

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
A Xerox Education Company

73-5336

BRISCOE, Fredrick George, 1937-
THE PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR
SECONDARY TEACHERS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC
SCHOOLS: A PILOT STUDY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972
Education, curriculum development

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR
SECONDARY TEACHERS IN SELECTED
MICHIGAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS:
A PILOT STUDY

By

Fredrick George Briscoe

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ABSTRACT

THE PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR SECONDARY TEACHERS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A PILOT STUDY

By

Fredrick George Briscoe

The purpose of this study was to identify the professional concerns of first-year secondary teachers in selected public schools in Michigan and to relate the identified concerns to a number of variables. Specifically, it was an investigation of differences in concerns among groups of first-year teachers categorized on the basis of each of the following factors:

1. Teaching level
2. Satisfaction with present teaching level
3. Average class size
4. Attendance at in-service meetings
5. Enrollment in college graduate courses, 1971-72
6. Average age of building faculty
7. Type of community

Fredrick George Briscoe

8. Racial composition of student population
9. Ages of first-year teachers
10. Extent of teaching assignment in major field of study
11. Degree of philosophical congruence between self and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.

Twenty buildings were selected. All the first-year teachers in each building were contacted, seventy-six in all. Sixty-five responded. There were fifty-six usable responses.

The professional concerns of first-year teachers were expressed through a four-part questionnaire administered during the last month of the school year. The first part gathered demographic information about the respondents. The second part was a rating scale of fifty-one areas of potential concern. It asked teachers to indicate the degree of their concern in each area at the beginning of the year and at the end. The third and fourth parts asked teachers to identify the sources most helpful to them during their first year, and to respond to open-ended questions designed to identify concerns that might not have been included in the study, as well as elicit their suggestions for upcoming first-year teachers and for the improvement of teacher education programs.

Fredrick George Briscoe

Each of eleven hypotheses was tested with a one-way multivariate analysis of variance. The results indicated:

1. There were no significant differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers:
 - a. at the various teaching levels
 - b. with varying degrees of satisfaction with their first-year teaching level
 - c. with varying average class sizes
 - d. with varying frequencies of attendance at in-service meetings
 - e. employed in varying types of communities
 - f. in buildings with varying racial compositions
 - g. teaching to varying extents in their major fields of study
 - h. with varying degrees of philosophical congruence between themselves and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.
2. There were significant differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers:
 - a. with varying ages
 - b. with varying average faculty ages
 - c. with varying frequencies of enrollment in college graduate courses.

DEDICATION

To the memory of my father who was a man of uncompromising integrity.

To my mother who has spent a lifetime caring and giving, always putting others before herself.

To my brother, Bob, whose search for new ideas and creative alternatives to the status quo has taught me a great deal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is about people--people who had professional concerns and were willing to share them, to have them studied. It is about people who served on a guidance committee. It is about people who were ready at any time to stop everything to help work out many of the problems I encountered.

Charles A. Blackman, as chairman of the guidance committee, provided invaluable help with his uncanny ability to help people grow without getting in the way or abdicating his responsibility as a teacher. His influence on my life has been profound.

Samuel S. Corl, III, as a committee member, employer, and teacher scholar of the highest order, contributed immeasurably to my growth.

Robert Docking and Donald Nickerson made committee meetings times when I was really forced to examine direction and focus. Their contributions were extremely helpful.

Joyce Kohfeldt left the staff at Michigan State University before this study got underway, but her creative talents and influence are still felt.

George Myers very graciously attended the orals in the absence of a committee member and contributed in a highly constructive fashion.

Jo Lynn Cunningham was a committee member--ex-officio. Without her this study would never have been completed. She provided HOPE when it was needed.

Jack Willsey taught me the meaning of "focus" and "get going!"

Gini Brown came to the rescue at a point where I was ready to scrap the whole project. Her help was invaluable.

Larry Schaftenaar provided help in another "hour of need."

John A. Vargo and Bay Cliff Health Camp permitted me to take a leave of absence to finish.

Finally, I will be eternally grateful to Superintendent H. J. Bothwell and the faculty and staff of the Marquette (Michigan) Public Schools. Without their trust and support as I grew into a new job and their continuing friendship after I left, I would not have had the confidence to pursue a new venture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Implications	10
Definition of Terms	11
Population	13
Overview of Succeeding Chapters	14
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Summary	34
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	37
Identification of Variables	38
Design of the Instrument	41
Selection and Description of Respondents	44
Administration of the Questionnaire.	49
Data Analysis Procedures and Hypotheses to be Tested	52
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS.	57
Differences in Concerns Among Groups	
First-Year Teachers	57
Teaching Level.	61
Satisfaction With Present Teaching Level	62
Average Class Size	63
Attendance at In-Service Meetings	64
Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1971-72	66
Average Age of Building Faculty	68
Type of Community.	69
Racial Composition of Student Population	71
Ages of First-Year Teachers	73

Chapter	Page
Extent of Teaching Assignment in	
Major Field	73
Philosophical Congruence	75
The Professional Concerns of First-	
Year Teachers	76
Supplemental Findings	83
V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	92
Implications for Teacher Education and	
In-Service Education	95
Limitations of the Study	97
Implications for Action.	99
Recommendations for Further Research . .	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. The Questionnaire Used to Gather Data	
For the Study	109
B. Letter to Superintendents.	116
C. Instructions to Distributors.	117
D. Letter to First-Year Teachers	119
E. Postcards Returned by Respondents	120
F. Tables for Multivariate Analysis of	
Variance.	121

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents: Certification, Degrees and Granting Institution	46
2. Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents: Age and Sex	47
3. Characteristics of First-Year Respondents: Educational Philosophies of First-Year Teachers, Their Fellow Teachers, Administrators, and Communities.	48
4. Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents: Levels Now Taught and Levels Teachers Would Choose to Teach.	49
5. Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents: Subjects Taught	50
6. Summary of Multivariate Analyses of Variance for the Eleven Independent Variables.	60
7. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers at Various Teaching Levels	62
8. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers With Varying Degrees Satisfaction With First-Year Teaching Level	63
9. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers With Varying Average Class Sizes	65
10. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers With Varying Frequencies of Attendance at In-Service Meetings	66

Table	Page
11. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers and the Extent of Their Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1971-72	68
12. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers in Buildings With Varying Average Faculty Ages.	69
13. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers Teaching in Varying Types of Communities. .	71
14. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers in Buildings With Varying Racial Compositions of Student Population	72
15. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by First-Year Teachers of Varying Ages	74
16. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers With Varying Extents of Teaching Assignment in Major Field of Study. . . .	75
17. Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Philosophical Congruence Between Self and Others. . . .	76
18. Year-End Professional Concerns Expressed by First-Year Secondary Teachers	77
19. Sources Ranked "Most Helpful" by First-Year Teachers	91
F-1. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Teaching Level	121
F-2. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction With First-Year Teaching Level	121
F-3. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Average Class Size	122
F-4. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Attendance at In-Service Meetings	122

Table	Page
F-5. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for College Courses Taken 1971-72	123
F-6. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Average Age of Building Faculty.	123
F-7. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Type of Community	124
F-8. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Racial Composition of Student Population.	124
F-9. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Ages of First-Year Teachers.	125
F-10. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Extent of Teaching Assignment in Major Field	125
F-11. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Philosophical Congruence	126

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Teacher education institutions do not graduate "finished products." This is not their intention. The very nature of teaching and teacher education makes this impossible, for the effective teacher is himself a continuing learner. Yet the public schools do not provide extensive staff or facilities for teacher education, especially not for the first-year teacher since their primary purpose is seen as educating children not educating teachers.

James B. Conant in his book, The Education of American Teachers, says,

. . . In my judgment, no kind of pre-service program can prepare first-year teachers to operate in the "sink or swim" situation in which they often find themselves. Many local school boards have, I believe, been scandalously remiss in failing to give adequate assistance to new teachers.¹

¹James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963), p. 70.

The new secondary teacher, on whom this study focuses, not only lacks an adequate support system to help make the transition between pre-service education and initial professional employment, but he has other adjustments to make as well. He is evaluated by his peers and supervisors for teacher tenure. He almost always receives a full class load, generally with more than one preparation, and frequently is asked to supervise extra-curricular activities.

Most initiates survive this year, but it need not be as unproductive and traumatic as many teachers say it is. It also need not be lost as a valuable data-providing tool. Teacher educators and in-service planners should be monitoring the perceptions of these people who can still recall their undergraduate education courses and student teaching and, at the same time, offer reactions to their new environment. This is not to infer that they have all the answers, but conversely, inexperience is not synonymous with having no answers, nor is it synonymous with a lack of ability to raise pertinent questions.

Arthur W. Combs, in The Professional Education of Teachers, states that:

1. Good teachers perceive their purpose in teaching as being one of freeing, rather than controlling, students.
2. Good teachers tend to be more concerned with larger rather than smaller issues.
3. Good teachers are more likely to be self-revealing than self-concealing.

4. Good teachers tend to be personally involved rather than alienated.
5. Good teachers are concerned with furthering processes rather than achieving goals.¹

If this is the case, it seems even more imperative that experiences be provided for first-year teachers that help them be more open. It does not follow that permitting graduates to walk into situations where they face inadequate support, full class loads, and evaluation for job tenure--all at once--is conducive to producing open, caring teachers.

Previous studies have indicated that first-year teachers tend to be preoccupied with smaller issues--lesson plans, seating charts, building rules, grading procedures, lunchroom duty, etc. If these concerns can be identified systematically, perhaps school systems, working in cooperation with colleges and universities, can provide support that will help solve some of the smaller issues and help teachers work toward improvement and solution of some of the larger issues.

