observations (M = 2.00). In fact, similarity in responses was shown for all questions asked regarding this component.

Teachers who participated in peer coaching were asked to respond to two questions, one which asked them to determine if peer coaching helped them set professional growth goals and the other which asked if peer coaching helped them to become more effective classroom teachers. Only nine teachers participated in peer coaching (n = 9). Table 29 displays the data noting teacher perception regarding peer coaching. None of the participants disagreed strongly with either of the two statements.

Table 29

Teacher Perception of the Value of Peer Coaching

	M	*SD*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Peer coaching valuable in helping me to set professional growth goals.	2.00	1.118	4 44.4%	2 22.2%	2 22.2%	1 11.1%
Peer coaching was valuable in helping me improve in my effectiveness as a classroom teacher.	1.78	.667	3 33.3%	5 55.6%	1 11.1%	*0 0.0%

*No participant chose this response. Scale is 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree.

Although the number of participants was low, of those who did participate by taking the survey, 88.9% felt that peer coaching helped them improve as classroom teachers.

Research Question Four

Question 4: What difference, if any, according to 5th year teachers' perceptions, does the length of time of each of the components of the induction program make?

In order to answer this question, an ANOVA was applied using the variables of length of time in which the respondents participated in each of the induction program components and teacher perception of the retention value of each individual component of the beginning teacher induction program. A new variable, total years of each component, was manually created so that a value of multiple years could be added for teachers who participated in a particular component for more than one year. The frequency and percentages of those teachers who participated in a certain component of their induction program for single or multiple years is reported in Table 30. Teacher perception of the value of each of these components is also shown in the table in order to determine if any relationship exists between the length of time in which teachers experienced a particular component and their perception of the value of that component.

Table 30

Frequencies and Percentages Showing the Relationship of Length of Time and Teacher Perception Value

Components	Year(s) of Participation	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Minimal Influence	No Influence	N/A
Mentoring *n* = 48	1	7 14.6%	7 14.6%	15 31.3%	13 27.1%	2 4.2%
	2	1 2.1%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%
	Multiple	1 2.1%	1 2.1%	0 .0%	1 2.1%	0 .0%
Orientation *n* = 42	1	2 4.8%	12 28.6%	14 33.3%	11 26.2%	0 .0%
	Multiple	0 .0%	2 4.8%	1 2.4%	0 .0%	0 .0%
Workshops *n* = 50	1	0 .0%	3 6.0%	0 .0%	3 6.0%	0 .0%
	4	1 2.0%	1 2.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%
	Multiple	4 8.0%	21 42.0%	11 22.0%	5 10.0%	1 2.0%

(table continues)

Components	Year(s) of Participation	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Minimal Influence	No Influence	N/A
Observations *n* = 18	1	0 .0%	4 22.2%	2 11.1%	0 .0%	0 .0%
	2	0 .0%	1 5.6%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%
	4	1 5.6%	0 .0%	1 5.6%	0 .0%	1 5.6%
	Multiple	2 11.1%	4 22.2%	1 5.6%	1 5.6%	0 .0%
Coaching *n* = 8	1	1 12.5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	2 25.0%	0 .0%
	4	1 12.5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 12.5%	0 .0%
	Multiple	2 25.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 12.5%	0 .0%

Note. Some years are missing if there were no responses for those years.

The analysis indicated that a loss of power existed because there were numerous cells associated with each induction component that had an expected count of fewer than 5. The significance values associated with all of the components suggest that the variables are acting independently but that a relationship of some kind exists. As shown in Table 27, Cramer's V significance values, which note the degree of the association between the two variables, were identical to the Pearson significance values.

All significance values for Levene's test were greater than .05; thus, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated. Because all significance values

of the ANOVA are greater than .05, there is no statistically significant result among the groups. No post hoc test was needed for further exploration before no significant results were reported with the ANOVA.

Research Question Five

Research Question 5: What difference, if any, do demographic variables make in terms of perception regarding each component of their induction program?

A MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was the test used to examine differences in gender in relation to teacher perception of the value of each of the induction components in terms of teacher retention. The dependent variables were mentoring, orientation, workshops, peer observations, and peer coaching. The independent variable was gender. All assumption tests were performed to check for violations of normality, outliers, and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices could not be computed for the variables of gender and component value because there are fewer than two nonsingular cell covariance matrices. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was used with a confidence of .05. When Wilks' Lambda and Pillai's Trace tests for significant differences between the groups were performed, no significant differences for males and females were shown. Wilks' Lambda value was .901, and the Pillai's Trace value was .099. Pillai's Trace is a more robust test if unequal groups or a small sample size exists (Pallant, 2007). Both tests' results displayed a significance value of .861. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no p-value lower than .05, again indicating no difference between male and female perceptions of the components' values related to teacher retention. According to Cohen (1988), the effect is small with partial eta squared

= .002 (mentoring), .002 (orientation), .002 (workshops), .003 (peer observations), and .000 (peer coaching). A comparison of means noted that there was little to no difference in value perception based upon gender. These data are shown in Table 31.

Table 31

Relationships Between Gender and Perception of Component Value

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
Male	3.200	.837	5	1	.039	.845
Female	3.111	.900	18			
Orientation						
Male	3.200	.837	5	1	.034	.854
Female	3.278	.826	18			
Workshops						
Male	3.000	1.000	5	1	.047	.831
Female	3.111	1.023	18			
Observations						
Male	3.400	.548	5	1	.073	.790
Female	3.278	.958	18			
Coaching						
Male	3.400	.548	5	1	.010	.920
Female	3.444	.922	18			

No significance may be shown due to the uneven number of participants who were male compared to those who were female. A calculation of effect size, which notes practical significance, showed an effect-size *r* of .051 when comparing the means of male to

female perception regarding mentoring, an effect-size *r* of -.048 when comparing the means of male to female perception regarding orientation, an effect-size *r* of -.054 when comparing the means of male to female perception regarding workshops, an effect-size *r* of . 076 when comparing means of male to female perception regarding peer observations, and an effect-size *r* of -.026 when comparing male to female perception regarding peer coaching. Cohen's *d* indicated small effect sizes for each of the components of the induction program.

A second MANOVA was performed using the variables of ethnicity and teacher perception of the value of each induction component. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices could not be computed for the variables of ethnicity and component value because there are fewer than two nonsingular cell covariance matrices. Application of Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that assumptions had been violated. Thus, a more conservative alpha level was applied (Pallant, 2007). However, even with the more conservative level of .017, the *p*-values were below the alpha level for the components of orientation, workshops, and observations. When Wilks' Lambda and Pillai's Trace tests for significant differences between the groups were performed, no significant differences for white, non-Hispanic and African American ethnicity (the only ethnic backgrounds reported) were shown. Wilks' Lambda value was .139, and the Pillai's Trace value was .861. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no *p*-value lower than .05, again indicating no difference between ethnicity and perceptions of the components' values related to teacher retention. According to Cohen (1988), the effect is small with partial eta squared = .002 (mentoring), .010 (orientation), .001(workshops),

.012 (peer observations), and .026 (peer coaching). A comparison of means noted that some perceptions are somewhat different depending upon ethnicity. These data are reflected in Table 32.

Table 32

Relationships Between Ethnicity and Perception of Component's Value

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
White, non-Hispanic	3.14	1.203	21	1	.047	830
African American	3.00	1.140	2			
Orientation						
White, non-Hispanic	3.29	.988	21	1	.219	.645
African American	3.00	1.140	2			
Workshops						
White, non-Hispanic	3.10	1.078	21	1	.016	.901
African American	3.00	.548	2			
Peer Observations						
White, non-Hispanic	3.33	1.284	21	1	.256	.618
African American	3.00	1.483	2			
Peer Coaching						
White, non-Hispanic	3.48	.873	21	1	.571	.458
African American	3.00	.000	2			

A larger amount of variance will be due to error, lessening the chance of finding significance. Thus, no significance may be shown due to the uneven number of participants representing each ethnic group. In order to determine if there was practical significance, a calculation of effect size was done. The calculation showed an effect-size r of .11 (Cohen's *d* = .22) when comparing the means of Caucasian to African American's perception regarding mentoring, an effect-size *r* of .24 (Cohen's *d* = .49) when comparing the means of Caucasian to African Americans' perceptions regarding orientation, an effect-size *r* of .07 (Cohen's *d* = .135) when comparing the means of Caucasian to African Americans' perceptions regarding workshops, an effect-size *r* of .50 (Cohen's *d* = 1.14) when comparing the means of Caucasian to African Americans' perceptions regarding peer observations, and an effect-size *r* of .36 (Cohen's *d* = .78) when comparing the means of Caucasian to African Americans' perceptions regarding peer coaching. Cohen's *d* when comparing the responses of the two ethnic groups showed a medium effect for orientation. Cohen's *d* when comparing the responses of Caucasians to those of African Americans regarding the value of peer observations showed an extremely large effect. Also, when comparing the responses of the two ethnic groups, a medium to large effect for peer coaching was shown. For these three components, the effect size insinuated practical significance.

Another MANOVA was used to explore the interactions between subject areas that the teachers taught and their perceptions of the teacher retention value of each of the components. No statistical information was produced because no valid cases were found.

