Induction: The Early Years of Teaching

Edi Guyton, Douglas Davis, Ron Colarusso, Barbara Grainger

Abstract

This article addresses the need for induction programs and the theoretical and research support for them. It develops the notion of induction as a community responsibility. The paper describes a university/school induction consortium, a university induction program, an induction project at a middle school, and the role of the principal in induction.

Shortages of teachers in school classrooms are a common and growing problem across the United States (Ingersoll 2001). In a thorough study of this problem, Ingersoll identifies teacher attrition as the key variable: "...the results of the analysis show that teacher turnover is a significant phenomenon, and a dominant factor behind the demand for new teachers and the difficulties schools encounter adequately staffing classrooms with quality teachers." In the state of Georgia, the *Georgia Teaching Force Report: 2001* (Georgia Professional Standards Commission: Division of Educator Research and Development 2001) cites attrition in the teaching force as a leading contributor to the state's shortage of qualified teachers. The Georgia report includes the following information:

- Shortages in the state of Georgia are caused by increased birth rates, population increases, class size reduction, and teacher attrition;
- The shortages are most acute in the Atlanta metropolitan area;
- In fiscal year 2001, Georgia hired more teachers from other states than teachers prepared in Georgia;
- The overall attrition rate for teachers in Georgia was 9.4 percent and 15 percent for those entering the work force in Georgia in fiscal year 2000;
- Twenty percent of new teachers left teaching after their first year;
- The attrition rate for the Atlanta metro area was 11.1 percent, the highest in Georgia; and
- Low performing schools have higher attrition rates and more teachers transfer out.

After examining these and other data, the Georgia Report states: "Teacher attrition is costly to both the school systems and the state." The report concludes that "the rising loss of qualified teachers in Georgia can have a dramatically negative effect on student achievement and efforts to improve school quality" and recommends, "new teacher hires require formal mentoring and induction programs to ensure their retention." As a result of this report, new teacher retention is an important concern for the state. This paper examines a major university partnership with local school districts to address the teacher attrition problem in the state of Georgia.

Research suggests a similar situation nationwide. The Education Trust (1998) reports that high-quality, certified teachers are more likely to be found in low-minority, low-poverty schools. All indications are that high-poverty, high-minority schools are more affected by teacher shortages and teacher attrition (Ingersoll 2001). Georgia State University serves the urban core of the Atlanta metropolitan area, an area particularly troubled by new teacher attrition (Professional Standards Commission 2001). As a result, the College of Education at Georgia State University has facilitated the development and implementation of an induction/mentor program—The Metro Atlanta Beginning Teacher Support and Induction Consortium—to support new teachers through mentoring and promoting growth.

This article reviews literature on induction and teacher development used to develop the induction program. Next, a description of the induction consortium involving Georgia State University and several metropolitan school systems is provided. Following is description of the university's role in the Consortium-developed induction program. Using the work of the Consortium to develop a community approach to induction, a pilot example of the process is presented. Finally, the article argues the essential role played by building-level administrators in new teacher induction. The article posits specific thoughts on leadership that will facilitate a school community culture supportive of new teachers.

Literature on Induction

Across the United States, institutions are sending new teachers out into the world after having provided them with the best preparation they can offer. New teachers receive their roll books and their briefings and are on their way to educate and inspire young minds. For some reason, by the end of the first year, many of these highly trained personnel are frustrated with the job of teaching and they leave. Their exodus creates a large deficit in the number of educators to fill teaching posts, and prompts universities to come up with alternative programs to help fill the empty classrooms. These new teachers often experience frustrations with their new careers and quit.

Many recent reports have focused on the first years of teaching and espoused induction as critical to the development of quality teachers (American Federation of Teachers 2000; NCTAF 1996). Further, many studies have shown the efficacy of mentor and induction programs for teacher development and retention (Colbert and Wolff 1992; Fagan and al. 1982; Feiman-Nemser 1996; Gray and Gray 1985; Guyton et al. 1987; Huling-Austin 1990; Odell and Ferraro 1992; Odell and Huling 2000; Reiman and Thies-Sprinthall 1998; Schaffer, Stringfield, and Wolfe 1992). Collegial support is a key factor in new teacher support and development, and induction and mentor programs are some of the ways to formalize collegial support. The literature emphasizes the need for teacher support in the first years of teaching to develop high quality teachers. In addition, induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers are related to teacher retention and teacher development (Holloway 2001). Some states that have instituted induction programs (e.g., Connecticut and North Carolina) have made the greatest gains in student achievement.