Why should secondary schools suddenly become concerned about support systems for first-year teachers when historically this has not been the case? There are increasing indications of concern from a number of areas. In 1965 the National Association of Secondary School

¹Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1965), p. 85.

Principals launched a three-year study, an experimental demonstration project, on the induction of beginning teachers. As an arm of the National Education Association, they gave nationwide attention to the adjustments and concerns of beginning teachers.

In Michigan, the State Department of Education has stated in a proposal to the Board of Education that:

Formal training cannot develop a person fully competent to deal with all kinds of classroom conditions. Extended experience with the actualities of the classroom is necessary to round out teaching competence. The first year or two of experience is a very critical time in the life of the new teacher. Those who manage to survive either become competent or inured to the press and demands of teaching.

. . . It is proposed that a state delivery system be instituted responsible for state-level planning and coordination of professional development programs.

. . . Reorganized intermediate school districts, in cooperation with involved local school districts, appropriate local teacher education institutions, and teacher associations shall develop for State Board approval comprehensive plans for professional teacher development to be provided in addition to the required 180 days of student instruction.¹

In 1969 the Michigan Education Association initiated a two-year study of teacher education programs by the MEA Teacher Education Task Force (TETF). The formation of the Force was a loud cry for dramatic improvements in the quality of teacher education. The resolution directing the establishment of this task force indicates the degree of their concern:

¹John W. Porter, "Recommendations Regarding Teacher Certification and Professional Development Issues" (To the State Board of Education of Michigan, Lansing, October, 19, 1971).

Dialogue between the Michigan Education Association and representatives of all teacher preparation institutions and student representatives, within the State of Michigan shall have been initiated . . . and a mutual agreement reached . . . regarding student teacher course content, curriculum, certification of teachers and other negotiable items.

Failure to establish these goals . . . shall result in all MEA teachers refusing student teachers, and notification by local MEA leaders to the school boards through the administration, that such professional action is being taken.¹

While the MEA TETF study focused on the teacher preparation programs in Michigan, it clearly called for assumption of greater responsibility for first year teachers by a number of parties, including the public schools. The Task Force stated:

The preparation of prospective teachers is the joint responsibility of the individual teacher, the professional associations of which he is a member, school administrators, the State Department of Education, and teacher preparation institutions.

The recognition of this responsibility underscores the state as well as local association concerns to spell out process, structure, standards, and goals for the preparation of prospective teachers. There is recognition that continued improvement of the professional teacher is a lifetime activity.

. . . Further it is the view of the Task Force that decisions affecting teacher preparation may take place at three levels: the local school district, the geographic region, or the state. A joint council should be established to bring the several parties together for discussion and decision-making purposes.²

¹Michigan Education Association, "Report: Teacher Education Task Force," Spring Assembly, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

²Michigan Education Association, "Teacher Education Task Force," Official Minutes, October 9, 1969, East Lansing. (Mimeographed.)

From the October 8, 1969, meeting of the MEA Task Force five major areas of concern were suggested. Among them was:

Concern #3. Continuing Teacher Education After Initial Certification.

- A. Where does responsibility lie for in-service training during the first years of teaching?
- B. What kinds of experiences should make up a planned program for continuing certification?
- C. How can student teaching programs and in-service programs for teachers be tied more closely together?
- D. Should teacher education programs be planned as four-year, four-and-3/5-year, or five-year programs?¹

While this was not a major concern of the MEA TETF, it has strong implications for the development of programs for first year teachers and is implied as the next step to a follow-up of their study recommendations.

One of the strongest positions taken by local public schools is the statement drafted by the Oakland County (Michigan) Curriculum Council in May, 1970:

. . . A reality of education today is that factors such as federal aid, social and political forces, teacher organization and bargaining, and the pace of change in a technologically mushrooming society have all contributed a growing disparity between "preparation" and "practice" in public education. We feel that the "cutting edge" of educational change has shifted from colleges of education to field practice in public school districts.

. . . Pre-service education courses are frequently not responsive nor relevant to "real" educational practices because of inappropriate and deficient interaction between public school and college professional staff.

. . . Local school district professional staff should be involved with university staff in developing

¹ Ibid.

a variety of "new" models of teacher preparation programs based upon the foregoing points. Temporary Department of Education approval of such models should then be jointly sought by public school and university officials.

. . . It will be further recommended . . . that if no progress is made . . . all field experience relationships with colleges and universities will be discontinued.¹

A first step toward bridging the training-employment gap appears to be greater cooperation between universities and secondary schools in developing programs for prospective teachers that move sequentially from pre-service to employment and into continuing in-service programs. It then seems axiomatic that one way to help develop such programs is to identify (1) the concerns expressed by first-year teachers, and (2) the kinds of support they perceive as having been helpful, or still needed. Implicit in all of this is the notion that any programs developed jointly by public schools and universities should have built-in renewal processes.

Statement of the Problem

The professional concerns of first-year secondary teachers in selected public schools in Michigan were identified in this pilot study. The concerns expressed were related to characteristics of (1) the first-year teacher, (2) the school, and (3) the community. More

¹Oakland County Curriculum Council, "Position Statement on Student Teaching and Pre-Service Education," May, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

specifically, the study was an investigation of differences in concerns among groups of first-year teachers categorized on the basis of each of the following eleven factors and their respective components:

1. Teaching level
 - a. senior high school only
 - b. junior high school only
 - c. senior high school and junior high school
 - d. elementary and junior high school
2. Satisfaction with present teaching level
 - a. desire no change in teaching level
 - b. desire to add a teaching level
 - c. desire to drop a teaching level
 - d. desire a complete change in teaching level
3. Average class size
 - a. fewer than 25 pupils per class
 - b. 25-29 pupils per class
 - c. 30 or more pupils per class
4. Attendance at in-service meetings, 1971-1972
 - a. attended no in-service meetings
 - b. attended 1 or 2 in-service meetings
 - c. attended 3 or more in-service meetings

5. Enrollment in college graduate courses, 1971-1972
 - a. enrolled in no college courses
 - b. enrolled in 1 college course
 - c. enrolled in 2 or more college courses
6. Average age of building faculty
 - a. under 30 years of age
 - b. 30-39 years of age
 - c. 40-49 years of age
 - d. 50 years of age or older
7. Type of community
 - a. rural
 - b. small town
 - c. city
 - d. suburban
 - e. inner city
8. Racial composition of student population
 - a. 95-100 per cent white
 - b. less than 95 per cent white
9. Age of first-year teacher
 - a. 23 years of age or less
 - b. 24 years of age or more
10. Extent of teaching assignment in major field of study
 - a. teaching primarily in major
 - b. teaching primarily outside major

11. Degree of philosophical congruence between self and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.¹
 - a. low discrepancy (0-2 points)
 - b. moderate discrepancy (3-4 points)
 - c. high discrepancy (5 or more points)

Implications

School administrators and teacher preparation institutions will be able to use the information provided by responding first-year teachers as an aid in planning pre-service and in-service programs. Because first-year teachers are untenured and because the supply of teachers exceeds the demand, they might be reluctant to respond candidly to any inventory of concerns generated from within their school building or system. It is quite possible, then, that a confidential survey conducted by someone from outside the school system might produce more valid results and provide information about areas of concern that would be helpful to school administrators.

On a longer range basis it is hoped that this study will stimulate public schools to claim for first-year teacher in-service programs a portion of the funds that seem forth-coming from the State Department of Education for professional development.

¹Measured by discrepancy score, defined as the summed deviation scores for fellow teachers, administrators, and communities in relation to self-rating.

Definition of Terms

Professional Concerns were matters expressed by the participating first-year teachers as problems, potential problems, or concerns related to their employment, whether or not they received help or desire help. For the purposes of this study, these concerns were identified in the structured portion of the questionnaire under two major categories: (1) Instruction, and (2) Personal Relationships.

The major categories were subdivided to include the following topics:

1. Instruction

- a. Classroom instruction: Dealing with slow learners, individualizing instruction, writing lesson plans, organizing instruction.
- b. Evaluation of students: Constructing tests, interpreting commercially prepared tests, evaluating individualized instruction, interpreting teacher-made tests, implementing the school's grading system.
- c. Instructional materials: Having adequate instructional materials available, knowing where to find instructional materials, operating audio-visual equipment.
- d. Classroom management: Keeping order in classes, handling racially mixed classes,

establishing classroom operating procedures,
keeping records, managing group dynamics.

2. Personal Relationships

- a. Teacher/pupil relationships: Maintaining respect, getting to know students as individuals, having students like the teacher.
- b. Teacher/teacher relationships: Finding supportive colleagues, seeking help from other teachers, getting to know other teachers.
- c. Teacher/principal relationships: Handling administrator observations, getting along with the principal, understanding and following administrative directives.
- d. Teacher/parent relationships: Conducting parent conferences, dealing with parent criticisms.
- e. Professional confidence: Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member, asking questions at faculty meetings, understanding the school's unwritten rules, knowing what the tenure evaluation criteria are, achieving tenure.
- f. Teacher/non-instructional personnel: Dealing with non-instructional personnel--secretaries, custodians, cooks, etc.

First-Year Secondary Teachers were persons holding Michigan provisional secondary teaching certificates who began teaching under contract in the fall of 1971, were completing their first year of teaching and had never been employed to teach before at any level of public school service, K-12. They must have been teaching primarily in grades 7-12.¹

Population

A representative sample of twenty-five school buildings was selected for use in this pilot study. All of the first-year teachers in each building chosen were contacted.