A MANOVA was performed using the variables of level of job description, kindergarten to fifth grade, sixth grade to eighth grade, and ninth grade to twelfth grade and teacher perception of the value of each induction component. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was not computed because there were too few cell matrices. Application of Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that no assumption had been violated for equality of variance for any of the components. When Wilks' Lambda and Pillai's Trace tests for significant differences between the groups were performed, no significant differences for grade level taught were shown. The Wilks' Lambda value was .661 and the Pillai's Trace value was .368. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no significance level lower than .05, again indicating no difference between grade level taught and perceptions of the components' values related to teacher retention. According to Cohen (1988), the effect is small with partial eta squared = .013 (mentoring), .007 (orientation), .033 (workshops), .010 (peer observations). The medium effect, however, is shown for peer coaching based upon partial eta squared = .060. A comparison of means noted that some perceptions are somewhat different depending upon the grade level the participant taught. For example, there is a slight tendency toward the choice of *agree* for teachers in grades six to eight in relationship to workshops. Otherwise, most of the means tend towards *neutrality* or *disagree* according to teacher perception. These data are reflected in Table 33.

Table 33

Relationships Between Grade Level Taught and Perception of Component's Value

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
Kindergarten – fifth grade	3.00	1.265	6	2	134	.875
Sixth grade – eighth grade	3.11	.782	9			
Ninth grade – twelfth grade	3.25	.707	8			
Orientation						
Kindergarten – fifth grade	3.17	.983	6	2	.071	.932
Sixth grade – eighth grade	3.33	.866	9			
Ninth grade – twelfth grade	3.25	.707	8			
Workshops						
Kindergarten – fifth grade	3.33	.816	6	2	.345	.712
Sixth grade – eighth grade	2.89	1.167	9			
Ninth grade – twelfth grade	3.13	.991	8			
Peer Observation						
Kindergarten – fifth grade	3.17	1.169	6	2	.096	.908
Sixth grade – eighth grade	3.33	.866	9			
Ninth grade – twelfth grade	3.38	.744	8			

(table continues)

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Peer Coaching						
Kindergarten – fifth grade	3.17	1.169	6	2	.642	.537
Sixth grade – eighth grade	3.67	.707	9			
Ninth grade – twelfth grade	3.38	.744	8			

Another MANOVA was performed using the variables of number of years teaching in high needs schools and teacher perception of the value of each induction component. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was not computed because there were too few cell matrices. Application of Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that no assumption had been violated for equality of variance for mentoring. However, the *p*-value for workshops was .056 which is only slightly above the alpha level. When Wilks' Lambda and Pillai's Trace tests for significant differences between the groups were performed, no significant differences for number of years teaching in a high needs school were shown. The Wilks' Lambda value was .591, and the Pillai's Trace value was .443. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no significance level lower than .05, again indicating no difference between number of years teaching in a high needs school and perceptions of the components' values related to teacher retention. According to Cohen (1988) the effect is small with partial eta squared = .024 for orientation. The effect size for both mentoring (.053) and workshops (.057) indicated more of a medium effect. The effect size for peer observations (.081) was well within the

medium range, and the effect size of .156 for peer coaching was large. A comparison of means noted that some perceptions are somewhat different depending upon the number of years the participant taught in a high needs school. These data are reflected in Table 34.

Table 34

Years Teaching in a High Needs School and Perception of Component's Value

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
0 years	3.29	.726	14	2	.557	1.000
2 years	3.00	1.126	1			
4 years	2.88		8			
Orientation						
0 years	3.36	.842	14	2	.245	.477
2 years	3.00		1			
4 years	3.13	.835	8			
Workshops						
0 years	3.14	1.099	14	2	.601	.814
2 years	2.00		1			
4 years	3.13	.835	8			

(table continues)

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Peer Observations						
0 years	3.50	.633	14	2	.884	.476
2 years	3.00	1.069	1			
4 years	3.00		8			
Peer Coaching						
0 years	3.64	.991	32	2	1.845	.413
2 years	4.00		1			
4 year	3.00	1.425	17			

To determine the interactions and main effect between the variables of age and teacher perception of the value of the induction components upon retention, a MANOVA was the statistical test chosen. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices could not be computed because there were too few cell matrices. Application of Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that no assumption had been violated for equality of variance for mentoring, orientation, peer observations, and peer coaching. However, the p value was .042 for workshops. When a more conservative alpha of .017 was applied, the p-value did not change. Thus, the *p*-value for workshops implies that a violation of the assumption of equality of variance exists. When Wilks' Lambda and Pillai's Trace tests for significant differences between the groups were performed, no significant differences for age were shown. The Wilks' Lambda value was .601, and the Pillai's Trace value was .455. These values suggested there was no difference among the

groups. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no p-value lower than .05, therefore, no differences among the variables of age and perception of component value are indicated. According to Cohen (1988) the effect is small with partial eta squared = .005 (mentoring), .028 (orientation), and .040 (peer observations). A moderate effect was indicated for both workshops (.079) and for peer coaching (.061) in relationship to age. A comparison of means, however, noted that all responses tended towards neutrality. Table 35 displays these findings.

Table 35

Age and Teacher Perception of the Value of Each Component

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
25-28	3.17	.983	6	3	.033	.992
29-34	3.00	.816	4			
35-39	3.17	.753	6			
40+	3.14	1.069	7			
Orientation						
25-28	3.17	.983	6	3	.186	.905
29-34	3.50	.577	4			
35-39	3.33	.816	6			
40+	3.14	.900	7			

(table continues)

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Workshop						
25-28	2.83	1.329	6	3	.546	.657
29-34	3.50	.577	4			
35-39	2.83	.983	6			
40+	3.29	.951	7			
Peer Observations						
25-28	3.50	.837	6	3	.266	.849
29-34	3.50	.577	4			
35-39	3.17	.753	6			
40+	3.14	1.215	7			
Peer coaching						
25-28	3.67	.816	6	3	.415	.744
29-34	3.50	.577	4			
35-39	3.50	.548	6			
40+	3.14	1.215	7			

In order to explore the interactions and main effects of the two variables of educational background, whether teachers graduated from four-year university preparation programs or whether they received their teaching certificates via an alternate route, and teacher perception of the retention value of the induction components, another MANOVA was used. Of the 23 teachers who participated in the survey, 17 received their

teaching certification through a four-year university teacher preparation program, and six received their certification through an alternative route for career professionals. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was not computed because there were too few cell matrices. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that no assumption had been violated for equality of variance for orientation $p = .298$, for workshops $p = .809$, for peer observations $p = .723$ and for peer observations $p = .937$. For mentoring ($p = .019$), the assumption for equality of variance of the variable was violated. The Wilks' Lambda value was .939 ($p = .949$), and Pillai's Trace value was .061 ($p = .949$). These tests for significant differences between the groups indicated no significant differences for educational background. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no significance levels lower than .05, indicating no differences among the variables of teacher education and perception of component value. According to Cohen (1988), the effect is small with partial eta squared = .001 (mentoring), .005 (orientation), .002 (workshops), .000 (peer observations), and .005 (peer coaching). A comparison of means noted that some perceptions are slightly different depending upon the means by which participants received their certification since most of the means suggested neutrality. Table 36 displays these results.

Table 36

Educational Background and Perception of the Value of the Components

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
4-year university program	3.12	.993	17	1	.013	.909
alternative route	3.17	.408	6			
Orientation						
4-year university program	3.29	.849	17	1	.105	.749
alternative route	3.17	.753	6			
Workshops						
4-year university program	3.06	1.029	17	1	.050	.826
alternative route	3.17	.983	6			
Peer Observations						
4-year university program	3.29	.920	17	1	.008	.927
alternative route	3.33	.816	6			
Peer Coaching						
4-year university program	3.47	.874	17	1	.113	.740
alternative route	3.33	.816	6			

A final MANOVA showed the interactions of the variables of educational degree status and teacher perception of the retention value of each of the induction components. Of the 23 teachers who participated in the survey, 11 had BA/BS degrees, and 12 had

MA degrees. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices *p*-value was .003 which is larger than the necessary *p*-value of .00. No violation of the assumption of homogeneity existed. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that no assumption had been violated for equality of variance for mentoring, orientation, workshops, and peer observations. However, peer coaching had a *p*-value of .012 which violated the assumption. Wilks' Lambda value was .813 ($p = .577$) and Pillai's Trace value was .187 ($p = .577$). As indicated by these tests, no significant differences for degree status were shown. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects recorded no *p*-level lower than .05 for any of the induction components, indicating there were no differences among the variables of degree status and perception of the components. According to Cohen (1988), the effect is small with partial eta squared = .022 for mentoring and .042 for orientation. A moderate or medium effect is shown with partial eta squared = .070 for workshops, .057 for peer observations, and .086 for peer coaching.

A comparison of means noted that some perceptions are somewhat different depending upon the participants' degree status. Table 37 lists these particular findings.