Other research has addressed induction in urban schools. Colbert and Wolff (1992) found that a beginning teacher support system was effective in increasing the retention and reducing the isolation of teachers in urban schools. Weiner (1993) emphasized the importance of role models in learning to teach in urban schools. She made this statement about preparing teachers to work in urban schools:

> Urban teachers confront the greatest diversity of student needs, but the conditions in urban schools severely limit individualization, so the special demand made of urban teacher preparation is to educate teachers who can deal with students as individuals and human beings in settings that depersonalize learning, making students and teachers anonymous and powerless.

Cochran-Smith (1991) insisted that urban teachers need to learn to "teach against the grain" and that they learn from experienced teachers:

> Teaching against the grain is deeply embedded in the culture and history of teaching at individual schools and in the biographies of particular teachers and their individual or collaborative efforts to alter curricula, raise questions about common practices, and resist inappropriate decisions. These relationships can only be explored in the company of experienced teachers who are themselves engaged in complex, situation-specific, and sometimes losing struggles to work against the grain.

Haberman (1994) believes that teachers grow professionally in urban schools by being associated with "star teachers." He characterizes these teachers as people who can do "gentle teaching in a violent society." There is support for induction and program models throughout the literature, with many commonalities: mentor support; trained mentors; emphasis on teacher reflection; coaching; a variety of experiences; focus on standards of good teaching; and sustained and regular support.

Promoting Teacher Growth

There is a growing acceptance of the belief that teaching performance is a function of complex intellectual processes. Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1996) summarized findings from a research program/study of in-service teacher education:

> Effective teacher education programs are based on a conception of teacher growth and development; acknowledge the complexities of classroom, school, and community; are grounded in a substantial and verifiable knowledge base; and are sensitive to the ways teachers think, feel, and make meanings from their experience.

The above focus on thinking, feeling, and meaning making is supported by the work of leading cognitive psychologists. Vygotsky (1978) and Blumer (1969) underscore the centrality of social interaction in learning to teach. Vygotsky defined the zone of proximal development as the level at which a person can perform intellectually with

the support of a more competent person. The expert scaffolds the novice's development by sensitively adjusting the level of support to the novice's emerging understanding. This conception clarifies the importance to new teacher induction of meeting the new teacher where he or she is. Vygotsky emphasized the importance of learning as social interaction that includes discussion, reflection, and growth. Vygotsky's theories support the idea that teachers learn by working with other teachers in the settings of their professional practice.

Teachers' thought processes have been studied for some time (Clark and Peterson 1986). Many studies have found a relationship between the cognitive complexity of teachers and student achievement (Costa and Garmston 1994; Fennema, Franke, Carpenter and Carey 1993; McKibbin and Joyce 1981; Peterson, Fennema, Carpenter, and Loeff 1989; Knapp and Peterson 1991; Sprinthall et al., 1996). Studies strongly suggest that intervention is needed to promote teachers' cognitive growth (King and Kitchener 1994; NCRTE 1991). As Dewey (1938) posited, experience at times can be miseducative. There must be ways of drawing meaning from experience. Much theoretical support exists for developing the reflective ability of teachers (Schon, 1983, 1987; Reiman and Parramore 1993; Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall 1993). Johnson (1996) also advocates cognitive apprenticeship models of teacher education. Coaching is a procedure that shows much promise for affecting teachers' cognitions and for engaging them in reflection and self -assessment (Costa and Garmston 1994). A good induction/mentor program includes mentor training in coaching and reflection.

Many states and/or school systems have developed induction programs. It is less common for the teacher education program to provide induction support. Georgia State University collaborates with school systems to be part of the induction community through a consortium described below.

The Metro Atlanta Beginning Teacher Support and Induction Consortium

The Georgia State University Teacher Education Graduate Induction Program operates within the work of the Metro Atlanta Beginning Teacher Support and Induction Consortium. The Consortium includes Georgia State University; Atlanta Public Schools, DeKalb County Schools, Fulton County Schools, and Gwinnett County Schools (the four largest districts in the metro area); and the Georgia Association of Educators, and was formed to address the induction and retention problems afflicting so many schools. The planning process for the Consortium (March–July, 2001) involved district administrators, principals, mentor teachers, beginning teachers, and university faculty.

The underlying rationale for the Consortium is that induction communities are more powerful than a single institution in providing induction for beginning teachers. The goal of the Consortium is to increase student achievement by supporting, developing, and retaining committed and effective beginning teachers for our schools. Eventually it

will be imperative to know how well the model works in facilitating the induction of beginning teachers and how well the beginning teachers facilitate their own students' learning. If the support and development functions of the model are effective, it will then lead to increased teacher retention and quality.