The sample of buildings was selected to insure variety in:

1. Size of student populations within buildings
2. Educational philosophy
3. Racial composition
4. Rate of teacher turnover
5. Age of building
6. Size and type of community

¹Some teachers of special subjects and areas such as art, music, physical education or middle school may have taught classes below the seventh grade level.

Overview of Succeeding Chapters

Literature pertinent to the study will be reviewed in Chapter II. Data collection and analysis procedures will be presented in Chapter III. Findings will be presented in Chapter IV. A summary of the study and its limitations and recommendations for further research will comprise Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Dear Son John: 'A wise son maketh a glad father,' but for a foolish son a dad takes no blame. Whether I shall be glad or have to place the responsibility for your failure on Mother, your experience during the next nine months will determine.

In spite of your good record as a student in Normal Teachers College, you are only half-baked. If ignorance of the real tricks of the teaching trade were a crime, you should be shot at sunrise! Don't think that I am so ungallant as to strike your poor old Alma Mater while she is down. She has followed faithfully the traditional ruts of Psychology, Principles of Education, History of Education, School Hygiene, Methods, School Administration, Educational Psychology, and similar "Sciences"; but what doth it profit a pedagog to know all of these and follow them from his youth, if he fall into a bottomless pit digged by a practical dirt politician? Rah, Rah, Rah, Alma Mater! for filling you with such high powered dope before sending you out into the cold, cold, world. The more of such learning you can hitch to your teaching the better. What you learned will not hurt you; but I want to invite your attention to what you didn't learn.¹

And so a father admonishes his son before his first year of teaching begins. Advice abounds for the initiate. From pedagogs to hard-boiled teachers, formulas,

¹George Miller, Letters from a Hard-Boiled Teacher to His Half-Baked Son (Washington, D.C.: The Daylison Co., 1935), pp. 3-4.

cautions, reminiscences, narrations and dissertations--all offer keys to success or analyses of failure.

There are universal themes running through all the literature about first-year teachers. Examples include:

When I began teaching, I was confident that I was ready to do a reasonably good job. . . . But once hired and assigned to my first position, I was literally abandoned to the isolation of my own classroom. My only guides were textbooks and courses of study.¹

Public school teachers go through a double socialization process. . . . The second phase of the socialization process begins as new teachers enter the "real" teaching world as full-time members of a school organization. Here neophytes may suddenly be confronted with a set of organizational norms and values at variance with those acquired in formal preparation; that is, the internalized ideal images of the teacher role may be in conflict with the norms and values of the school subculture.²

For years too many beginning high school teachers have been left to their own devices, and too many have become lost and crushed in the shuffle.³

I do feel that I've played this whole school year by ear, though. My training didn't prepare me to be a teacher. Oh, I had courses on putting up bulletin boards, my professors gave me advice like, 'Join all three education associations, local, state, and national,' and I have frequently drawn upon information learned in music and reading courses,

¹Vern Archer, Roy Edelfelt, and Herbert Hite, "POINT Points the Way," NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 29.

²Wayne K. Hoy, "Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," The School Review, LXXVI (September, 1968), 315.

³Paul Marashio, "A Proposal for Helping the Beginning Teacher," The Clearing House, XLV (March, 1971), 419.

but for the most part, my methods courses provided no practical information on how to run a classroom.¹

. . . There are many reasons for this exodus of young people from the teaching profession. It would seem that one of the main reasons is that their four years of college training is of such a nature that it does not give them practical experience or knowledge of the problems they will confront as beginning teachers.²

Many other themes occur and reoccur with predictable regularity. Because this study focuses on the identification of professional concerns of secondary teachers, this review of pertinent literature will assume a similar focus. Not only will it provide an historical perspective of teacher concerns, it will provide help in the design of instruments to identify teacher concerns as well as give a framework in which to compare the newly identified concerns. As a means of providing points of reference, this review will also include the suggestions made over the years for the improvement of teacher induction as well as pre-service and in-service programs.

With one exception the literature discussed here will be from the post-1950 era. The one exception is in

¹NEA, "The Beginning Teacher," Today's Education, LX (September, 1971), 55.

²Herbert Wey, "The Difficulties of Student Teachers and Beginning Teachers as a Basis for the Improvement of Teacher Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXVII (February, 1951), 98.

the form of a delightful, and in many ways still-current, book with the unscholarly title of Letters from a Hard-Boiled Teacher to His Half-Baked Son, by George Miller, introducing this chapter.

The bulk of the attention paid to first year teachers is found in periodicals. Books and dissertations vie for second place quantitatively. In the post-1950 era 1963-1968 seems to be the big period for examining first-year teacher problems. The 1965 Conference of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards was the culmination of eight regional conferences conducted during 1963-1964 on the topic, "The Real World of the Beginning Teacher." The report of this conference published in 1966 presents a variety of perspectives on the "real world of teaching."

The National Association of Secondary School Principals devoted 155 pages of its October, 1968 Bulletin to the beginning teacher. This was part of the coverage given to their three-year Project on the Induction of Beginning Teachers.

The October 1965 issue of the NEA Journal (now Today's Education) devoted one full section of four articles to the beginning teacher.

These reports provided broad national coverage for a frequently recurring issue. Preceding these articles and studies, however, was the largest and most comprehensive

national study done of first-year teachers. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare surveyed new teachers in the public schools during 1956-1957. Their findings, published in the book, Beginning Teacher, provide a vast array of data about neophytes, their backgrounds, their preparation for teaching, economic status, home and community situation, occupational values, satisfaction with teaching (broadly defined), and career commitment. Professional concerns, however, were not isolated or defined.

One large work that studied the whole profession--including a section on new teachers--was Huggett and Stinnett's Professional Problems of Teachers. The unit on first-year teacher problems, however, dealt with job considerations, ethics, salary, application forms, personal freedoms, living conditions, and similar issues as opposed to actual in-the-classroom concerns.¹

Eye and Lane in their book also dealt with teacher problems, again from the job application and pre-service perspective, although they did cover such topics as "The Cruel Treatment of Newcomers," where

¹Glen Eye and Willard Lane, The New Teacher Comes to School (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1956), p. 66.

There has been an inclination for the receiving group to place full responsibility upon the newcomer to measure up to its expectations. . . . The newcomer knew that he was being judged, but he did not know the measures being applied.¹

"Disparities in Teaching Loads, Equipment, and Room Assignments," and "Traditions and Hidden Policy" were also treated. A substantial portion of this text dealt with a school's induction responsibilities, not only in completely informing the teacher before he is hired, but following up with help and, just as important, "stimulating the community to identify its obligations in the induction of new teachers and fulfill its appropriate function."²

Finally, among the books dealing with first-year teachers was So You Want to Be a Teacher. In its chapter, "Guide Posts for Your First Job," readers were advised about teaching in a rural school, a small town, and a city, about self-analysis, flexibility, and concern with students' problems along with other hints.³

All of these works were written in eras when there was a tremendous teacher shortage. It seems ironic that when the potential average was so great, teachers

¹Glen Eye and Willard Lane, The New Teacher Comes to School (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1956), p. 66.

²Ibid., p. 186.

³Paul Gelinas, So You Want to Be a Teacher (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 106-28.

were being told to roll with the punches and be prepared for the "poor deals" first-year teachers frequently received. The literature revealed a tendency on the part of authors to generalize about teacher problems and their solutions.

At the other end of the spectrum several studies sharply reversed this trend. Frank T. Lane, in his doctoral study, followed 106 beginning teachers during their first semester with periodic tabulations of their problems. These teachers "report a plurality of causes for more than two-thirds of their problems . . . college preparation is the primary cause of problems within three major categories for which beginners express the greatest concern ('Non-Disciplinary Provision for Children,' 'Methods of Instruction, and Control, i.e., Discipline')." ¹

" . . . (1) pressure of planning, (2) marking, (3) clerical work, (4) controlling classes, (5) time, and (6) finances" were listed as the "components comprising pressure" by first-year secondary intern teachers studied by H. Bernard Miller. ² He indicated that:

¹Frank T. Lane, "A Study of the Professional Problems Recognized by Beginning Teachers and Their Implications for a Program of Teacher Education (at State University of New York Teachers College at Brockport) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of New York at Stonybrook, 1954).

²H. Bernard Miller, "An Analysis of Empirically Selected Components of Pressure, Difficulty and Satisfaction Reported by Beginning Secondary School Intern

Planning was ranked both the most frequent and strongest source of pressure. Interns reported difficulty in (1) dealing with student misbehavior, (2) finding ways to vary lessons, (3) going slowly and simply enough for their students, (4) evaluating student performance, and (5) analyzing aspects of their teaching performance.¹

One hundred graduates of East Texas State University were surveyed extensively by Thomas Allan Clinton in 1965 to identify their problems during the first year of teaching. The survey covered the following areas (as determined by Clinton's extensive pre-study investigation):

1. School organization and relations--philosophy of the school, objectives of the school, orientation and assignment, curriculum, physical facilities, classroom management, public relations, guidance activities, interpersonal communications, administrative supervision, schedule;
2. Instructional activities--planning, materials and resources, individual planning, materials and resources, individual differences, motivation, methods and techniques, evaluation of teaching-learning process (pupil progress, testing, grades), knowledge of subject matter;
3. Discipline;
4. Non-instructional activities;
5. Teacher relationships--teacher-board of education, teacher-superintendent-teacher-principal, teacher-staff, teacher-pupil, teacher-parent, teacher-community;
6. Professional development--membership and activities, professional reading, future plans, teacher morale, suggestions for improving teacher education programs.²

Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1970).