Table 37

Degree Status and Perception of the Retention Value for Each Component

	Mean	*SD*	Number	*df*	*F* value	Sig.
Mentoring						
BA/BS	3.00	1.000	11	1	.464	.503
MA	3.25	.754	12			
Orientation						
BA/BS	3.09	.831	11	1	.925	.347
MA	3.42	.793	12			
Workshops						
BA/BS	2.82	1.079	11	1	1.575	.223
MA	3.33	.888	12			
Peer Observations						
BA/BS	3.09	1.044	11	1	1.268	.273
MA	3.50	.674	12			
Peer Coaching						
BA/BS	3.18	1.079	11	1	1.981	.174
MA	3.67	.492	12			

The means indicated that the perceptions of teachers with Masters degrees tended to be slightly more negative when judging each component. All means, however, tended toward neutrality.

Comparison of National Data to District Data

After examining the data submitted via electronic survey and holding focus group sessions in each of the districts, I compared district data regarding teacher retention to the national retention data. Keigher (2010) reported upon national teacher retention data from a 2008-2009 survey which indicated that 8% of the teachers had left the profession. Of the 269,800 who left teaching, 52,600 (9.1%) had only one to three years of experience. Of teachers with four to nine years of experience, 76,800 (7.9%) left the profession. Teachers who stayed in the same school in which they started their careers numbered 2,854,900, and those who changed schools but remained in the profession numbered 255,670. Of these two groups, 3,110,570 teachers remained in the classroom. Accurate retention data are not typically available from school districts, so state documents are the main sources for the information. The state's Assistant Superintendent of Teacher Education and Licensure did report that 5,145 teachers were hired in 2008-2009 who had no previous teaching experience. The turnover rate for the state where the three school districts studied are located for the year 2008-2009 showed that 9.2% were not employed the following year in any school in the state. This figure of 9.2% was lower than the 9.5% rate reported for the 2007-2008 year (Pitts, 2010). Although the rate decreased for the state from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009, the turnover rate was still higher than the national average.

Summary

Some of these findings agree with the literature on induction programs, but other findings vary from those found in the literature. For instance, no relationship was found between teacher retention and the components of the beginning teacher induction programs. However, through examination of means and frequencies, there is evidence that some aspects of each component were perceived to be more valuable than other aspects by these teachers. For example, 78.9% of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed that the mentor's help in the area of school expectations and policies was valuable, but only 42% of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed that the mentor's help in the area of student assessment was valuable. Seventy-two percent of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed that orientation programs were valuable in helping them meet other beginning teachers in the district. However, only 32% strongly agreed or agreed that these programs were valuable in acclimating teachers to the school community. Descriptive statistics indicated that workshops that focused upon how they taught or worked directly with students were of more value than those that focused upon teacher reflection or the setting of professional growth goals. Some of the findings were not as strong as perhaps they should be because there were too few cases to explore. For example, I felt there should have been statistical significance shown when examining the different age groups and how each group perceived the value of the different components. However, no significance was evident. No statistical significance was evident when exploring the impact of other demographic factors upon teacher perception, as well. Thus, further exploration of the topic is necessary.

Chapter V

Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter includes a summary of the study components, discussion and an evaluation of findings, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

Purpose

The purpose of this research study was to examine teacher perceptions regarding the components of their induction programs in relation to teacher retention. Previous research has focused upon why teachers leave the profession, causing a shortage, and has focused upon induction programs that offer support to beginning teachers. However, the purpose of this study was to examine each component of the induction program to determine if the positive attributes of any individual component would help more than others to retain teachers, which would prevent future shortages. I expected to find, based upon the literature, that a relationship would be shown, especially between mentoring and teacher retention. To reach the goal of this project, five research questions were researched. They are

1. What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the components of the induction program in retaining teachers?
2. According to teacher perception, how important a factor were the induction programs in 5th year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom?
3. Which components of the induction program do the 5th year teachers perceive to be the most valuable?

4. What difference, if any, according to 5th year teachers' perceptions, does the length of time of each of the components of the program make?
5. What difference, if any, do demographic variables, such as type of teaching certification, grade or subject area taught, teaching in high needs schools, gender, or ethnicity, make in terms of teacher perception regarding each component of their induction program?

The findings from the surveys did not support the strong relationships expected based upon the literature on both induction programs and mentoring. Focus group comments, however, showed the importance of being assigned a mentor. In fact, these comments supported the views of Brown (2003) who reported that new teachers who participate in an induction program like mentoring are nearly twice as likely to remain in the teaching profession.

Research Question One

What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the components of the induction program in retaining teachers?

The findings for this research question validate the literature that supports the idea that induction programs are effective in offering support to beginning teachers. Villani (2002) states that mentoring has two goals, to retain quality teachers and secondly to improve instruction. Wong (2001) defines induction as the "process of systematically training and supporting new teachers" and notes that two of the goals of induction programs are for teachers to be eased into teaching and to improve teacher effectiveness. Survey responses indicated no significance, however, teachers gave examples during the focus group sessions that supported and negated the effectiveness of the induction

components. For example, all of the teachers in the focus groups agreed that having a mentor had helped them. A special education teacher stated when asked how she felt when she no longer had a mentor after her first year of teaching, "I still went to the person even though she was not officially my mentor. She was the first person I went to because I was comfortable now and I knew they would help me out." Thus, even though there were no significant findings regarding the effectiveness of each component, teachers noted that they had relied upon their mentors to offer them support. In some cases, teachers also commented upon the value of some of their workshops, such as the CRISS strategies workshop commented upon by a math teacher, and the world languages workshop where the Spanish teacher learned a new technique that she incorporated into her classroom routine. Technology workshops were also spoken about favorably. Teacher perceptions of the value for each topic areas covered by each component showed through means and frequencies that teachers valued some components more than others. For example, the tendency for teachers to *agree* that mentoring was valuable because it informed beginning teachers of school expectations and policies was noted. This was also true of the orientation program's value in introducing beginning teachers to other inexperienced teachers and to the expectations of the district. These findings lend support to the research of Martinez (2004) who noted that inter and intra-school networking helps to counteract the isolation felt by beginning teachers.

Two reasons that the findings did not support the literature are that some workshops are perceived so unfavorably that the positives associated with the "good" workshops are forgotten. Secondly, because so many of the participants had not

experienced many of the induction components, the data were skewed because there were too few cases. Because too few teachers participated, I would recommend further study.

Research Question Two

According to teacher perception, how important a factor were the induction programs in 5th year teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom?

The results for this question show that districts and schools vary in the programs that offer beginning teachers. No significant relationship was found between any of the induction components and teacher retention. This is surprising because during the focus group sessions, teachers stated that although they are no longer assigned mentors, they still seek help from the mentor they had in previous years. Perhaps teachers have other reasons for staying in the classroom, and they would stay whether induction programs were present or not. Two teachers spoke of strong feelings they had for teaching as a profession during the focus group sessions. One was ready to quit teaching due to lack of administrative support. She stated, "I got down that weekend and I said-- look I'm not here for them; I'm here for my 100 students that I teach, and I wouldn't… because of my students, I wouldn't quit." She stated at another time during the session that "I'm still teaching because of my students. They're the reason I'm in this classroom." Another also spoke of teaching as if it were a mission This career switcher stated, "I'll be honest. I've started thinking about leaving and I truly don't want to. I truly don't want to stop teaching. I feel that the Lord…." Therefore, some teachers might remain because they believe teaching is their mission. Others may remain due to the economic issues. This focus upon salary supports the views of Bradley (1999), Bracey (2002) and Ingersoll (2003) who noted the importance of salary in retaining teachers. They, however, found

that salary was the main reason for teachers leaving the profession. Perhaps budget issues whining the districts at this time have caused teachers to view their salary as a reason to remain in the teaching field. In fact, one special education teacher voiced that she was going to enter a MA program so that she would be more marketable in the teaching field since she almost lost her job in the previous year due to budget cuts.

A third reason that no significant relationship was discovered may be due to the small numbers of respondents who had actually participated in a particular induction component. Villani (2002) notes that teacher turnover is reduced by having multiple supports in place for beginning teachers. However, the findings of this study show that multiple supports were not always in place. In fact, one participant in the focus group noted that she had no induction supports.

I expected to find significance, indicating a relationship between some of the components and teacher retention. I especially thought that the research would note a strong relationship between mentoring and retention. However, only a study of frequencies and means insinuated each component's value in terms of teacher perception. A study of means noted that teachers *agreed* that the workshops on topics such as working with special needs children, differentiating instruction, using reading and writing strategies, and collaborating with a special education or general education teacher were valuable. The means of the responses given by teachers in relation to their growth as practitioners due to their participation in peer observations and peer coaching indicated that teachers *agreed* that these components offered value. A study of the means for the

value associated with effectiveness as a classroom teacher due to peer coaching indicated that teachers *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that the component offered valuable experience. These findings support the results of the *Schools and Staffing Survey* (2004) by the National Center for Education Statistics which noted the necessity for multiple components in an induction program in order to retain teachers. This research showed that only 18% of teachers who had eight or more induction supports left as contrasted to the 28% that left who had only three induction supports and the 40% who left who were given no support.

Research Question Three

Which components of the induction program do the 5th year teachers perceive to be the most valuable?