All of the work in the Consortium is pursued under a common, agreed-upon set of principles:

1. The literature on teacher induction is clear in its recognition that teacher effectiveness takes time to develop. Therefore, the Consortium model calls for teachers to be provided with the needed support, time, reflection, and on-going assessments in the first year of teaching before student achievement measures will be used for evaluative purposes.
2. All activities and goals for teachers' development in the Consortium model should be consistent with currently accepted standards, such as Interstate National Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for beginning teachers.
3. The Consortium will devise strategies and procedures for assessing its effectiveness in facilitating the support, development, and retention of beginning teachers in the program using a variety of data sources and types. Those assessments will provide the basis for making decisions to maintain or revise specific project activities in the future.
4. In most induction plans, the assigned mentor plays the central, and often solo, role in the provision of services to the beginning teacher. The fundamental role of the mentor teacher is changed in the Consortium, to that of facilitator of the overall process and coordinator of services needed by the beginning teacher.
5. The Consortium will re-examine the expertise needed by mentor teachers, other professionals, and other agencies participating in the mentoring plan. The model can lead to new ways in which training is provided
6. The primary delivery point for the Consortium is the school in which a beginning teacher works. It is the key reference community within the model.

One primary function of the Consortium is to facilitate the training of mentors who work with beginning educators. In Georgia, many school systems provide mentor training. The state has a certification add-on endorsement for mentor teachers. It is conducted by school systems and higher education institutions and includes one course and an internship. Endorsed teachers receive a stipend for working with other teachers. The State Teaching Force Center (2001) reports that the metro area had more than 800 teachers who received stipends for working with 1,200 beginning teachers. The Consortium can reach more teachers. In addition to direct training, the Consortium supports school leaders in developing new teacher induction and mentoring programs in their schools. This support will include training, assessing the needs of new teachers, and providing a resource for information on best practices in mentoring and induction.

At this time, the Consortium is involved in a continuum of work that includes:
1. Developing the GSU two-year induction plan for teacher education graduates;
2. Using the Consortium as an ongoing mechanism to integrate the work of Consortium members in the area of teacher support and induction; and
3. Developing a model community teacher development school.

The Consortium meets several times a year to share ideas and give feedback on the GSU program and the school system induction programs. At the university, a steering committee of 12 faculty from the colleges of education and art and sciences meets monthly to guide the GSU induction program. The program is administered in the college of education dean's office. The Georgia State University induction program is described below.

Georgia State University Induction Program

From GSU collaborations with Atlanta Public Schools, DeKalb County Schools, Fulton County Schools, and Gwinnett County Schools, it is clear that each system has its own induction and mentoring programs that provide orientation for beginning teachers. Each beginning teacher in these systems has an assigned mentor. The school systems provide mentor selection and mentor training and guidelines for mentor/beginning teacher activities. Some of the systems and/or schools also have full-time lead mentors who work with other mentors.

The "Community of Induction," though, should ideally also include teacher preparation programs and faculty. GSU does not wish to duplicate or interfere with school programs; we want to complement them by making the GSU program consistent with their efforts. In addition to the GSU induction program, we participate in each system program, as requested. GSU seminars and public web pages are also available to all beginning teachers in these systems.

The foundation for the GSU program is based on professional and state standards for teachers and students. The standards provide focus for the collaborations, especially in helping to define success for teachers in bringing all students to high levels of achievement. State Curriculum Guidelines and Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards inform the work.

The Metro Atlanta Consortium developed an induction program for Georgia State University to complement what the schools do. The Georgia State University Induction Program has support components and professional development components. It involves university faculty working directly with beginning teachers, another element unique to the work of this Consortium. Three major support components are:

1. personal and one-on-one contact with beginning teachers and mentors;
2. group contact with beginning teachers and mentors; and
3. web contact with beginning teachers and mentors.

In the first component—**personal contact**—each teacher education program designates a contact person (a faculty member) for its graduates. This person is available for e-mail and telephone contact about any problem a beginning teacher is experiencing. The contact person provides whatever help seems appropriate, which may include putting the teacher in contact with another Georgia State University faculty member or visiting the classroom of the teacher. Several graduate students supplement the work of the contact people. Mentors and administrators are also given information about the university program and can ask for support or provide suggestions for improvements in the program.

Induction **group contact** is achieved through voluntary seminars for graduates each semester. The topics are determined according to assessed needs of beginning teachers. Seminars can be conducted for all beginning teachers in a school system, if requested. Seminars also can be conducted for mentors, administrators, and schools, when possible and as requested. All seminars are developed around the community theme: that teaching is participation in a learning community and that beginning teachers should be provided and use all the resources of the community.

The purpose of the **web contact** component is to provide an additional dimension of access to resources, support from experts and colleagues, and a clearinghouse for sharing information. Through technology, project participants can access resources on induction at their convenience and can be linked to a network of mentors, to experts at Georgia State University, and to other beginning teachers who are in their discipline. The technology resources are another dimension of community, providing professional resources as well as social and emotional support for beginning teachers.