¹Ibid.

²Thomas Allan Clinton, "Beginning Teachers' Problems: A Study of Problems Encountered by One

In the first Ohio State University follow-up study to include analysis of beginning secondary teachers' problems, Margaret Vesey contacted fifty-seven teachers to determine "the problems, satisfactions, adequacy of preparation and effectiveness of beginning teachers." She found that: "(1) The beginning teacher felt least secure in (a) meeting individual differences, (b) handling discipline, and (c) using a variety of teaching methods."¹

Edward Stone identified the most important problems of junior and senior high school teachers (in decreasing order of frequency) as:

1. Motivating adolescents to achieve to their capacity;
2. Handling discipline problems in the classroom;
3. Teaching retarded or slower classes;
4. Establishing rapport with pupils while still maintaining authority;
5. Accepting the erratic behavior and unpredictable emotional reactions peculiar to the adolescent;
6. Finding time to do everything expected;
7. Understanding what should be taught;
8. Evaluating and reporting pupil achievement on report cards;
9. Finding time for clerical activities;
10. Finding time for planning and preparation;
11. Being aware of the usual patterns of classroom management used in the school.²

Hundred Graduates of East Texas State University and the Functional Relationship Between These Problems and the Teacher Education Program" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas University, 1965).

¹Margaret Alice Vesey, "A Field Follow-Up Study of Beginning Secondary School Teachers" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1957).

²Edward H. Stone, "Personal and Professional Problems Recognized by Beginning Junior and Senior High School Teachers and the Relationship of the Number of These Problems to Personal Characteristics, Professional Preparation, Teaching Assignment and Career Plans" (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1963).

An interesting note is that new junior high school teachers experienced four problems with significantly greater frequency than did senior high school teachers. The problems were:

1. Accepting the erratic behavior and unpredictable emotional reactions peculiar to the adolescent;
2. Accepting the adolescent's intense loyalty to peers and his drive for emancipation from adults;
3. Establishing rapport with pupils while still maintaining authority;
4. Handling discipline problems in the classroom.¹

As the title suggests, Gaylord Eugene Moller's "A Comprehensive Study of the Problems of Beginning Teachers in Selected Large Senior High Schools" is the most comprehensive of the studies reported in this chapter.

(1) Motivating students to satisfactory achievement was by far the most frequently reported beginning teacher problem. (a) Activities pertaining to classroom instruction (student motivation, grading, meeting individual differences, discipline, working with low-ability students, finding a satisfactory speed for covering course material, making satisfactory tests, lack of teaching creativity, tendency to "talk over students' heads") were the most serious problems reported.²

Among his other findings,

Beginning female teachers reported more problems than beginning male teachers. . . . Fellow teachers provided more help for new teachers than any other

¹Ibid.

²Gaylord Eugene Moller, "A Comprehensive Study of the Problems of Beginning Teachers in Selected Large Senior High Schools" (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1968).

source. . . . Novice teachers wanted more supervisory help than they were receiving.¹

Between the books which tended to over-generalize about teacher concerns and dissertations which tended to go directly to the source for identifying specific professional problems lay a large body of literature, mainly periodical, which covered the range between. Needless to say, not all books tended to over-generalize and not all dissertations were surveys of specific problems. Thus, while the remaining literature generally fell between, there was still overlap at both ends. The range of ideas and suggestions in the periodical literature was as varied as the authors.

John Stout, on the one hand listed the "Deficiencies of Beginning Teachers." Thomas Butler on the other hand, listed the "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers." Samples of their remarks were:

Outstanding among basic weaknesses of beginning teachers is their lack of understanding of the children to be taught. . . . Don't recognize individual differences, they expect too much of their pupils, don't expect enough of their students, don't understand children.²

An analysis of . . . replies reveals that the most satisfied teachers listed twenty-seven positive statements concerning their administrators and supervisors and only two negative statements. . . . Samples of the positive replies from satisfied teachers were:

¹Ibid.

²John B. Stout, "Deficiencies of Beginning Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, III (March, 1952), 44.

'I have supervisors who are broad-minded, understanding, and want to help,' and 'teachers are supported by administrators.'¹

Another author pleading the beginning teachers' exclaimed:

With all the frustrations and obstacles we place in the path of beginning teachers, it is a minor miracle that any remain in the profession. . . . Until we do everything we possibly can really to aid beginning teachers, many more will become demoralized and leave the profession. American education can ill afford such a tragic waste.²

Public schools were under fire once more from Wilbur Yauch who, even in an era of great teacher shortage, pleaded for greater concern for teacher induction:

It is blithely assumed that the teachers college will adequately take care of all aspects of the professional preparation for teaching. . . . The only hopeful solution to this apparent dilemma is for the teacher education institution to concentrate on the general preparation of teachers, and then to work cooperatively with specific school systems in their efforts to orient new teachers.³

Again motivated by a period of critical teacher shortage, the case for follow-through with first-year teachers was presented by Robert Strickler who cited the NEA:

¹Thomas Butler, "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House, XXXVI (September, 1961), 11-13.

²Carl O. Olson, Jr., "Let's Stop Demoralizing Beginning Teachers," Peabody Education Journal, XLVI (July, 1968), 23.

³Wilbur A. Yauch, "Helping the New Teacher to Succeed," Educational Forum, XX (November, 1955), 37-38.

One of the most effective ways to meet the teacher shortage is to decrease the annual demand for replacement of the teachers who quit. . . . In truth, increased efforts to retain good teachers can strike a telling blow at the teacher shortage.¹

In descending order of difficulty, (1) discipline, (2) relations with parents, (3) methods of teaching, (4) evaluation, (5) planning, (6) materials and resources, and (7) classroom routines were problems listed by seventy-eight teachers from the 1960 Queens College class studied by Dropkin and Taylor. They also reported that a city-suburban difference appeared in the areas of discipline, materials and resources, and classroom routines. City teachers felt that their problems were more severe in these areas than did suburban teachers.²

A continuing interest in beginning teachers has been expressed in both book and periodical by Willard Abraham. In "How Are Your New Teachers Doing Now?" he asked schools to keep in touch with first-year teachers throughout the year, especially after the "glow has begun to wear off a bit, and she has to have help in

¹Robert W. Strickler, "Follow-Through With the First-Year Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (January, 1959), 1.

²Stanley Dropkin and Marvin Taylor, "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers and Related Factors," Journal of Teacher Education, XIV (December, 1963), 389.

recognizing that thousands of others have problems similar to those she is facing."¹

Nineteen factors were identified by two Northern Illinois University staff members as factors influential in the resignation of first-year teachers. In this 1963 study they listed:

(1) Salary, (2) teaching loads, (3) assignments beyond regular classroom teaching, (4) inadequate supervision, (5) poor assignments given to first-year teachers, (6) discipline problems are often placed in the classes of beginning teachers, (7) pressure groups, (8) poor mental hygiene, (9) marriage, (10) inadequate preparation of major or minor field of study or knowledge of subject, (11) inability to handle classes, (12) unfair teacher evaluation, (13) inadequate facilities, (14) poor faculty relationships, (15) lack of opportunity to develop new ideas, (16) routine clerical duties, (17) competition between schools and industry for trained personnel, (18) poor school boards, (19) health.²

Wallace Morris, in a 1951 study of 136 newly inducted teachers measured the relative difficulty of the twenty-five problems most frequently encountered. Among this group, the top ten listed in descending order of difficulty were:

(1) problem of gaining a clear and workable understanding of the school's philosophy and objectives, (2) conditions of work--inadequate materials, (3) demands for teacher's time and energy after school hours, (4) learning administrative routines, reports and procedures, (5) inadequate salary--not able to

¹Willard Abraham, "How Are Your New Teachers Doing Now?" Educational Leadership, XI (February, 1954), 311-15.

²Robert H. Nelson and Michael Thompson. "Why Teachers Quit," The Clearing House, XXXVII (April, 1963), 467-72.

meet community standards of living, (6) disciplinary problems, (7) conditions of work--inadequate building facilities, (8) teacher-class load, (9) gaining an understanding of the school's system of evaluating pupil achievement, (10) problem of securing pleasant living accommodations.¹

What were beginning teachers saying?

I would say the teacher shouldn't smile until after he's midway through the second semester. I just began to get into the swing of things about March. I felt I had everything under control by then and that I would make it by June.²

I found the other staff a great help. . . . As it was I found myself regularly discussing my problems with the other teachers.³

If I'd been able to read Up the Down Staircase a year ago, before I began my first year of teaching, my class probably never would have had a certain vocabulary drill and I might have been spared a few bad moments.⁴

Spend as much time in a classroom as possible before you take over your own class and collect as much resource material as you can.⁵

¹Wallace Morris, "Problems Experienced by 136 Teachers During Their Induction Into Service," North Central Association Quarterly, XXV (January, 1951), 292.

²"The Beginning Teacher," Today's Education, LX (September, 1971), 57.

³Simon Jenkins, "Reflections on that First Year: Interviews," Times Educational Supplement, 2782 (September, 1968), 448.

⁴Robert St. Germain, "I Was an Innocent in the Classroom," NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 21.

⁵"The Beginning Teacher," Today's Education, LX (September, 1971), 59. (Statement by interviewee, Rosa Lee, Colorado.)