The findings of this research question supported the research on mentoring. Most teachers who participated in the survey strongly agreed or agreed that having a mentor was a valuable experience for them. Many of the teachers agreed that having an orientation program and having workshops were valuable experiences, but the responses were not high in the strongly agreed category. Responses varied based upon the purpose of the orientation program and the type of workshop. For example, scores were much higher for workshops that were on the topic of instructional strategies. This is supported by comments made in the focus group sessions where one of the teachers openly stated that the workshops that were the most valuable were those that were linked to the curriculum. Although very few teachers (18-20) had participated in peer observations, those who had had positive experiences. No teacher chose the response that noted strong disagreement about the value of peer observations. Peer coaching seemed to be the most

valuable experience for the nine teachers who had participated. However, most of them did not participate in their first year of teaching. Villani (2002) notes the importance of multiple induction options. The findings of this study agree with his position. It becomes obvious that some teachers who value one workshop or one component would not value another one equally. Perhaps teachers have different individual professional needs or perhaps the format of one component meets the learning style of one teacher more than another.

Research Question Four

What difference, if any, according to 5th year teachers' perceptions, does the length of time of each of the components of the induction program make?

Breaux and Wong (2003) stated that the most successful induction programs begin with training four or five days prior to the beginning of the school year, is systematic, and continues for two or three years. Although I anticipated finding a relationship between the length of time each component lasted and the value teachers associated with each component, the findings for this research question were inconclusive. No significant relationship was shown between length of time teachers participated in any one component and the way that they perceived the value of that component. Several reasons might exist for this being the case. One reason may be that some teachers needed a longer period of time for support from one component; whereas, another teacher may not have needed as much time to have gained the same result or benefit. Another possible reason for the findings, particularly as they relate to mentoring, were that teachers returned for support to their previously assigned mentors in years when they were no longer assigned a mentor. It is strongly possible, but not conclusive,

that no significant results were found because there were too few cases to make an impact.

Research Question Five

What difference, if any, do demographic variables make in terms of perception regarding each component of their induction program?

No significant relationship differences were found when comparing male and female perceptions of their induction program. This is supported by a comment made in the focus group when one teacher gave an example of two males who had gone to the same workshop. One returned to the school building and incorporated the information into his instruction, and the other male thought the workshop was a waste of time. Differences in gender, ethnicity, grade level taught, teaching in a high needs school, age, type of teaching certificate, type of degree, nor educational background showed any relationship to teacher perception of the value of the induction components. These findings may be due to the fact that different teachers have different needs.

The results of this study did not support the findings found in the literature which indicated that a relationship would be found between demographic factors and teacher perception of the value of their induction programs. The literature showed the impact of age, gender, ethnicity, and educational background upon perception and learning. For example, Ocak (2005) when studying the relationship of personal characteristics to the attitude that mathematics teachers had toward computer use, found "consistent and significant gender differences in computer confidence and anxiety among mathematics teachers" (p. 86). Teacher's age was a factor because the research showed that younger teachers had a higher confidence level and more favorable attitudes toward computer use

and the use of technology in the classroom. Prytula, Hellsten, and McIntyre (2010) also found that experience of teachers had an impact upon their perceptions. For example, they found that "first and second year teachers perceived *planning and collaboration with other teachers,* as well as *professional development* as the least important support or resource for their induction years. This finding complicates the job of the staff developer who has to find other induction methods to bring about teacher learning for improved student performance.

Implications for Practice

The design of this study is important because it gave teachers an opportunity to reflect upon different indication components they had experienced. It allowed teachers time to describe their perceptions and give voice to their concerns about professional development. This is especially important in times of budget cuts. If one component had not seemed as valuable as another for teachers, perhaps the funds for that particular component could be used in an area of greater need. The information gathered during this study leads to the formulation of several recommendations for staff developers. Recommendations include the following:

1. A variety of training and professional development opportunities should be offered. No particular component is going to be perceived equally valuable by all teachers.
2. Mentoring is important to teachers, and should be offered. Even when teachers are only assigned a mentor for one year, they continue to rely on the mentor and consider that person a confidant and friend. The impact transcends the time

frame established for mentoring. Thus, the mentor-mentee relationship may be so strong that its impact is not limited to the year of assignment. Perhaps this relationship is most necessary for the retention of beginning teachers.

3. Opportunities for peer observations and especially peer coaching should be expanded. Although very few teachers experienced these two components, the results were favorable.
4. Workshops should focus upon curriculum and instructional strategies. This was shown by the findings of what teachers thought were the most valuable workshops. Teachers in the focus groups elaborated upon their use of particular instructional techniques that they actually used in their classroom instruction. In fact, they were disappointed when focus was taken away from what they learned in the workshops.
5. Teachers or teacher committees should be allowed to create the support and growth opportunities. In this way workshops might be clearly directed to curriculum and instructional strategies. Steiner (2004) stated that to be effective, professional growth activities should align with the goals and "context" of the teachers.
6. Orientation programs should focus upon having new teachers meet other inexperienced teachers. Building a social and professional network is a focus of some of the literature on retention. This is supported by the research of Martinez (2004) who emphasizes networking support.
7. Demographic factors may not be as important a consideration when creating

professional growth opportunities. Learning styles, attitudes, and growth needs may be more important. This view is supported by Sims and Sims (1995) and Steiner (2004) who stress that adult learning styles should be a consideration when designing courses and educational activities for adult learners.

8. A reflection of each professional development opportunity would perhaps help teachers consider the value of the activity. Perhaps this would aid in transference of information to the classroom. Yost (2006) noted that self-efficacy "and the ability to use reflection for problem solving, outweighed positive school climate as a factor in novice teacher success" (p. 73).

Recommendations for Further Research

Several future studies should be considered. They are as follows:

1. Longitudinal research that focuses upon peer coaching over a period of years
2. Case study research that focuses upon the value of peer observations
3. A qualitative study that focuses upon the different components of induction programs
4. Research study of the effects of accountability upon teacher retention
5. Research study of the importance of administrative support upon teacher retention
6. A follow-up study on the reasons teachers leave the profession which incorporates questions about the economic conditions of the present time

7. Further exploration of the relationship between the mentor and mentee
8. The impact of budget concerns upon teacher retention
9. A follow-up study that examines with an appropriate number of cases if there is a significant relationship between gender and perception regarding induction programs and if a significant relationship exists between ethnicity and perception regarding induction programs
10. Further exploration to determine if certain induction components are more valuable in the early years of teaching and whether peer observations and peer coaching become more valuable for improvement of student performance in the teacher's 3rd, 4th, and 5th years of teaching
11. A study to explore the perceptions of those teachers presently in their fourth year of teaching so that memory recall of their experiences is not a limitation

Limitations

The strength of this research study was hampered by the lack of teacher participation. This was the result of teachers' having to volunteer their time, both to take the survey and to participate in focus groups. Teachers in the focus group noted the demands upon their time. To volunteer to participate in a research study was yet another demand upon a teacher's time. Another limitation of the study was that one of the districts required a flyer to be given to all teachers so that the teacher had to contact the researcher to be given the web link to the electronic survey. Because this required more initiative on the part of the teacher, this was a limitation. Although the flyers were taken to each of the schools and instructions given regarding the date surveys were to be placed

in teacher mailboxes, the researcher had no way of knowing if that task was completed. In fact, two teachers volunteered to participate by taking the survey, but it was after the completion deadline. Yet another limitation of a study of this type is that those who volunteer to complete surveys and particularly to participate in a focus group, tend to be quite vocal; hence, subject bias was a threat. Also, districts offered different induction components and the length of time varied for how long the supports were in place. Teachers also noted the disparity in districts and sometimes within schools of how mentors were selected and assigned to mentees. A final limitation on the study was that teachers had to recall their experiences of the previous four years.

Conclusions

Although orientation was important to teachers in their earlier years to help them become acclimated to their schools, mentoring was equally important. Teachers spoke of orientation as being brief, but the long-term mentoring relationship was noted as being quite important. Teachers who experienced peer coaching gave positive responses regarding it, but few teachers had had the opportunity to experience it.

Demographic factors did not have a strong impact upon teachers' perceptions regarding the value of their induction programs. Enough data were evident that indicated some variance between female and male perceptions regarding certain components of the programs, which would warrant further research. It was also found that a discrepancy between ethnicity and perceptions regarding some of the components of the programs requires further research.

Though budget concerns could have impacted the teachers' views in this study, I found that monetary concerns, although quite apparent, played a minor role in teacher retention for the participants of this study. Even if money were a factor, according to focus group members, they would not at this time change their career path due to this factor. They said that they were looking at other opportunities that made them more marketable within the profession.

Findings indicated that a beginning teacher support program was essential, but other than having an orientation program and a mentor assigned, the needs of the teachers and attitudes of the teachers toward other components varied. This would indicate the need for individual programs, designed to meet the needs and learning styles of each teacher. An important point that became evident with the findings of this study was that staff developers have an extremely difficult job. Creating an induction program that fits all of the needs of each beginning teacher, although their backgrounds are quite dissimilar, is problematic.