The technology infrastructure consists of two parts: a public website that provides information and support about induction, and a password-protected website that provides beginning teachers with personal information and support through chat rooms, threaded discussion sites, and specialized links to resources. The "open to the public" website (http://education.University.edu/induction) provides information and links to resources for effective teaching, mentoring, and model induction programs. This site is available to beginning teachers, mentors, and anyone interested in information about and links to teaching and learning in P–12 settings. The site also provides links to each of the Metro school systems participating in the Consortium, links to professional organizations, and links to the resources of the Georgia Department of Education.

From the public site, participants in the induction program can access the password-protected WebCT site. This site, the "Virtual Teachers Lounge," has been developed to facilitate access to information, sharing ideas, asking for help, and storing documents related to the project within a limited access site. The WebCT site also offers chat rooms that will be scheduled for synchronous interactions related to topics chosen by the beginning teachers. For example, an expert on working with parents might lead a discussion designed to prepare beginning teachers for upcoming parent teacher conferences; or, on some occasions, the beginning teachers may decide to have a

discussion on certain issues without the experts. For other topics, the threaded discussion site is available to provide an asynchronous opportunity to ask questions, raise concerns, or share information or successes. Because WebCT is password-protected, the questions and comments of the participants are accessible only to those in the induction project. This collaboration advances the use of technology for induction and in future thinking about how to link teacher education and schools in the effort to retain and develop quality teachers.

Another unique aspect of the collaboration is that the school systems and the Georgia State University work together to develop quality teaching in a teacher's first two years of teaching. The professional development component of the induction program cannot be distinguished completely from the support components, but the second year's program focus is on teacher growth in bringing students to high standards of learning. Seminars, online discussion sites, and chat rooms focus on facilitating and assessing student learning and reflecting and using assessment data to guide instruction. Georgia State University graduates are familiar with a model for assessing teacher impact on student learning, and this model and/or school system requirements are the framework for professional development.

At the end of the teacher education program, graduates are provided with information about accessing the web sites and seminar schedules, and they meet with their contact person. At this meeting, the College of Education administers a needs assessment and provides forms for demographic data and information about where the graduate will be teaching. Follow-up procedures provide ways of getting school information from graduates who have not taken a teaching position at the time of the seminar.

Woodland Middle School: An Induction Community

Another program GSU has developed as part of the Consortium is a relationship with one particular school to develop a community of induction. Barbara Grainger, the director of the school's mentor/induction program, describes this collaboration below.

Our school's collaboration with Georgia State University began in the spring of 2001. Two university people, an associate dean and a clinical professor, served as our liaisons. Woodland Middle School is located in South Fulton County in an older building that housed more than 1,200 students during the 2001–2002 school year in a space created for 800. Several portable units provide additional space. Seventy-eight percent of our students are Black, and 13 percent are Hispanic. The Hispanic and total ESOL population grew throughout the year and an ESOL program addresses their needs. Nearly 100 percent of our students receive free or reduced lunch. The school, in spite of overcrowding, is kept extremely clean and is physically appealing. One of the best features of our school is its inviting staff and administration, headed by Moses L. Scott.

We are aware of our problems, the most critical one being our low test scores, which seem to fluctuate between the thirtieth and fortieth percentile. We work extremely hard

to improve scores with a school-wide morning focus program, an after-school program, school-wide tutorials, continuous testing and assessment of test data, and adhering to the county mandated curriculum. We welcome the participation of the university in hopes that its efforts to promote teacher retention and to strengthen the effectiveness of our teachers will facilitate an increase in our students' test scores.

During the 2001–2002 school year, 26 teachers were new to the school—30 percent of our instructional staff. A few of them had teaching experience outside of the school system. Seventeen percent of 2001–2002 teachers were new teachers retained from the previous year. Each year our pool of veteran teachers gets smaller while the number of teachers with only a few years of experience or no experience grows. This year (2002–2003), downsizing, resulting from the transfer of students housed in our building to a newly constructed school in the community, has halted the trend of hiring a large number of new instructors.

The university provided us with literature on successful mentoring programs from all over the country during the early stages of their involvement. University contact persons met with our school's leadership during the summer of 2001 to create and refine a rough design for the year's interactions. Georgia State University created a website for beginning teacher assistance. The staff development office from the district was in full support of our liaison and is also involved in the Consortium. A university representative came and spoke to the faculty and welcomed the new teachers during the teacher pre-planning week prior to the 2001–2002 school year. At an early faculty meeting, a task force from the university came to address the entire school staff, including custodial workers and classified workers to outline the "Communities Develop Teachers" project and to introduce the idea of support for the new teachers coming from all persons connected with the school. At the end of this meeting, staff members filled out a survey form suggesting ways the university could work with our school and how they could participate in the induction community. A needs survey helped identify salient, recurring needs and the results were incorporated into the program design. As the year progressed, we took careful steps and paused to measure the effects of the program using feedback forms and continuous observations and discussions.