To new teachers I would say that all book learning and all those courses don't amount to a thing unless you have the soul, or the human understanding to deal with children. Don't think just because you've got that B.S. or M.S. or whatever that you've got it made. Remember you're working with human beings.¹

What has been done to help? As far back as 1954, Curtis E. Nash described efforts to help first-year teachers:

. . . the college has in each of the past two years sponsored a one-day, on-campus conference for first-year teachers. . . . According to . . . reports and evaluation sheets received from the teachers, faculty, members, and school administrators, these conferences have been very successful.²

In Hawaii a fifth-year teacher internship was begun in 1966 where the education majors were recognized as regular employees of the Department of Education rather than as college students. The primary aim of the program was to assist the beginning teacher in his professional and personal growth as he entered the profession.³ This project assumed that the transition from student to teacher is a critical one and should be met with adequate resources to bridge the gap between theory and practice. In a similar spirit, the Project on the Induction of

¹Ibid.

²Curtis E. Nash, "A Conference for First-Year Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, V (December, 1954), 321.

³Daniel S. Noda, "Beginning Teacher Development in Hawaii," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 63.

Beginning Teachers (sponsored by the NASSP and mentioned earlier in this chapter) attempted to give new teachers some "extra time and extra help so that they might learn more effectively those things about teaching and the school that can be learned only on the job."¹ First-year teachers in the three schools selected for the project had their teaching load reduced by one class period. A cooperating teacher (who also had a similarly reduced classload) was selected to advise the "neophyte." Assistance in finding instructional material was provided, as well as information about the community, school body and school policies.²

New York State tackled first-year teacher problems by training a master teacher to aid these fledglings in a team situation. Master teachers were trained in a six-week summer workshop. This program was unique from all the others discussed in this chapter because it was "quasi-therapeutic in nature"; that is it provided a climate of trust among a team of people where problems could be discussed in a setting where "without fear" was the key

¹Patricia Swanson, "A Time to Teach--and A Time to Learn," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 63.

²Ibid.

phrase.¹ No confidences were violated and no administrators were present.

In Salem, New Hampshire, a program to help beginning teachers was developed that consisted of a four-part in-service training program: (1) internship, (2) interaction analysis, (3) seminars, (4) observations. According to teacher reports the project was extremely helpful.²

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) of the National Education Association (NEA) and the Washington Education Association (WEA) shared responsibility for the genesis of POINT--Project for the Orientation and Induction of New Teachers. This project was designed on the premises

. . . that teacher education institutions need to extend their responsibility into the beginning years of teaching, that beginning teachers should be inducted gradually into teaching and should, therefore, carry lighter teaching loads, that they should have expert supervision and guidance, that they should be introduced and exposed to the work of their professional associations and learned societies and that they should be helped to analyze and evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses.³

¹Cecelia McGinnis, "The Beginning Teacher Project in New York State," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 44-48.

²Paul Marashio, "A Proposal for Helping Beginning Teachers," The Clearing House, XLV (March, 1971), 419-21.

³Vern Archer, Roy Edelfelt, and Herbert Hite, "POINT Points the Way," NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 29-30.

POINT included numerous sub-projects designed to explore ways to help the new teacher. These were developed and approved in such a way that there was a strong evaluation section built into each proposal.

In 1966, the Cleveland public schools initiated a program in their English departments to help new teachers adjust, particularly at the junior high level. Two regular classroom teachers were released to provide help. One of these teachers, the author of a Clearing House article describing the program, stated that

. . . as my position became more clearly defined and as I became a more familiar figure in the schools, rapport seemed to be more easily maintained. I was able to devote time to assisting teachers in their planning and thereby supplement or reinforce the guidance of their department chairmen.¹

Anthony Mangione reported that "the beginning teacher needs help in lesson planning; in establishing and in maintaining classroom rapport and management; in selecting and in using materials; in evaluating his own performance and his pupils', in understanding the community."² He then succinctly offered advice in each of these areas.

¹Ronald J. Goodrich, "Advisory Teacher Program Benefits Beginning Teachers," The Clearing House, XLIV (September, 1969), 12-15.

²Anthony Roy Mangione, "Advice for Beginning Teacher," The Clearing House, XLIV (September, 1969), 41-42.

Summary

An historical perspective of professional concerns of first-year teachers has been the focus of this chapter. These concerns were seen through the eyes of professional educators--university faculty and public school administrators--as well as first-hand through the narrations and experiences of first-year teachers themselves.

Chronologically examined professional concerns changed in priority as the years passed and school climates changed. In addition there were increasing pleas for programs that work--programs that make a difference for the new teacher.

Conant suggested that in addition to the university's responsibility,

. . . during the initial probationary period, local school boards should take specific steps to provide the new teacher with every possible help in the form of (a) limited teaching responsibility; (b) aid in gathering instructional materials; (c) advice of experienced teachers whose own load is reduced so that they can work with the new teacher in his own classroom; (3) shifting to more experienced teachers those pupils who create problems beyond the ability of the novice to handle effectively; and (e) specialized instruction concerning the characteristics of the community, the neighborhood, and the students he is likely to encounter.¹

¹James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), pp. 70-71.

This, perhaps more than any other statement has set the tone and frequently, the focus, for induction programs in public schools. It also provided incentives for those who wished to continue studying the first-year teacher as a means not only to give attention to an important facet of the education of the American teacher, but to provide continuing feedback for pre-service and in-service programs.

A significant omission was apparent in the literature. Despite repeated studies, recurring concerns and recommended solutions, none of the studies proposed ways to build in processes that would help educators continually refine and up-date the data they have regarding first-year teacher concerns.

There are a number of ways that this study differed from those reviewed earlier in the chapter as well. The Clinton study,¹ for example, included a very detailed survey of student problems that was similar to this research. A significant difference lay, however, in the inclusion in the present study of a section of open-ended questions as well as a measure of degrees of concern both at the beginning of the year and at the end. Moller's study showed that fellow teachers provided more help for new teachers than any other source,² but it did not list

¹Clinton, op. cit.

²Moller, op. cit.

in detail other sources and their ratings for helpfulness. This information is of particular value to in-service and pre-service planners who need to marshal the most effective resources possible to help prospective and newly-inducted teachers.

Many of the studies (e.g., Frank T. Lane and Thomas Allan Clinton)¹ identified concerns which were in turn used to determine implications for teacher education at a particular university. This study, however, assumed a community focus rather than a university focus. It attempted to broaden the examination of concerns to include their relationship to selected variables such as racial composition of school population, community philosophy, average age of building faculty, and satisfaction with teaching level.

The differences in concerns among teachers are the result of the interaction of a number of variables, thus there is value in considering as broad a range of possible influences as possible. While cause and effect relationships cannot be defined, the data generated provides a means of examining the ranges of differences that exist with implications for a systems approach to studying concerns.

¹Lane and Clinton, op. cit.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to identify the professional concerns of first-year secondary teachers in selected public schools in Michigan and to relate these concerns to a number of variables. The intent of this chapter is to describe how the variables were selected, how the concerns were identified, how the instruments to identify them were developed and administered, how the sample schools were chosen, and how the data collected are to be analyzed.

Walter Borg says that the "purpose of descriptive research in education is to tell 'what is.'" He adds that

. . . although the major function of descriptive studies in education will probably always be directed to "what is," many surveys do go further. . . . Surveys . . . can obtain information not only about strengths and weaknesses of the current curriculum [for example], but can also elicit recommendations for change. Many of the more recent surveys give us both a description of current status and a source of ideas for change and improvement.¹

¹Walter Borg, Educational Research (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963), p. 203.

It was the purpose of this study to tell "what is" as the first step toward determining "what is good" and "what is better."

Identification of Variables

The instrument developed to gather information for this study has four major parts. The objectives were:

1. To gather demographic and descriptive information about the respondents;
2. To determine the degree of concern teachers felt about fifty-one potential problem areas at the beginning of the school year and at the end of the school year;
3. To determine those sources which were most helpful to the first-year teachers;
4. To seek:
 - a. advice for new teachers,
 - b. ways to help these teachers,
 - c. recommendations for improving teacher education courses, and
 - d. concerns that may not have been included elsewhere in the questionnaire.

A review of the literature and interviews with teachers, administrators, researchers, and university staff all played a role in defining those variables to

be used. In addition, other variables not used in the study were included for use in future supplemental studies.

The variables used were:

1. Demographic and descriptive information about the respondents:
 - a. grade(s) taught
 - b. subject(s) taught
 - c. grade(s) respondent would choose to teach
 - d. number of classes taught in major field
 - e. number of classes taught in minor field
 - f. number of daily class preparations
 - g. number of extra-curricular responsibilities
 - h. number of in-service programs offered
 - i. number of in-service programs attended
 - j. number of college courses taken this year
 - k. grade levels taught in respondent's building
 - l. average age of faculty in building
 - m. certification status (secondary provisional)
 - n. degree(s) held
 - o. major(s) and minor(s)
 - p. type of community
 - q. racial composition of school
 - r. age of building

- s. educational philosophies
 - 1. respondent (self)
 - 2. administration
 - 3. fellow teachers
 - 4. community
- t. sex of respondent
- u. age of respondent
- 2. The extent to which first-year teachers perceived problems at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year in these areas:
 - a. instruction
 - 1. classroom instruction
 - 2. evaluation of students
 - 3. instructional materials
 - 4. classroom management
 - b. personal relationships
 - 1. teacher/pupil relationships
 - 2. teacher/teacher relationships
 - 3. teacher/principal relationships
 - 4. teacher/parent relationships
 - 5. professional confidence
 - 6. non-instructional personnel
- 3. Identification of sources which were helpful in the areas of:
 - a. classroom management
 - b. grading students

- c. planning for instruction
 - d. adjusting to the job
 - e. dealing with parents
 - f. teaching subject area
 - g. finding instructional materials
4. Identification of the ways teachers completing their first-year in the classroom would help prospective first-year teachers:
- a. if they could give new teachers advice before they entered the classroom
 - b. if they were principals
 - c. if they could change teacher education courses
 - d. by listing other concerns not covered in the questionnaire.