References

Abrams, L. M., Pedulla, J. J., & Madaus, G. F. (2003, Winter 2003). *Theory into practice: Views from the classroom: teachers' opinions of statewide testing programs, 1*, Retrieved December 2, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2005). Teacher attrition: a costly loss to the nation and to the states. *Issue Brief.* Retrieved December 6, 2008, from http://www.all4ed.org/files/archive /publications/TeacherAttrition.pdf

Ainsworth, Andrew. (n.d.). MANOVA basics: Lecture 10, Psy 524. California State University. Retrieved May 15, 2010, from http://www.csun.edu/~ata20315/ psy524/index.htm

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (October 2006). Teacher Induction programs: trends and opportunities. *Policy matters, 3*(10), 1-4. Retrieved May 10, 2010 from http://www.aascu.org/media/pm/pdf/v3n10.pdf

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Barksdale-Ladd, M. A., & Thomas, K. F. (2000, November). What's at stake in high-stakes testing. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Bentley, M. (2008). NCLB: Bad education policy for 21st century education. *Business Matters.* Retrieved December 6, 2008, from http://businessmatters.net/s008/09/nclb-bad-education-policy-for -21st-century-education

Blair-Larsen, S. M. (1998). Designing a mentoring program. *Education, 118*, 602-605. Retrieved February 11, 2006, from InfoTrac database.

Bolich, A. M. (2001). *Reduce your losses: Help new teachers become veteran teachers.* Retrieved October 18, 2005, from ERIC database

Bracey, G. W. (2002, December). Research: About that teacher shortage. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84* (4), 331. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Bradley, A. (1999, March 10). States' uneven teacher supply complicates staffing of schools. *Education Week, 18*. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/vol-18/26supply.h18

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

Brown, S. (2003). Working models: Why mentoring programs may be the key to teacher retention. Retrieved February 22, 2006, from http://www.acteonline.org/members/techniques/may03_story1.cfm

Chamblese, J. R., Sweeney, M. V., & Thompson, W. D. (1999). *The Mississippi Teacher Fellowship Program: A state-based initiative for the recruitment and retention of teachers in critical shortage districts.* Retrieved October 18, 2005, from ERIC database.

Clewell, B.C., Darke, K. & Davis-Googe, T. (2000). Literature review on teacher recruitment programs. *U.S. department of education planning and evaluation service*. (EDRS Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 447558)

Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., Vigdor, J. & Aliaga, R. (2004). Do school accountability systems make it more difficult for low performing schools to attract and retain high quality teacher? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *23*(2), 251-271.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2006, April). Stayers, leavers, lovers, and dreamers: Why people teach and why they stay. *Barbara Biber lecture: Occasional paper series.* Retrieved December 18, 2007, from http://firstsearch.oclc.org

Cody, K.J. (2006, September 12). Absence rates hit two-year low, BNA survey finds second-quarter turnover is up slightly from first quarter figures. Bureau of National Affairs. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from http://www.bna.com/press/2006/specialreports/abssurv2006.htm

Cohen, J.W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd edn.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Custer, R. & Wright, M. (1998, Spring). Why they enjoy teaching: The motivation of outstanding technology teachers. *Journal of Technology Education*, *9* (2), 60-70.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child. *National commission on teaching & America's future*. (EDRS Document Reproduction service No. Ed 463337).

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005). *A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Dillon, S. (2010, February 7). With federal stimulus money gone, many schools face budget gaps. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 1, 2010 from http://nytimes.com/2010/02/08/ education/08educ.html

Digest of Education Statistics, 2004. (2005). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved May 15, 2010, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04/

Dorn, S. (1998, January 2). The political legacy of school accountability systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 6*. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Easley, J. (2000). *Teacher attrition and staff development for retention.* Retrieved October 19, 2005, from ERIC database.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS.* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC : Sage Publications.

Garson, G.D. (2009, January 14). Chi-square significance tests. *Statnotes: Topics in Multivariate Analysis.* Retrieved May 21, 2010, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/A765/chisq.htm

Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010, June). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study*. Washington, D.C. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved August 11, 2010, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104027

Guarino, C., Santibanez, L., & Daley, G. (2006). "Teacher recruitment and retention: a review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 173-208.

Guthrie, J. W. (1999, November). A response to John Goodlad's whither schools of education? Unless other changes occur, they might well wither. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50* (5), 363. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Hammer, C. H., & Gerald, E. (1991, August). *Aspects of teacher supply and demand in public school districts and private schools: 1987-88*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved September 27, 2005, from ERIC database.

Hargrove, T., Walker, B. L., Huber, R. A., Corrigan, S. Z., & Moore, C. (2004, Spring 2004). No teacher left behind: supporting teachers as they implement standards-based reform in a test-based education environment. *Education, 124*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Henke, R. R., Choy, S. P., Chen, X., Geis, S., & Alt, M. N. (1997, July). *America's teachers: Profile of a profession, 1993-94*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved September 27, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/ pubsinfo.asp?pubid=97460

[School district]. (n.d.) Annual financial plan 2010/2011. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from www.[school district website]/pdf/finance

Hill, D. & Barth, M. (2004). NCLB and teacher retention: who will turn out the lights? *Education and the Law*, *16* (2/3), 1-9.

Hirsch, E. (2006, February). Teachers in Alabama: Educators on what it will take to staff all classrooms with quality teachers. *Center for Teaching Quality*. Retrieved August 23, 2009, from http://www.teachingquality.org/pdfs/al_recruitretain

Huling, L., Resta, V., & Rainwater, N. (2001, September). The case for a third alternative. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(4), 326. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Hussar, W. J. (2005, September). *Projections of education statistics to 2014* (33rd ed.). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2005074

Ingersoll, R.M. (2001, January). *Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of schools*. University of Washington: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved May 3, 2010, from http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Turnover-Ing-01-2001.pdf

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

Ingersoll, R.M. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work? Power and accountability in America's schools.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). Four myths about America's teacher quality problem. In M.A. Smylie & D. Miretzky (Eds.), *Developing the teacher* workforce*: 103rd yearbook*

of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J. M. (2004). Teaching quality: The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says. Retrieved February 11, 2006, from http://www.ecs.org/html/Document.asp?chouseid=5036

Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *Graduate School of Education (GSE Publications)*, *88*(638), 38-50. Retrieved December 6, 2008, from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/134

Johnson, S.M., Birkeland, S., Kardos, S., Kauffman, D., Liu, E., & Peske, H. (2001, September/October). Retaining the next generation of teachers: The importance of school-based support. *Harvard Education Letter*. Retrieved September 12, 2001, from http://edletter.org/current/support.shtml

Justice, M., Greiner, C. & Anderson, S. (n.d). Determining the influences of traditional Texas teachers versus teachers in the emergency teaching certification program. *Education,* 124(2), 376-389.

Keigher, A. (2010). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2008-09 teacher follow-up survey.* Washington,DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 12, 2011, from nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010353 -22k-2010-08-11

Kelley, L. M. (2004). Why induction matters. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55,* 438-449. Retrieved February 11, 2006, from the InfoTrac database.

Levine, R., Christenson, B., & Hammer, C. (1998, February). *Public school districts in*

the United States: A statistical profile, 1987-88 to 1993-94. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d97/d97t079.asp

LaPier, T.K. (1999, Winter). Research corner: The when and why of statistical tests. *Cardiopulmonary Physical Therapy Journal.* Retrieved April 3, 2010, from http://findarticles.com/ p/articles/mi_qa3953/is_199901/ai_n8852308.

Luna, C. & Turner, C. (2001, September). The impact of the MCAS: Teachers talk about high-stakes testing. *English Journal*, 79-87.

MANOVA. *Statistics Solutions: Dissertation Consulting and Research Support for Doctoral Students, Thesis Students and Researchers*. (2009, November 24). Retrieved May 21, 2010, from http://www.statisticssolutions.com/metods-chapter/statistical-tests/manova/

Marshak, J. & Klotz, J. (2002, November). To mentor or to induct: That is the question. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Chattanooga, TN. Retrieved April, 9, 2009, from ERIC database.

Martinez, K. (2004, April). *Mentoring new teachers: promise and problems in times of teacher shortage.* Retrieved October 19, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Marvel, J., Lyter, D., Peltola, P., Strizek, G. & Morton, B. (2006). *Teacher attrition and mobility: results from the 2004-05 teacher follow-up survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved December 7, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/ pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007307

Martz. M. (2010, January 24). [School district, school district] schools face different budget issues. *Richmond Times-Dispatch.* Retrieved May 15, 2010, from

http://www2.timesdispatch.com/rtd/news/local/education/article/BUDG24_20100123-223209/319803/

McMillan, J.H. (2004). *Educational Research: Fundamentals for the Consumer* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Mitchell, M. L. & Jolley, J. M. (2007). *Research Design Explained.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Morgan, S.E., Reichert, T. & Harrison, T.R. (2002). *From numbers to words: Reporting statistical results for the social sciences.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

National Center for Education Statistics (April 1997). Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the teacher follow-up survey: 1994-95: Highlights and introduction. Retrieved September 28, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/9450

National Center for Education Statistics (2004). Schools and staffing survey. Retrieved December 6, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/state_2004_35.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). Special analysis 2005: Mobility in the teacher workforce. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/ programs/ coe/2005/analysis/sa03.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2008, September). *Projections of education statistics to 2017* (36th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008078

NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education. (1999). Creating a teacher mentoring program. Retrieved February 11, 2006, from www.nfie.org/publications/mentoring.htm

NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education. (2002, Summer). Using data to improve teacher induction programs. *Establishing High-Quality Professional Development, 4.* Retrieved May 14, 2010, from http://www.neafoundation.org/downloads/NEA-Using_Data_Teacher_Induction.pdf

Ocak, M.A. (2005, July). Mathematics teachers' attitudes toward the computers. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET).* 4 (3), 82-88. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from http://www.tojet.net/articles/4311.pdf

Oelrich, K. (2001, June). Virtual schools: A 21st century strategy for teacher professional development. *The Journal (Technological Horizons in Education), 28*(11), 48. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from InfoTrac database.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS: Survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows* (3rd ed.).New York, New York: Open University Press.