The university provided numerous workshops for our new teachers. Conducting these workshops were strong professors from their teacher education programs. One early workshop focused on Parent Communication that provided strategies for the upcoming parent conferencing day that had created a lot of anxiety among the new teachers. The facilitator, a counseling professor, was extremely engaging and provided concrete assistance in the way of research. She created problem-solving scenarios and provided scripted material that could be used during conferencing. Georgia State University also provided a workshop on classroom management that was delightful to attend and extremely informative. The instructor had spent time among the teaching ranks and knew exactly what she was talking about. The information was practical and to the point.

A GSU faculty member presented continuing workshops on cognitive coaching for the mentors. Many other "problem solving/bases-touching" meetings took place. E-mail, fax, telephone, and frequent visitations by the contact persons provided constant monitoring and assistance. At one meeting, teachers addressed their unique individual needs in the classroom, and the university compiled them and provided a university contact for particular teachers. Our ESOL science person was paired with a university ESOL faculty member. Several issues with provisional certification were addressed. Personal requests were made for classroom visitations and assessment.

New ideas emerged as the year progressed and are being integrated into next year's design. At one point in the year, many faculty members wrote grants for school improvement. Georgia State provided information regarding grant possibilities for teachers, an extra benefit we had not expected. The university offered classroom coverage so that mentors could visit beginning teachers' classrooms and is working on a summer workshop at the university for teachers going into their second year. In November a teacher education class visited our school. The students spent the entire day "living" the middle school experience. The school site mentor and the GSU coordinator have attended numerous conferences and workshops on teacher induction and retention and made presentations on the Induction Community. Information from these conferences was shared throughout the school and has served to strengthen the school's mentoring program.

Georgia State University and Woodland personnel have developed a plan of action for 2002–2003. In addition, GSU student teachers are placed at Woodland for the spring semester. We anticipate strengthening and defining a program that offers only great possibilities for our students, the people who work with them, and our community.

School Leadership, New Teacher Induction, and Learning Organizations

It is evident through the work with Woodland Elementary School that administrative support is necessary for successful induction efforts; however, it is also felt that much more is needed. Successful induction requires an entire organizational culture that is supportive of the needs of new teachers. The next section describes what this type of culture might look like from an administrative perspective and how school leadership might facilitate such a culture.

Leading scholars (Smith 1998; Seyfarth 1996; Rebore 2001) devote considerable attention to efforts to prepare school administrators to facilitate the induction of new teachers into schools as part of the human resources management role required of administrators. School administrators must, among other tasks, provide resources, plan programs, place new teachers and assign schedules, provide training for mentors, and plan and deliver presentations. In addition, many of these tasks involve opportunities for leadership. Peterson (1990) argues that assessment of the teaching and learning process in a new teacher's classroom is required for effective induction.

According to Peterson (1990), new teachers usually have competency gaps, unrealistic attitudes, and demanding performance requirements. Further, new teachers must adjust to cultural norms within the school involving such things as roles, rewards, relationships, and expectations. Finally, new teachers need to know that their students are learning, to receive peer recognition, and to grow professionally. Leadership, whether from the administration or other practicing professionals, facilitates the meeting of the important needs that new teachers have. Nonetheless, as important as these procedural details are, they describe only a small part of the opportunity for leadership to support the induction of new teachers.

This section argues that school leadership must facilitate a community culture within a school that supports the development of new teachers as beginning professionals. In short, successful new teacher induction requires a specific style of school leadership. Fortunately, this style of school leadership is consistent with a wide range of current leading theories on the type of leadership necessary to improve teaching and learning.

Much of the current literature on ideal school leadership is a combination of traditional trait theory, behavior theory, and situational theory with some chaos/complexity theory and postmodernism (irrational, non-theoretical, and/or leadership-as-an-art) thrown in. Overall, the wide-ranging focus is on change, problem definition and solving, managing dilemmas, developing collegial relationships, motivation and vision, the professionalization of teaching, meeting needs and serving others, community development, building organizational culture, and the facilitation of all personnel as leaders. Embedded thematically in all of this is Fullan's (1993) notion of learning organizations.