Design of the Instrument

The variables of interest, including the professional concerns of teachers, were identified by means of a four-part, seven-page questionnaire (see Appendix A). The first three parts comprised the structured portion of the instrument. The fourth part consisted of four open-ended questions.

One of the major questions that had to be resolved in the instrument design was how to cover a broad range of concerns without "leading" the respondent. One could conclude that an open-ended, "essay-type" questionnaire would be best. On the other hand, with this

type of approach, one could end up with little or nothing from respondents who could not think of any problems at the moment, or who would think of them long after the questionnaire had been completed. The researcher would also have an enormously difficult, if not impossible, task of trying to classify or standardize responses to permit comparison and analysis. The mechanics alone of having to write lengthy responses might be a serious handicap. It was decided to combine tactics and provide a structured portion in which a respondent could react to a pre-determined series of items which would constitute the major focus of the study as well as to open-ended items which would provide a great deal of latitude and allow for individual differences. This would insure uniform coverage of a number of important issues, permit systematic analysis of data, yet not completely box in the respondent.

Once this was decided, the next question became: What topics should be included in the structured portion of the questionnaire? And, of course, what should the open-ended questions be? Building the content and format of the questionnaire became a seven-step process:

1. Reviewing the literature;
2. Interviewing ten second-year teachers;
3. Writing the first draft of the instrument;
4. Presenting the rough draft to five experienced teachers and five administrators for reaction;

5. Revising the rough draft;
6. Presenting the revision to the following groups:
 - a. five first-year teachers,
 - b. a panel of university staff from three areas:
 1. curriculum,
 2. secondary education,
 3. research;
7. Developing the final copy of the questionnaire.

The review of literature provided the "what has been" as the logical antecedent in the search for "what is." It identified recurring themes that warranted inclusion in the present study. It also showed that although a theme reoccurred it did not necessarily retain the same degree of importance. Salary as a concern, for example, diminished as a concern, while classroom control, increased as a concern through the years.

Interviews with second-year teachers were the next step. While these teachers had lost much of the detail of their first year, they retained enough of a global perspective to be able to share some of the major concerns that they had felt.

The experienced teachers and administrators provided breadth and depth through their very pertinent

questions and criticism. Much redundancy was avoided because of their helpful reactions. The language of several areas was simplified as well.

First-year teachers reacted favorably; they added no concerns, but did encourage revision of the directions to Part II, the identification of concerns. Their responses indicated that the instrument was eliciting the information sought. None of the "trial run" first-year teachers was used in the final study.

Selection and Description of Respondents

First-year teachers were the subjects studied in this research. In defining the sample, a representative sampling process was chosen in an attempt to insure as varied a sample as possible. The sample was actually based on the selection of buildings. Then, all the first-year teachers in each building were contacted.

The geographic areas from which the buildings would be selected were named first. One was central, western Michigan; the other was the central and western upper peninsula of Michigan. Staff members from area university education departments who were familiar with the schools were asked to identify schools which would provide a variety of characteristics including:

1. Size of student populations within buildings,
2. Educational philosophy,
3. Racial composition,
4. Rate of teacher turnover,
5. Age of building,
6. Size and type of community.

From the systems suggested, twenty-five buildings were chosen. Five of the buildings had no first-year teachers. Of seventy-six teachers contacted, sixty-five responded (a return rate of 85 per cent). There were fifty-six usable responses; this represented 73 per cent of those contacted and 86 per cent of those returned.

An examination of the demographic data about the respondents indicated that a substantial majority of them received their degrees and certificates in 1971, and that two held masters degrees. Fifty-one of these first-year teachers graduated from colleges or universities in Michigan (see Table 1).

A majority of the teachers whose responses were used in the study were twenty-three years of age or younger. There was almost equal representation of males and females (see Table 2).

The responding teachers were asked to indicate their educational philosophies and then indicate what they perceived to be the educational philosophies of their

TABLE 1.--Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents:
Certification, Degrees and Granting Institution.

Highest Degree (N = 56)	
Bachelor's Degree	54
Master's Degree	2
Date of Secondary Provisional Certificate (N = 56)	
1971	49
1970	4
1969	1
1968	.
1967	2
Date of College Degree (N = 55)	
1971	50
1970	2
1969	3
1968	.
1967	.
Institution From Which Degree Granted (N = 56)	
Michigan Public Colleges	51
Michigan Private Colleges	3
Out-of-State Colleges	2

TABLE 2.--Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents:
Age and Sex.

Ages of Respondents			
Age	First-Year Teachers*	Age	First-Year Teachers*
22	3	31	1
23	25	32	0
24	9	33	1
25	7	34	0
26	2	35	0
27	1	36	0
28	3	37	1
29	2	38	
30	0	39	
Sex of Respondents			
Male	24		
Female	31		
Total	55		

*One person did not give age.

fellow teachers, administrators, and communities on a continuum from (1) "Very Conservative" to (5) "Very Liberal." The teachers rated themselves as more liberal than their fellow teachers, administrators, and communities (see Table 3).

TABLE 3.--Characteristics of First-Year Respondents:
Educational Philosophies of First-Year Teachers,
Their Fellow Teachers, Administrators, and
Communities.

	Educational Philosophy					Total N	Mean	Standard Deviation
	Very Conservative			Very Liberal				
	1	2	3	4	5			
Self	0	9	19	23	5	56	3.43	.8709
Administration	9	16	19	12	0	56	2.61	1.0032
Fellow Teachers	0	12	32	12	0	56	3.00	.6606
Community	16	19	17	4	0	56	2.16	.9298
Total	25	56	87	51	5			

Teachers were asked to indicate the grade level(s) they had been assigned to teach (senior high, junior high, junior high/senior high, junior high/elementary) and then indicate the grade level(s) they would choose to teach. Teachers showed a preference for teaching senior high over junior high and junior high/senior high (see Table 4).

TABLE 4.--Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents:
Levels Now Taught and Levels Teachers Would
Choose to Teach.

Level	Number Teaching	Number Choosing to Teach
Senior High	14	24
Junior High	37	18
Senior High/Junior High	4	12
Elementary/Junior High	1	1
Total	56	55

Fifteen subject matter areas were taught by the respondents. The largest numbers of them taught English, science, social studies, and math, in descending order (see Table 5).

Administration of the Questionnaire

The administration of a questionnaire becomes a series of tactical decisions including:

1. Deciding on the most effective time for administering the study,
2. Securing permission from the public schools,
3. Designing administration procedures,
4. Conducting the follow-up.

The decision was made to administer the questionnaire during the third and fourth weeks preceding the end of the school year to permit the greatest portion of

TABLE 5.--Characteristics of First-Year Teacher Respondents:
Subjects Taught.

Subject	Number of Persons Teaching*
Art	1
Business Education	3
English	16
Foreign Language	2
Home Economics	6
Industrial Arts	5
Journalism	2
Math	8
Music	2
Physical Education	6
Reading	4
Science	10
Social Studies	9
Special Education	1
Speech	2

*Some teachers are counted more than once because they teach more than one subject.

the beginner's first year to elapse without interfering with the myriad tasks that come with the conclusion of school. There were a number of problems inherent in this decision. Because this is such a busy time in the school year, any extra paper work could irritate administrators and teachers could misplace or put off a mailed questionnaire. The second decision was to have the questionnaires personally delivered during the teacher's prep hour or before or after school. This would eliminate extra work for administrators and say to teachers, "This study is important enough to the researcher to warrant a personal contact requesting your help." At the same time, the decision was made not to identify in any way the respondent or the building or the school system. This decision posed problems for the development of a follow-up procedure; the solution is discussed later in the chapter.

A letter (Appendix B) was sent to the superintendents of the selected school districts explaining the study and requesting their cooperation. A follow-up phone call was made to obtain approval. At the same time dates were set when the schools would be contacted.

Three university students were hired and trained (Appendix C) to distribute the questionnaires. Each teacher received a packet of materials that included:

1. An explanatory letter to first-year teachers (Appendix D).
2. A questionnaire (Appendix A).
3. A stamped-addressed envelope in which to return the questionnaire.
4. A postcard (Appendix E) to mail back separately.

The postcard served a two-fold purpose. It enabled the researcher to retain a follow-up procedure and still preserve the anonymity of the respondent. (The card had the respondent's name which could be checked off on the original contact list, but did not link him to a particular questionnaire in any way). The card offered the respondents the opportunity of requesting a copy of the study. This was a motivational device to provide a reward for responding. The trial of the instrument with first-year teachers before its final construction had verified that teachers would be very interested in the results.