Perie, M. & Baker D.P. (1997, August). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved May 14, 2010, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97471.pdf

Phelps, J.D. (2002). *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: Opportunities for career technical Education.* Washington, DC: National Association of State Directors of

Career Technical Education Consortium. Retrieved May 13, 2010, from ERIC database.

Pitts, P.S. (2009, June). *Supply and demand of instructional school personnel.* Paper presented at the 82th Annual Virginia Middle and High School Principals Conference and Exposition. Virginia Department of Education, Williamsburg, VA. Abstract retrieved from http://www.vassp.org/ TEACHER%20QUALITY%20AND%20SUPPLY%20AND%20DEMAND

Professional development for teachers. (n.d.). *North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.* Retrieved April 8, 2009, from info@ncrel.org

Provasnik, S., & Dorfman, S. (2005, June). *Mobility in the teacher workforce: Findings from the condition of education 2005*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/ pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2005114

Prytula, M.P, Hellsten, L.M., & McIntyre (2010). Perceptions of teacher planning time and epistemological challenge. *Current Issues in Education.*13 (4). Retrieved April 11, 2011, from http://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/437/91

[School district] Public Schools. (2009, June 15). *School board adopted budget 2009: Executive summary.* Retrieved May 15, 2010, from http://newweb.[school district website] /departments/budget-reporting/reports.aspx

Salkind, N.J. (2000). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publicatons.

Sands, R.G., Parson, L.A., & Duane, J. (1991, March/April). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education.* 62 (2), 174-193.

Sims, R.R.& Sims, S.J. (1995). *The importance of learning styles: Understanding the implications for learning, course design, and education.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Smith, T. M., Choy, S. P., Retallick, L., & Sally, L. (1994). *America's teachers ten years after 'A Nation at Risk': Findings from* The Condition of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved May 14, 2010, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs95/ 95766.pdf

Smith-Slabaugh, J. (2006). *Structured faculty mentoring in higher education: A descriptive analysis of the perceptions of junior and senior faculty.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2006.

Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2002, January). *Recruiting teachers for hard-to-staff schools: Solution for the Southeast and the nation.* Retrieved October 18, 2005, from ERIC database.

Stansbury, K., & Zimmerman, J. (2006). Lifelines to the classroom: Designing support for beginning teachers. Retrieved March 7, 2006, from http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/ rs/212

Steiner, L. (2004, November). Designing effective professional development experiences: What do we know? Retrieved April 11, 2011, from http://www.tqsource.org/issueforums/plantoAction/resources/4_PDResearchPolicyAction/DesigningEffectivePD.pdf

Support new teachers and keep them teaching. (2005). *The Education Digest, 70* (9), 40-42. Retrieved April 10, 2009, from ERIC database.

Tabs, E.D. (2004, August). *Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results from the Teacher Follow-Up Survey, 2000-01*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004301.pdf

Teacher induction programs: Trends and opportunities. (2006). *American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Policy Matters*, 3(10), p. 1-4.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). Statistical abstract of the United States. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (1995). Mission and principles of professional development. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from http://www2.ed.gov/inits/TeachersWeb/mission.html

Villani, S. (2002). *Mentoring programs for new teachers: Models of induction and support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Virginia Department of Planning and Budget. (n.d.). *Virginia's budget tables: state-wide summary 2004-2006*. Retrieved May 8, 2010, from http://dpb.virginia.gov/budget/vabud/ vabud.cfm

What is meant by staff development?. (n.d.). *Omaha Public Schools.* Retrieved April 8, 2009, from http://www.ops.org/district/CENTRALOFFICES/HumanResourcesDivision/StaffDevelopment/Definition/tabid/804/Default.aspx

Wong, H. (2001, August 8). Mentoring can't do it all. *NewTeacher.com.* Retrieved December 7, 2008, from http://www.newteacher.com/ppapers/mcdia.html

Workshop. (2000). *American heritage dictionary of the English language* (4th ed.). Houghton Mifflin. Retrieved May 13, 2010, from http://www.thefreedictionary.com/workshop

Yost, D.S. (2006, Fall). Reflection and self-efficacy: Enhancing the retention of qualified teachers from a teacher education perspective. *Teacher Education Quarterly.* Retrieved April 9, 2011, from ERIC database.

Appendix A

Recruitment Email for Districts to Send to all Teachers

Dear Teacher:

I am presently a Ph.D. candidate at Virginia Commonwealth University who is beginning a research study on the topic of beginning teacher induction programs and the relationship of those programs to teacher retention. Because you have participated in some or all of the components of an induction program, I seek your help to gain an understanding of your experiences and your perceptions of the program. I hope that you will volunteer to complete and submit the survey which will be sent to all teachers by the Research Director in your district. Although your school district is not conducting this study, I have been given approval by the Research Director to conduct the study. As a result, surveys will not be returned to personnel in your district but will be electronically submitted to me through the Office of Assessment at VCU.

I hope that you are willing to participate in this research project by volunteering to complete the survey that follows in another email.

If you have any questions about this project, please do not hesitate to contact me at anrein1@comcast.net or to call at 804-608-0594. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the VCU Office of Research at 804-827-2157.

Your help is greatly appreciated.

Arleen N. Reinhardt

Appendix B

Reminder Recruitment Email Sent to all Teachers Before the Survey Deadline

Dear Teacher:

Two weeks ago, you received a survey asking for your responses regarding your beginning teacher induction program. I hope that you have decided to help me in gathering data for this important research study. If you have not yet submitted the survey, you still have time to do so. The deadline for submissions is October 29.

If you have any questions regarding this research study, please contact me at anrein1@comcast.net or call at 804-608-0594. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the VCU Office of Research at 804-827-2157.

Thank you for your help with this project.

Arleen N. Reinhardt

Appendix C

Introduction Page for Electronic Survey

The purpose of this research study is to examine beginning teacher induction practices and to explore the relationship between these practices and teacher retention. This survey will ask questions about the beginning teacher induction program offered by your district. If you decide to participate in this study, I ask that you complete the survey which will ask questions about the components of any induction program in which you participated from the time you began teaching in your district. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete and includes questions about these programs and your experiences with them. If you did not participate in a particular component about which questions are asked, you will be able to skip those questions and move to the next section of the survey. You can withdraw from the study at anytime without penalty.

Please understand that your participation is strictly voluntary. You may stop taking the survey at any time, and you may skip questions that you do not want to answer. Your responses to the survey questions and any comments that you make will be completely confidential. Your responses will be downloaded directly into a computer program, Inquisite, by an administrator. The researcher will then go to the Office of Assessment at Virginia Commonwealth University to download the data from the survey onto a password protected laptop. It is not possible to identify specific individuals from the survey results, your anonymity will be maintained throughout the study.

At the end of the survey there are questions about your interest in participating in a follow-up focus group. If you choose to participate in a focus group session, at the end of the survey, you will be directed to another survey where you may offer your contact information. It will not be possible to connect your survey responses with this contact information.

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Your clicking *agree* on the survey says that you consent to participating in this research study by completing the survey. Your clicking *decline* on the survey indicates that you do not wish to participate by completing the survey.

Do you agree to participate in the study by completing the following survey?

( ) Agree

( ) Decline

Appendix D

Directions: Please answer the questions in each section that relate to a component of the induction program in which you were a participant. Please attempt to answer every question in a section, but you are free to leave questions blank. No particular response is more important than any other. Choose the answer that is most closely associated with your experience. After each group of questions regarding a particular component of the program, a comment area is available. Feel free to write any comments that you may consider relevant. All information will be kept completely confidential and you can skip any questions you do not wish to answer. If you are willing to participate in a focus group on this topic, please provide contact information at the end of the survey.

Is this the beginning of your fifth year of teaching experience and have all four of your previous years of teaching experience been in this district?

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

What is your level of job description?

{Choose one}

( ) Kindergarten - fifth grade

( ) Sixth grade - eighth grade

( ) Ninth grade - twelfth grade

What is the primary subject that you teach? (Check all that apply.)

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Special Education

( ) All Subjects (Elementary)

( ) English/Language Arts

( ) History/Social Studies

( ) Science

( ) Mathematics

( ) Physical Education

( ) Other [ ]

Number of years teaching in a high-needs school where 40% or more of the students are eligible for free or reduced lunches:

{Choose one}

( ) 0 years

( ) 1 year

( ) 2 years

( ) 3 years

( ) 4 years

What is your gender?

{Choose one}

( ) Male

( ) Female

What is your ethnicity?

{Choose one}

( ) Hispanic

( ) White, non-Hispanic

( ) African American

( ) Asian American

( ) Native American

( ) Other (please specify) [ ]

What is your educational background?