Fullan (2001) links leadership practice and the facilitation of learning organizations. He presents a new framework for leadership in learning organizations that represents a convergence of theories, knowledge bases, ideas, and strategies. Through this, Fullan suggests radical shifts in traditional notions of leadership. Leaders are seen less as individuals with the expert knowledge to determine the best answer to problems and then implement solutions, and more as individuals skilled in facilitating group problem solving processes. According to Fullan, a new type of leader is necessary in the current educational climate because: "The big problems of today are complex, rife with paradoxes and dilemmas. For these problems there are no once-and-for-all answers. Yet we expect our leaders to provide solutions. We place leaders in untenable positions." Instead, an emphasis is placed on organizational processes.

The process of new teacher induction is a perfect example of the utility of Fullan's (2001) argument. The quality of a district's new teacher induction program, for example, may be diminished in situations with unsupportive school leadership. In fact, an induction program may be state-of-the-art in every respect and still not result in improved retention and teaching and learning because change requires leadership. Fullan makes this clear: "Understanding change and the change process is less about innovation and more about innovativeness. It is less about strategy and more about strategizing." Clearly, today's educational leader must be a facilitator of group

problem-solving processes. As schools seek to change through mechanisms such as an intentional focus on the teaching and learning process provided by a program for new teacher induction, the effort becomes a group problem-solving process.

Cuban (2001) also provides valuable insight into leadership and group processes. He defines a problem as the difference between the way things are and the way things ought to be. An example might be current efforts to induct new teachers and the enormous potential to have an impact on teaching and learning through an improvement in this area. Cuban further describes school related problems as dilemmas that are complex, messy, conflict-filled, and requiring choices between competing issues. The key to working with dilemmas, according to Cuban, is how they are defined:

> Because we live in a can-do culture, the result, the solution, the outcome is far more important than how the problem was initially defined. Too often, solutions are mismatched to the problem or simply botched when applied because so little time was spent on determining what the problem really was. I believe it is a serious error to concentrate more on solutions than on figuring out what the problem is.

Thus, framing the problem, or dilemma, is a critical part of the process. Cuban emphasizes that "how a problem is framed is a subjective process." Further, successful problem solving requires reframing, looking at common issues in new ways. It is here that Cuban links problem solving to change: "...the explicit connection [is] that problem solving and managing dilemmas are about change...every planned change is a solution to some problem." Thus, problems such as improving new teacher retention in schools must be resolved first through a process of definition.

Nonetheless, as Fullan (2001) makes clear, change requires a specific type of cultural context that embraces change: "Leading in a culture of change does not mean placing changed individuals into unchanged environments. Rather, change leaders work on changing the context." This is a radical shift from popular notions of transformational leadership (Burns 1978) in which the leader is expected to bring about some type of personal transformation among the individuals in the organizations. Such transformation, however, assumes that the leader is best situated to decide what transformation is desirable for achieving the goals of the organization. In contrast, Fullan argues that organizations must transform as well. Thus, problem solving requires certain cultural conditions in school organizations that relate to leadership rather than specific components of any induction program. Relationships are particularly important in a learning organization. Fullan describes the role of leadership: "Development of individuals is not sufficient. New relationships are crucial, but only if they work at the hard task of establishing greater program coherence and the addition of resources. The role of leadership is to 'cause' greater capacity in the organization in order to get better results." Leaders must not only facilitate building relationships, but they must also facilitate types of relationships

needed for learning organizations. Individuals must have a positive attitude, or be motivated, to change.

Hoyle (2002) argues that relationships are key to motivation and suggest that leaders motivate through a deep caring for others, or love. Schools must be, according to Hoyle, caring organizations as apposed to competitive organizations. Other leading scholars (Bolman and Deal 1997; Deal and Peterson 1999) describe symbolic leadership as key to facilitating a caring culture. These authors add a dimension to existing theories of leadership and suggest that leaders must focus on the symbolic and cultural side of schools. Deal and Peterson state: "One of the most significant roles of leaders (and of leadership) is the creation, encouragement, and refinement of the symbols and symbolic activity that give meaning to the organization." These authors cite vision and values as the "bedrocks" of culture, and therefore, symbolic leadership.

Another similar current leadership ideal is termed authentic leadership (Evans 1996). Like other scholars in the field, Evans also focuses on change. Evans's focus, however, is slightly different because he concentrates on organizational and cultural resistance to change. Evans views confidence and trust as essential to change and argues that leaders achieve these through integrity and savvy. Authentic leaders demonstrate consistency between "personal beliefs, organizational aims, and working behavior." Overall, there is wide-ranging focus on change, problem definition and solving, managing dilemmas, developing collegial relationships, creating motivation and vision, supporting the professionalization of teaching, meeting needs and serving others, community development, building organizational culture, and facilitating all personnel being leaders.