Data Analysis Procedures and Hypotheses to be Tested

Data from the returned questionnaires were coded, quality checked, transferred to data processing cards, and verified. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was computed with each of eleven independent variables for the professional concerns of teachers. The independent variables selected were:

1. Teaching level
 - a. senior high school only
 - b. junior high school only
 - c. senior high school and junior high school
 - d. elementary and junior high school.
2. Satisfaction with present teaching level
 - a. desire no change in teaching level
 - b. desire to add a teaching level
 - c. desire to drop a teaching level
 - d. desire a complete change in teaching level
3. Average class size
 - a. fewer than 25 pupils per class
 - b. 25-29 pupils per class
 - c. 30 or more pupils per class
4. Attendance at in-service meetings, 1971-1972
 - a. attended no in-service meetings
 - b. attended 1 or 2 in-service meetings
 - c. attended 3 or more in-service meetings
5. Enrollment in college graduate courses, 1971-1972
 - a. enrolled in no college courses
 - b. enrolled in 1 college course
 - c. enrolled in 2 or more college courses
6. Average age of building faculty
 - a. under 30 years of age
 - b. 30-39 years of age

- c. 40-49 years of age
 - d. 50 years of age or older
7. Type of community
 - a. rural
 - b. small town
 - c. city
 - d. suburban
 - e. inner city
 8. Racial composition of student population
 - a. 95-100 per cent white
 - b. less than 95 per cent white
 9. Age of the first-year teacher
 - a. 23 years of age or less
 - b. 24 years of age or more
 10. Extent of teaching assignment in major field of study
 - a. teaching primarily in major
 - b. teaching primarily outside major
 11. Degree of philosophical congruence between self and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.
 - a. low discrepancy (0-2 points)
 - b. moderate discrepancy (3-4 points)
 - c. high discrepancy (5 or more points)

The null hypotheses to be tested at the .05 level of significance were:

- Hypothesis 1: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers at the various teaching levels.
- Hypothesis 2: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying degrees of satisfaction with their first-year teaching level.
- Hypothesis 3: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying average class sizes.
- Hypothesis 4: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying frequencies of attendance at in-service meetings.
- Hypothesis 5: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying frequencies of enrollment in graduate college courses.
- Hypothesis 6: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers in buildings with varying average faculty ages.
- Hypothesis 7: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers employed in varying types of communities.

Hypothesis 8: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers in schools with varying racial compositions.

Hypothesis 9: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers of varying age.

Hypothesis 10: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers teaching to varying extents in their major fields of study.

Hypothesis 11: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying degrees of philosophical congruence between themselves and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The research findings reported in this chapter fall into two major areas: (1) the expressed professional concerns of first-year teachers, and (2) the differences in concerns among groups of first-year teachers categorized on the basis of eleven factors (independent variables). Also included is a brief discussion of the responses to the open-ended questions at the end of the instrument as they relate to the major findings of the study and as they have implications for research and program implementation.

Differences in Concerns Among Groups First-Year Teachers

The differences in expressed professional concerns among groups of first-year secondary teachers categorized on the basis of eleven factors are presented in this part of Chapter IV. Each of the eleven variables which was studied was stated in operational terms for hypothesis testing.

For the purposes of this section, "expressed professional concerns" means "expressed professional concerns in the areas of instruction and personal relationships."

The concerns were originally organized on the basis of these two areas (Instruction and Personal Relationships): these in turn were divided into ten sub-topics. These sub-topics are listed below:

A. Instruction

1. classroom instruction
2. evaluation of students
3. instructional materials
4. classroom management

B. Personal Relationships

1. teacher/pupil relationships
2. teacher/teacher relationships
3. teacher/principal relationships
4. teacher/parent relationships
5. professional confidence
6. non-instructional personnel

The differences occurring between these concerns and the eleven independent variables chosen were examined by means of a one-way multivariate analysis of variance for each of the hypotheses postulated. A .05 alpha level of significance was selected as the critical value in the interpretation of the findings.

These differences are summarized in Table 6 and then reviewed briefly in the succeeding pages. Appendix F contains more detailed information about the univariate dimensions of the multivariate analyses of variance of the eleven variables.

There were two basic approaches used to examine the professional concerns of first-year teachers. The first examined differences in professional concerns that occurred among groups of teachers contrasted on the basis of each of eleven independent variables. These differences were examined by means of a series of one-way multivariate analyses of variance. The second approach described the average degrees of concern for each of fifty-one potential problem areas. The closer the average degrees of concern or cell means were to 1.0, the greater the degree of concern; the closer the cell means were to 3.0, the lesser the degree of concern. While the multivariate analyses did not all show statistically significant differences in concerns among groups of teachers, there still may have been differences in the average degrees of concern which reflected trends meriting consideration.

TABLE 6.--Summary of Multivariate Analyses of Variance for the Eleven Independent Variables.

Independent Variable	Multivariate F-Ratio	Degrees of Freedom	P Less Than ^a	Results
Teaching Level	1.8613	6 & 102.000	0.0947	No Significant Differences
Satisfaction With Present Teaching Level	1.4293	6 & 102.00	0.2107	No Significant Differences
Average Class Size	0.1621	4 & 104.00	0.9571	No Significant Differences
Attendance at In-Service	0.8186	4 & 96.000	0.5164	No Significant Differences
Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1971-72	2.8359	4 & 104.000	0.0281	Significant Differences
Average Age of Building Faculty	2.4989	4 & 100.00	0.0474	Significant Differences
Type of Community	0.9532	8 & 100.00	0.4770	No Significant Differences
Racial Composition	2.1956	2 & 49.000	0.1222	No Significant Differences
Age of First-Year Teachers	4.4049	2 & 52.000	0.0171	Significant Differences
Extent of Teaching Assignments in Major Field	0.6920	2 & 53.000	0.5051	No Significant Differences
Philosophical Congruence	0.6959	4 & 104.000	0.5965	No Significant Differences

^aA .05 level of significance was used.

Teaching Level

Hypothesis 1: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers at the various teaching levels.

Results: There were no significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.0947$) [see Appendix Table F-1].

Contrary to the expectation that junior high teachers would have had more "problems," cell means for the concerns showed that senior high school teachers had a greater degree of concern in both areas--Instruction and Personal Relationships--than did teachers at the other levels. There are several possible inferences to draw from this finding. Senior high school teachers are generally more content-oriented than junior high school teachers, so instructional organization, teaching of slow learners, and individualizing of instruction would logically be vital concerns. Also, senior high school teachers are closer in age to their students than junior high school teachers which could contribute to a higher degree of concern for personal relationships. Comparison between the two areas of concern for the senior high school teachers, however, indicated that relatively greater concern was expressed in the area of Instruction (see Table 7).

TABLE 7.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers at Various Teaching Levels.

Teaching Levels	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Senior high school	1.837143	2.047571
Junior high school	2.120568	2.298405
Junior high/senior high	2.138250	2.590250
Junior high/elementary	2.099000	2.514000

Satisfaction With Present
Teaching Level

Hypothesis 2: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying degrees of satisfaction with their first-year teaching level.

Results: There were no significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.2107$) [see Appendix Table F-2].

Cell means for the concerns showed that teachers desiring a complete change in level indicated a higher degree of concern in the areas of both Instruction and Personal Relationships than did teachers who desired no change in teaching level (see Table 8). These figures were consistent with anticipated findings, since it seemed natural that teachers desiring a complete change in teaching level were more dissatisfied with their present

TABLE 8.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers
With Varying Degrees Satisfaction With First-
Year Teaching Level.

Satisfaction Level	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Desire no change in teaching level	2.124222	2.332259
Desire to add a teaching level	1.929333	2.108833
Desire to drop a teaching level	2.130400	2.575000
Desire for a complete change in teaching level	1.972917	2.119167

teaching level and might therefore have had greater concerns. The converse would also seem true: teachers desiring no change in teaching level would be more satisfied with their assignment and therefore have fewer concerns. While reasons for these differences cannot be attributed to a single factor, possible influences for teacher dissatisfaction could have been unhappiness with the type of student found at the present teaching level or with the subject matter taught at the particular level.

Average Class Size

Hypothesis 3: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying average class sizes.

Results: There were no significant differences
($\alpha \leq 0.9571$) [see Appendix Table F-3].

Although there were no statistically significant differences in concerns among groups, there was a slight tendency for teachers with class sizes averaging thirty or more students to express a greater degree of concern in both Instruction and Personal Relationships, compared to teachers with smaller average class sizes. Caution must be used in generalizing from this finding, however. It cannot be assumed that reduction in class size will automatically reduce the concerns of first-year teachers or the problems that generate these concerns. There may also be differences among subject matter areas in relation to class sizes. For example, where it could be disastrous to have forty students in a French class, it might not be as much of a problem in a band or orchestra class. Although there is no inherently good class size that can be projected for all subject areas in all schools for all times, this factor may interact with other variables in relation to extent of teacher concerns (see Table 9).

Attendance at In-Service Meetings

Hypothesis 4: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying frequencies of attendance at in-service meetings.

Results: There were no significant differences
($\alpha \leq 0.5164$) [see Appendix Table F-4].

TABLE 9.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers
With Varying Average Class Sizes.

Average Class Size	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Fewer than 25 pupils per class	2.039421	2.277737
25-29 pupils per class	2.034269	2.233962
30 or more pupils per class	2.108455	2.292909

Cell means for both Instruction and Personal Relationships showed that there was a slightly greater degree of concern expressed by teachers who had attended any in-service meetings when compared to those who had not attended any in-service meetings. There were several ways to interpret these figures. For example, teachers with greater concerns may have a greater tendency to seek help, i.e., in-service meetings. This would suggest the inverse conclusion that "non-attenders" had fewer concerns when, in fact, the truth might be that they were not able to recognize their problems or were too apathetic or insecure to want to deal with them. These results should also be interpreted in consideration of the fact that some schools may not have offered any in-service meetings, while attendance at these meetings might have been a requirement

at other schools. Information concerning the second of these possibilities was not available in this study, so it was not possible to determine the extent to which voluntary attendance and/or availability of meetings may have been influential in relation to expressed concerns (see Table 10).