{Choose one}

( ) 4-year university teacher preparation program

( ) 3-year university teacher preparation program

( ) Alternative route for career professionals

What is your degree status? (Check the highest level attained.)

{Choose one}

( ) BA/BS

( ) MA

( ) PhD/ED.D.

What is your age?

{Choose one}

( ) 25 - 28

( ) 29 - 34

( ) 35 - 39

( ) 40+

I was assigned a mentor or a mentoring committee (a team of teachers). (Check all that apply.)

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Year 1

( ) Year 2

( ) Year 3

( ) Year 4

( ) I was not assigned a mentor.

Please click on the appropriate response.

A full-release mentor who had no other teaching responsibilities other than as a mentor was assigned to me.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

A mentor who had a partial teaching load was assigned to me.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

A mentor with full-time teaching responsibilities was assigned to me.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

A mentoring or induction committee (a team of teachers) was assigned to me.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

How often did your mentor or mentoring committee formally meet with you for the purpose of improving student performance or helping you become a more effective teacher?

{Choose one}

( ) Weekly

( ) Bi-weekly

( ) Monthly

( ) Quarterly

( ) Whenever I or the mentor deemed it necessary

Please click on the appropriate response for each of the following statements regarding your mentor or mentoring committee.

My mentor or committee was readily available to me.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee aided me in lesson planning and in understanding the curriculum.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee aided me in knowledge of school expectations and policies.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee aided me in the area of classroom management.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee aided me in creating student assessments.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee aided me in reflecting upon my teaching practices.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee aided me in setting professional growth goals.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

My mentor or committee helped me to remain a classroom teacher.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Don't Know

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Having a mentor or committee members who taught in my subject area or grade level was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

The help my mentor or committee members gave me in lesson planning and curriculum was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

The help my mentor or committee members gave in helping me understand school expectations and policies was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

The help my mentor or committee members gave me on the topic of classroom management was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

The help my mentor or committee members gave in helping me create student assessments was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

The help my mentor or committee members gave me in reflecting upon my teaching practices was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

The help my mentor or committee members gave in helping me to set professional goals was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

My mentor's summative evaluation (a formal evaluation which became part of my personnel file) of my teaching performance was helpful.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

Having a mentor or mentoring committee was valuable in my making the decision to remain in the classroom.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Not Applicable

My mentor wrote a summative evaluation (a formal evaluation which became part of my personnel file) of my teaching performance.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

Feel free to add any comments about your experiences with having a mentor or mentoring committee.

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

I participated in an orientation program (a program which is offered in the school or district to help acclimate the beginning teacher to the school or district) which was offered to beginning teachers who had no teaching experience either in the school or in the district.

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Year 1

( ) Year 2

( ) Year 3

( ) Year 4

( ) I did not participate in an orientation program.

Please click on the appropriate response for each of the following statements regarding your orientation program.

The orientation program acclimated me to the school environment.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

The orientation program acclimated me to school procedures.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

The orientation program acclimated me to school expectations.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

The orientation program introduced me to contact personnel and support personnel.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

The orientation program acclimated me to the community the school serves.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

The orientation program introduced me to the expectations of the district.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

During the orientation program I met other teachers with no teaching experience at my school.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

During the orientation program I met other teachers with no teaching experience in the district.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

The orientation program took place in my school.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

The orientation program was valuable in introducing me to the school environment.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable in helping me get acclimated to school procedures.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable in introducing me to school expectations.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable in introducing me to contact personnel and support personnel.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable in acclimating me to the community the school serves.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program introduced me to the expectations of the district.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable in apprising me of professional growth opportunities. *{Choose one}*

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable because I met other teachers with no teaching experience at my school.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable because I met other teachers with no teaching experience in my district.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The orientation program was valuable to me as a classroom teacher.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

Feel free to add any comments about your experiences with having a mentoring committee.

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

For what length of time was the orientation program in which you participated?

{Choose one}

( ) 6 or more hours

( ) 5 hours

( ) 4 hours

( ) 3 hours

( ) 2 hours

( ) 1 hour or less

Feel free to add any comments about your experience with an orientation program.

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

I participated in workshops and/or professional development opportunities. (Check all that apply):

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Year 1

( ) Year 2

( ) Year 3

( ) Year 4

( ) I did not participate in professional development opportunities.

Please click on the appropriate response for the following statements about your participation in workshops.

School workshops were offered.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My attendance at these workshops was voluntary.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

These workshops were developed and led by personnel in my school.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

These workshops were developed and led by other personnel in the district (not those in my school) or by someone brought in from outside the district.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

With what frequency were workshops offered in your school?

{Choose one}

( ) 1 or more per month

( ) 1 bi-monthly

( ) 1 quarterly

( ) 1 per semester

( ) 1 per year

( ) N/A

With what frequency were these district workshops held?

{Choose one}

( ) 1 or more per month

( ) 1 bi-monthly

( ) 1 quarterly

( ) 1 per semester

( ) 1 per year

( ) N/A

Please click on the appropriate response to the statements about your experience with district workshops.

District workshops (those developed and led by personnel in the district or by someone brought in from outside the district) were offered.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My attendance at these workshops was voluntary.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

These workshops were led by district personnel or by someone outside of my school.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Please check all of the following workshops that you have attended.

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Effective Classroom Management

( ) Creating Student Assessments

( ) Effective Lesson Planning

( ) Teacher Reflection

( ) Working with Students with Special Needs

( ) Instructional Strategies and/or Differentiated Instruction

( ) Effective teacher collaboration (special education teacher collaboration with the general education teacher)

( ) Reading and Writing Strategies

( ) Setting Professional Goals

( ) I have not attended any of these workshops

( ) Other (please specify) [ ]

Consider all the workshops that you have attended as a classroom teacher. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

The workshop regarding effective classroom management was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop regarding creating student assessments was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop regarding effective lesson planning was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop regarding teacher reflection was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop on working with students with special needs was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop on instructional strategies and/or differentiated instruction was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop regarding teacher collaboration between a special education teacher and a general education teacher was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop on the topic of reading and writing strategies was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

The workshop on the topic of setting professional goals was valuable.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Not Applicable

Feel free to add any comments about your experiences with professional development opportunities.

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

Consider all of the workshops that you have attended as a classroom teacher. Answer the following questions regarding the extent to which each workshop was interactive in nature.

Effective classroom management

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Creating student assessments

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Effective lesson planning

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Teacher reflection

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Working with students with special needs

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Instructional strategies and/or differentiated instruction

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Teacher collaboration (a special education teacher collaborating with a general education teacher)

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Reading and writing strategies

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

Setting professional goals

{Choose one}

( ) All of the time

( ) Most of the time

( ) Sometimes

( ) Never

( ) NA

My district/school encouraged and I participated in peer observations. (check all that apply):

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Year 1

( ) Year 2

( ) Year 3

( ) Year 4

( ) I did not participate in peer observations.

Please click on the appropriate response for each of the following statements regarding your experience with peer observations.

My district mandated peer observations.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My school mandated peer observations.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Peer observations occurred at least once per grading period or more times during a one-year period.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Peer observations occurred twice per year, once per semester.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

I chose the teachers that I observed.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

I observed teachers in my subject area or on my grade level.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Some form of feedback was encouraged after each observation.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Some form of feedback was required after each observation.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Considering all of your peer observations, to what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

Peer observations helped me improve my own classroom management skills.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

I used classroom management techniques that I observed.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

Peer observations improved my use of instructional strategies in the classroom.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

I used instructional strategies that I observed.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

Peer observations helped me to set my own professional growth goals.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

Peer observations helped me improve my practice in the classroom.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

Considering all of my peer observations, the observations were valuable to my growth as a practitioner.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) Disagree

( ) Neutral

( ) Agree

( ) Strongly Agree

Feel free to add any comments about your experiences with peer observation.

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

My district encouraged and I participated in peer coaching. (Peer coaching is a formal pairing of one teacher with another to serve as coaches to help each other become more effective classroom teachers.) Note: In peer coaching, both teachers may have the same level of experience. Check all that apply.

{Choose all that apply}

( ) Year 1

( ) Year 2

( ) Year 3

( ) Year 4

( ) I did not participate in peer coaching.

Please click on the appropriate response for each of the following statements regarding peer coaching.

My district mandated peer coaching.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My school mandated peer coaching.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My peer coach was assigned.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My peer coach was a teacher with the same number of years of teaching experience.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My peer coach was a more experienced teacher.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

My peer coach taught in my subject area or on the same grade level.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Peer coaching strategies were provided and a workshop was developed by personnel from the district or outside the district (not personnel from my school).

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

Peer coaching strategies were provided and a workshop was developed by personnel in my school.

{Choose one}

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) N/A

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements regarding your peer coaching experiences?

The workshop on peer coaching provided by the district or someone outside of my school was valuable to me as a classroom teacher.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) N/A

The workshop on peer coaching provided by personnel in my school was valuable to me as a classroom teacher.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) N/A

Peer coaching was valuable in helping me to set professional growth goals.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) N/A

Peer coaching was valuable in helping me improve in my effectiveness as a classroom teacher.