Sergiovanni (2000) also calls for authentic leadership and uses a framework described by the German philosopher Jurgen Habermas (1987, as cited in Sergiovanni), to make meaning of this type of practice. According to Sergiovanni, Habermas

> ...asserts that all of society's enterprises, from the family to the corporation, possess both a lifeworld and a systemsworld. In our case, leaders and their purposes, followers and their needs, and the unique traditions, rituals, and norms that define a school's culture compose the lifeworld. And the management designs and protocols, strategic and tactical actions, policies and procedures, and efficiency and accountability assurances compose the systemsworld. School character flourishes when the lifeworld is the generative force for determining the systemsworld.

In short, Sergiovanni argues that shared community values and moral purposes held by people in organizations must be the dominant influence on practice rather than bureaucratic processes. In other words, the norms of the professional practitioners must drive the professional practice. The alternative is for rules and procedures to control practice at the expense of individual professional judgment.

Clearly, a school-wide new teacher induction program falls into the cultural arena of the systemsworld. This is necessary and Sergiovanni makes it clear that all organizations need systemsworld procedures to accomplish their goals. Nonetheless, organizational cultures have influence over the meaning of the systemsworld in the organization. The challenge to school leadership is to integrate necessary systemsworld processes—like a new teacher induction program—and, at the same time, using most of the leadership principles described above, facilitate a process that allows the lifeworld of the culture to control the meaning of the program, vis-à-vis the professional practice in the school.

Conclusion

Induction programs are not extraneous to successful schools; they are essential. A teacher shortage and the need to have and to keep the best-qualified teachers possible in our classrooms are compelling reasons for good induction programs. Induction is not the responsibility of one person; it is the responsibility of the educational community. A trained mentor is essential but cannot do the work alone. This paper proposes a model for induction that provides a learning community/professional home for beginning teachers. In this home, teachers, administrators, school system personnel, teacher education program personnel, support staff, counselors, parents, and students support the beginning teacher. They work together to be a learning and support community for all members, including beginning teachers. The school leader is essential as a facilitator who can create a caring community and a culture that supports everyone in the school. Taking the time to develop the community is worthwhile in terms of efficiency—encouraging teachers who have had resources put into their education to stay in teaching, and also in terms of quality teaching—helping teachers to be the best teachers they can be.

References

American Federation of Teachers, *Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction* (Washington, DC: Author).

Blumer, H., *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969).

Bolman, L., and T .E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (2nd ed.), (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

Burns, J. M., *Leadership* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978).

Clark, C. and P. Peterson, "Teachers' Thought Processes," in M. C. Wittrock, ed., *Handbook of Research in Teaching* (3rd ed.), (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co, 1986).

Cochran-Smith M., "Learning to Teach Against the Grain," *Harvard Educational Review, 61* (3, 1991): 279–310.

Colbert, J. A. and D.E. Wolff, "Surviving in Urban Schools: A Collaborative Model for a Beginning Teacher Support System," *Journal of Teacher Education, 43* (3, 1992): 193–199.

Costa, A. L. and R. J. Garmston, *Cognitive Coaching* (Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon, 1994).

Cuban, L. *How Can I Fix It? Finding Solutions and Managing Dilemmas: An Educator's Road Map* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001).

Davis, D. R., J. E. Pool, and M. Mits-Cash, "Issues in Implementing a New Teacher Assessment System in a Large School District: Results of a Qualitative Field Study," *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 14* (4, 2000): 285–306.

Deal, T. E., and K. D. Peterson, *Shaping School Culture: The Heart of Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999).

Dewey, J., *Experience and Education* (New York: Macmillan,1938).

Education Trust, "Good Teaching Matters: Well-Qualified Teachers Can Close the Gap," *Thinking K-16* (Summer 1998).

Fagan, M. M. and G. Walter, "Mentoring Among Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research 76* (2, 1982): 113-118.

Feiman-Nemser, S., *Teacher Mentoring: A Critical Review*. ERIC Digest (July 1996). www.peer.ca/teachermentors.html.

Fennema, E., M. Franke, T. Carpenter, and D. Carey, "Using Children's Mathematical Knowledge in Instruction," *American Educational Research Journal 30* (3, 1993): 555-584.

Fullan, M., *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform* (London: The Falmer Press, 1993).

Fullan, M., *Leading in a Culture of Change* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001).

Georgia Professional Standards Commission: Division for Educator Research and Development, *The Georgia Teaching Force, 2001: A Report of the Supply, Demand and Utilization of Pre-Kindergarten–Twelfth Grade Teachers in Georgia Public Schools* (Atlanta: Author, 2001).

Gray, W. W. and M. M. Gray, "Synthesis of Research on Mentoring Beginning Teachers," *Educational Leadership 43* (3, 1985): 37–43.