{Choose one}

( ) Strongly Agree

( ) Agree

( ) Neutral

( ) Disagree

( ) Strongly Disagree

( ) N/A

Feel free to provide any comments about your experience with peer coaching.

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

What were the most effective components of your induction program?

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

What were the least effective components of your induction program?

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

Considering all the components of the beginning teacher induction program in which you participated, check all that you believe were important in your making the decision to remain in the classroom after four years. Consider the extent to which each of these components influenced you to remain in the profession.

Mentoring or mentoring committee

{Choose one}

( ) Strong influence

( ) Moderate influence

( ) Minimal influence

( ) No influence

( ) N/A

Orientation program for beginning teachers

{Choose one}

( ) Strong influence

( ) Moderate influence

( ) Minimal influence

( ) No influence

( ) N/A

Professional development opportunities or workshops for beginning teachers

{Choose one}

( ) Strong influence

( ) Moderate influence

( ) Minimal influence

( ) No influence

( ) N/A

Peer observations

{Choose one}

( ) Strong influence

( ) Moderate influence

( ) Minimal influence

( ) No influence

( ) N/A

Peer coaching

{Choose one}

( ) Strong influence

( ) Moderate influence

( ) Minimal influence

( ) No influence

( ) N/A

What might you have liked to have had offered to you as part of your beginning teacher induction program? What may have helped you be more effective in your first years of teaching?

{Enter answer in paragraph form}

[

]

Thank you for your participation!

Please click "Finish" to submit your responses.

Thank you! Please exit out of your browser at this time.

If you would be willing to participate in a focus group on this topic, please click on the link below. (Otherwise, simply exit out of your browser.) If you are interested, you will be directed away from this survey to provide your contact information. (You will be directed away from this survey so that your name will not be connected to your survey responses.)

Click here to enter your information

Appendix E

RESEARCH SUBJECT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPATION

TITLE: Fifth Year Teacher Perceptions of Induction Programs Upon Teacher Retention

VCU IRB NO.: HM13078

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between beginning teacher induction programs and teacher retention.

You are being asked to participate because you have participated in your district's induction program, because you have remained in the teaching field into your fifth year of teaching, because you completed the survey portion of this study, and expressed a willingness to participate in a focus group session regarding your perceptions of your induction program.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AND YOUR INVOLVEMENT

If you decide to participate in a focus group session, you will be asked to sign this consent form after you have had all your questions answered and understand what will happen to you.

In this study you will be asked to attend one focus group meeting with 4-5 other participants. The meeting will take place in a central location in your teaching district and will last approximately 1 ½ hours. You will be asked open-ended questions regarding your district's induction program that will help the researcher gain a deeper understanding of the comments found on the surveys and of your district's induction program. The meetings will be tape recorded so we are sure to get everyone's ideas, but no names will be recorded. These recordings will only be listened to by the researcher for the purpose of acquiring accurate notes and will be destroyed once the study is complete. All recordings and notes will be stored in a locked cabinet until that time.

Significant new findings developed during the course of the research which may relate to your willingness to continue participation will be provided to you.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

All information provided by you is confidential. Neither teacher names nor individual district names will appear in the dissertation or any publications or presentations that results from this research. The identities of all participants in the focus group will be protected.

You do not have to talk about any subjects you do not feel comfortable talking about, and participation is voluntary.

BENEFITS TO YOU AND OTHERS

As a participant, you may not receive a direct benefit, but your participation will help provide a greater understanding of the influence of induction programs upon teacher retention. You may also be helping your district determine which components of your induction program are the most valuable in terms of your decision to remain in the profession.

COSTS

There are no costs for participating in this study other than the time you will spend in the focus groups.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There is no compensation for participating in this focus group. However, your time is greatly appreciated.

ALTERNATIVES

Since your participation is voluntary, there is no alternative other than to not participate.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Potentially identifiable information about you will consist of focus group notes and recordings. Data are being collected for research purposes. Your name will not be used during the focus session in order to maintain anonymity; no personal information will be used to identify you. Each individual in the focus group will be assigned a number to refer to when speaking as a form of identification, and each of the individuals in the focus group will be expected to keep all responses and identities confidential. All personal identifying information will be kept in a locked cabinet and will be destroyed after the completion of the dissertation. Records such as notes and tape recordings from the focus group meetings will be destroyed at that time. Access to all data will be limited to study personnel. .

We will not tell anyone the responses you give us; however, information from the study and the consent form signed by you may be looked at or copied for research or legal purposes by Virginia Commonwealth University.

What we find from this study may be presented at meetings or published in papers, but your name will not ever be used in these presentations or papers.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You do not have to participate in this study. If you choose to participate, you may stop at any time without any penalty. You may also choose not to answer particular questions that are asked in the study.

If you decide to leave the study before the conclusion of the focus group session, there are no consequences for you.

QUESTIONS

In the future, you may have questions about your participation in this study. If you have any questions, complaints, or concerns about the research, contact:

Arleen N. Reinhardt,

Student Researcher

anrein1@comcast.net

804-608-0594

Dr. Nora Alder, Ed.D.

Associate Professor

nalder@vcu.edu

804-828-1305

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact:

Office for Research

Virginia Commonwealth University

800 East Leigh Street, Suite 113

P.O. Box 980568

Richmond, VA 23298

Telephone: 804-827-2157

You may also contact this number for general questions, concerns or complaints about the research. Please call this number if you cannot reach the research team or wish to talk to someone else. Additional information about participation in research studies can be found at http://www.research.vcu.edu/irb/volunteers.htm.

CONSENT

I have been given the chance to read this consent form. I understand the information about this study. Questions that I wanted to ask about the study have been answered. My signature says that

I am willing to participate in this study. I also understand that the focus group sessions will be recorded and my signature indicates that I consent to the recording . I will receive a copy of the consent form once I have agreed to participate.

Participant name printed *Participant signature* *Date*

_____

Name of Person Conducting Informed Consent

Discussion / Witness

(Printed)

_____ _____

Signature of Person Conducting Informed Consent Date

Discussion / Witness

_____ _____

Principal Investigator Signature (if different from above) Date

Are you a teacher with four years of teaching experience in the same district?

Are you willing to share your experiences and opinions with other educators?

IF SO,

I hope that you will agree to participate in a research study by taking a short survey. I seek your help to gain an understanding of your experiences and perceptions of the teacher induction program in which you participated.

To take the electronic survey, please email me at anrein1@comcast.net.

Arleen N. Reinhardt
VCU Doctoral Student
Dr. Nora Alder, Dissertation Chair

Permission has been granted through the Richmond Public Schools Office of Research and Evaluation for the researcher to recruit participants for this study.

Participation is completely voluntary, and all responses are confidential.

10-15-10

1

Appendix G

Focus Group Questions

These questions are not conclusive because responses from the surveys have not been explored and because probing questions must be asked by the researcher when further elaboration by the participants is necessary. Open-ended questions will be created based upon participant response.

1. Now that you are in your 5th year of teaching, how would you describe your growth as a teacher?
   (To what do you attribute this growth?)
2. How have your districts met your needs in terms of professional growth?
3. How have you used your induction experiences in your own classrooms, with students, and with other teachers?
   (Please elaborate further.)
4. Describe any times that you have considered leaving the teaching profession.
   (When did you feel this way?
   To what do you attribute those feelings?
   Why did you decide to remain in the teaching field?
   How did the school or district help you to overcome these feelings?
   What other supports or in what other ways could the school or district have helped you during that difficult time?)
5. How did parts of your induction program help you grow as a professional?
6. Do you feel that you would be at the same place as a classroom teacher today whether you participated in the components of your induction program or not?
   (Please elaborate upon your reasons.)
7. What do you perceive to be the most valuable component of your induction program?
   (Why do you feel this way?)
8. Do you believe that demographic traits made any impact upon the value you gained from your induction program?
   (Please elaborate upon your response.
   Do you feel more strongly about this relationship regarding one particular component of your induction program than another component?)
9. How do you regard the relationship between your induction program and your desire to remain in the profession?
10. Would you make the same decision today to become a teacher?
    Why or why not?

11. Has the economic climate impacted your decision to remain in the classroom? (If so, how?)
12. Are there any other comments that you would like to make?
13. Are there any parts of the questionnaire that would like to elaborate upon?

Upon closing, the researcher will thank the participants for volunteering their time in order to give a more in-depth and insightful view of the induction program in which they participated so that the researcher would have a better understanding of the program from the teacher's point of view. This understanding is so important because staff developers may be able to use the information obtained from this study to help make decisions about their district's induction program. This is especially important when the economy is so poor. Developers of induction programs do not want to waste money, and they want to use the money more effectively and on the components that teachers feel have helped them in the classroom.

Vita

Arleen Norris Reinhardt was born on August 20, 1955 in Waynesboro, Virginia and is an American citizen. She graduated from Waynesboro High School, Waynesboro, Virginia in 1973. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree in English from James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia in 1977 and subsequently taught in Colonial Heights Public Schools in Colonial Heights, Virginia (1977-1984) and Chesterfield County Public Schools in Chesterfield County, Virginia (1984-). She is currently a department chair and teacher at Manchester High School in Midlothian, Virginia. She received a Master of Education degree in English/English Education from Virginia Commonwealth University in 1980.