Guyton, E., D. Dobbs, F. Gray, and J. Wright, "The Mentor Teacher: A Key Component of Induction Programs," *Georgia Association of Teacher Educators Journal 2* (1, 1987): 5–11.

Haberman, M., "Gentle Teaching in a Violent Society," *Educational Horizons 72* (3, 1994): 1–13.

Habermas, J., *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functional Reasons*, T. McCarthy, trans., (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987).

Holloway, J. H., "The Benefits of Mentoring," *Educational Leadership 58* (8, 2001): 85.

Hoyle, J. R., *Leadership and the Force of Love: Six Keys to Motivating with Love* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2002).

Huling-Austin, L., "Teacher Induction Programs and Internships," in W.R. Houston, ed., *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1990).

Ingersoll, R. M., "Teacher Turnover and Teacher Shortages: An Organizational Analysis," *American Educational Research Journal 58* (3, 2001): 499–534.

Johnson, K. E., "The Vision Versus the Reality: The Tensions of the TESOL Practicum," in D. Freeman and J.C. Richards, eds., *Teachers Learning in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Johnson, K. "The Role of Theory in Teacher Education," *TESOL Quarterly 30* (4, 1996): 765–771.

King, P. M. and K. S. Kitchener, *Developing Reflective Judgment: Understanding and Promoting Intellectual Growth and Critical Thinking in Adolescents and Adults* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994).

Knapp, N. and P. Peterson, *What does CGI mean to you? Teachers' ideas of a research-based intervention four years later.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1991.

McKibbin, M. and B. R. Joyce, "Psychological States," *Theory into Practice 19* (4, 1981): 248–255.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education, *Final Report* (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1991).

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (New York: author, 1996).

Odell, S. J. and D. P. Ferraro, "Teacher Mentoring and Teacher Retention," *Journal of Teacher Education 43* (3, 1992): 200–204.

Odell, S. and Huling, L., *Quality Mentoring for Novice Teachers* (Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Dleta Pi, 2000).

Peterson, K. D., "Assistance and Assessment of Beginning Teachers," in J. Millman, and L. Darling-Hammond eds., *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 1990): 104–115.

Peterson, P., E. Fennema, T. Carpenter, and M. Loef, "Teachers' Pedagogical Content Beliefs in Mathematics," *Cognition & Instruction 6* (1, 1989): 1–40.

Rebore, R. W., *Human Resources Administration in Education: A Management Approach* (6th ed.), (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2001).

Reiman, A. R., and B. M. Paramore, "Promoting Preservice Teacher Development through Extended Field Experience," in M. O' Hair and S. Odell, eds., *Teacher Education Yearbook I: Diversity and Teaching* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1993): 111–121.

Reiman, A. J. and L. Thies-Sprinthall, *Mentoring and Supervision for Teacher Development* (New York: Longman, 1998).

Schaffer, E., S. Stringfield, and D. Wolfe, "An Innovative Beginning Teacher Induction Program: A Two-Year Analysis of Classroom Interactions," *Journal of Teacher Education 43* (3, 1992): 181–192.

Schon, D. *The Reflective Practitioner* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

Seyfarth, J., *Personnel Management for Effective Schools* (2nd ed.), (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1996).

Sergiovanni, T. J. , *The Lifeworld of Leadership: Creating Culture, Community and Personal Meaning in our Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000).

Smith, R. E., *Human Resources Administration: A School-Based Perspective* (Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, 1998).

Sprinthall, N. A., A. J. Reiman, and L. Thies-Sprinthall, "Role Taking and Reflection: Promoting the Conceptual and Moral Development of Teachers," *Learning and Individual Differences 5* (4, 1993): 283–299.

Sprinthall, N. A., A. J. Reiman, and L. Thies-Sprinthall, "Teacher Professional Development," in J. Sikula, T. Buttery, and E. Guyton, eds., *Handbook of Research in Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillian, 1996).

Vygotsky, L., *Mind in Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978).

Weiner, L., *Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools: Lessons from Thirty Years of School Reform* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993).

Author Information

Edi Guyton is Associate Dean of the Georgia State University College of Education. She has published in the area of teacher education, and she currently edits the *Yearbook of Research on Teacher Education.*

Douglas Davis is Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership in the Georgia State University College of Education.

Ron Colarusso is the Dean of the Georgia State University College of Education. His interest is in teacher education and urban teaching.

Barbara Grainger is an English teacher at Woodland Middle School, Fulton County Schools, Georgia. She coordinates the mentor/induction program at the school.

Edi Guyton
Georgia State University
College of Education
Atlanta, GA 30303
Telephone: 404-651-2526
Fax: 404-651-2555
E-mail: eguyton@gsu.edu