TABLE 10.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers With Varying Frequencies of Attendance at In-Service Meetings.

Frequency of Attendance	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
0 meetings	2.173615	2.395231
1-2 meetings	1.992455	2.165364
3 or more meetings	1.976765	2.217353

Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1971-72

Hypothesis 5: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with varying frequencies of enrollment in graduate college courses.

Results: There were significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.0281$) [see Appendix Table F-5].

The possibility of multiple interpretations must be considered in interpreting the relatively strong differences between teachers with varying frequencies of

enrollment in college graduate courses. According to cell means, teachers who enrolled in one course during the year had a higher degree of concern in both Instruction and Personal Relationships than did teachers who either took no course, or who took two or more courses (see Table 11). This could have been because "non-enrollers" had fewer concerns in fact, or because they were unaware of their problems or apathetic to the problems or their solutions. The most difficult part of the data to explain was why teachers taking two or more courses had fewer concerns than teachers who took only one course. This was especially difficult to understand if one used the rationale that teachers take courses to try to help solve problems that cause concerns. One explanation might have been that teachers with more concerns felt they had time to take only one course, whereas teachers with fewer concerns were simply taking courses to fulfill degree requirements and not to help with skill or content deficiencies they sensed in their teaching. Finally, taking one course may have raised awareness levels to the point where a first-year teacher suddenly saw many of his shortcomings for the first time. By the time he enrolled in a second or third course he may have acquired a broad enough perspective to place his own concerns in context and not magnify them as he may well have done when he saw them for the first time.

TABLE 11.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers and the Extent of Their Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1971-72.

Number of College Graduate Courses Enrolled in, 1971-72	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
0 courses	2.049306	2.230694
1 course	1.812556	2.186556
2 or more courses	2.249545	2.418000

Average Age of
Building Faculty

Hypothesis 6: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers in buildings with varying average faculty ages.

Results: There were significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.0474$) [see Appendix Table F-6].

Cell means showed that as the average age of building faculty increased, so did the average level of concerns expressed by first-year teachers in the areas of Instruction and Personal Relationships. First-year teachers could have seen older teachers as threatening or difficult to communicate with or simply so well-organized and secure that the first-year teacher was afraid to expose his own inadequacies. This finding was somewhat ironic since first-year teachers also said elsewhere in the study that their most valued resource was fellow teachers. Readers

are cautioned to remember that the average ages of other teachers are the ages as perceived by the first-year teachers. It may be that in their insecurity, first-year teachers see their colleagues as being older than they actually are. Many of the barriers between older and younger teachers may exist only in the perceptions of the new teachers who have not had or have not taken time to get to know their fellow teachers (see Table 12).

TABLE 12.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers in Buildings With Varying Average Faculty Ages.

Average Faculty Ages	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Under 30 years of age	2.239462	2.389923
30-39 years of age	2.035158	2.267868
40-49 years of age	1.568667	1.694667

Type of Community

Hypothesis 7: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers employed in varying types of communities.

Results: There were no significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.4770$) [see Appendix Table F-7].

Cell means showed that greater overall concern was shown for the area of Instruction than for Personal

Relationships, regardless of type of community. Inner city teachers showed the greatest concern for Instruction: next in order were rural and city teachers. There are several factors that might contribute to the differences in cell means in spite of the significant differences in the multivariate analysis. It seems logical that there would be greater differences in value systems between community and school with respect to inner city areas where there tends to be a broader representation of value systems. This in turn would make the teacher's task more difficult (i.e., meeting parents' expectations) and thus cause a higher degree of concern. There would probably also be a wider range of student problems in an inner city school, and hence added concerns for first-year teachers. Rural and city school teachers also showed greater concerns; one could speculate that rural schools might be limited in facilities and staff. If this were the case, first-year teachers might have more than the usual number of preparations and/or classes. City teachers, on the other hand, might have larger classes, less personalized contacts with staff, and bureaucratic complexities which make it difficult to get supplies, arrange field trips, etc. (see Table 13).

TABLE 13.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers Teaching in Varying Types of Communities.

Type of Community	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Rural	1.936333	2.154333
Small town	2.107278	2.297000
City	1.962333	2.115778
Suburban	2.157625	2.361938
Inner city	1.823000	2.253500

Racial Composition of
Student Population

Hypothesis 8: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers in schools with varying racial compositions.

Results: There were no significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.1222$) [see Appendix Table F-8].

Cell means showed that there were greater concerns in both Instruction and Personal Relationships for teachers in schools with fewer than 95 per cent whites. For testing this particular hypothesis, respondents were dichotomized on the basis of school racial composition: those with 95-100 per cent whites and those with less than 95 per cent white students. It should not be assumed from (see Table 16) this that schools with more than 5 per cent minority

population are going to show greater teacher concerns just because of this one factor. It is important to note that this division is merely a tool for dealing with information, rather than a value-laden decision; it might, in fact, be questioned whether there is a meaningful difference between percentages differing by such a small amount as those reflected in this study. As is the case in other hypotheses, there are undoubtedly a number of inter-woven factors that influence differences in professional concerns. For example, racial balance in the school may correspond strongly to reflect on factors such as socio-economic level and previous educational opportunities of the students.

TABLE 14.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers in Buildings With Varying Racial Composition of Student Population.

Racial Composition	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
95-100 per cent white students	2.112268	2.305512
Less than 95 per cent white students	1.883727	2.176818

Ages of First-Year Teachers

Hypothesis 9: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year teachers of varying ages.

Results: There were significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.0171$) [see Appendix Table F-9].

Teachers twenty-three years of age and under had significantly greater degrees of concern in the areas of Instruction and Personal Relationships than did teachers twenty-four years of age or more (see Table 15). This was the second time that age was a significant variable in the multivariate analyses of variance for extent of concerns. Here again caution must be used in reaching any conclusions about reasons for these differences, but several possible explanations might be suggested. For example, younger teachers might tend to be apprehensive as well as less experienced. Other factors that could enter include the type of discipline standards maintained by the school, the maturity level of the teacher and the amount of age difference between the new teacher and his or her students.

Extent of Teaching Assignment in Major Field

Hypothesis 10: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers teaching varying numbers of classes in their major field of study.

Results: There were no significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.5051$) [see Appendix Table F-10].

TABLE 15.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by First-Year Teachers of Varying Ages.

Ages of First-Year Teachers	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
23 years of age or less	1.914786	2.154714
24 years of age or more	2.192704	2.372444

Despite the fact that the multivariate analysis of variance did not show significant differences, averages of the responses indicating degree of concern (see Table 16) showed that there were somewhat greater concerns expressed by teachers who were teaching outside their major field when compared with those who were teaching primarily in their major fields. This is consistent with expectations based on studies indicating that teachers expressed concern about being assigned to teach in areas outside their major field. Since first-year teachers have already indicated concern over matters of instruction, it would follow that being placed in a class outside one's major area of concern would compound the task and raise the level of teacher concerns.

TABLE 16.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers
With Varying Extents of Teaching Assignment in
Major Field of Study.

Extent of Assignment in Major Field	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Teaching primarily in major	2.022350	2.216650
Teaching primarily outside major	2.121188	2.369750

Philosophical Congruence

Hypothesis 11: There are no differences in expressed professional concerns among teachers with varying degrees of philosophical congruence between themselves and fellow teachers, administrators, and community.

Results: There were no significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.5965$) [see Appendix Table F-11].

As might be expected, concern in both Instruction and Personal Relationships increased as the degree of philosophical congruence lessened. It is interesting to note that if the educational philosophy mean scores were ranked, fellow teachers would be the most congruent with the self-perceptions of the respondents, followed by administrators and then community in that order. It must be remembered that these are all ranked on the basis of the perceptions of the first-year teacher respondents (see Table 17).

TABLE 17.--Mean Levels of Concern Expressed by Teachers
With Varying Degrees of Philosophical Congru-
ence Between Self and Others.

Philosophical Congruence	Expressed Professional Concerns of First-Year Teachers	
	Instruction	Personal Relationships
Low discrepancy (0-2 points)	2.134304	2.353826
Moderate discrepancy (3-4 points)	2.024556	2.254611
High discrepancy (5 or more points)	1.953467	2.124067

The Professional Concerns of
First-Year Teachers

The second part of the research instrument for this study contained a listing of fifty-one potential professional concerns (see Appendix A). Respondents were asked to indicate to what degree each had been a concern ("Of Much Concern," "Of Some Concern," "Of No Concern") at "The Beginning of the Year" as well as how much each was still a concern at the end of the school year, "Now." For the purposes of this study only the "Now" concerns were used for multivariate analyses of variance. These same scores were also ranked in order of their average degrees of concern (see Table 18).

TABLE 18.--Year End Professional Concerns Expressed by First-Year Secondary Teachers.

Professional Concern	Beginning Concerns				Now Concerns			
	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation
Providing instruction for slow learners	56	2	1.43	.5987	56	1	1.41	.5963
Organizing instruction for the year	56	7	1.59	.6544	56	2	1.61	.7053
Having adequate instructional materials available	56	3	1.52	.6873	56	3	1.62	.6759
Determining students' academic needs	55	9	1.61	.6790	55	4	1.64	.6195
Finding appropriate instructional materials	55	5	1.56	.7140	55	5	1.64	.6767
Providing instructional variety within individual lessons	55	16	1.78	.6856	55	6	1.69	.7168
Having students respect me as teacher	56	14	1.70	.7844	56	7	1.71	.7559
Maintaining student respect	55	8	1.60	.6555	55	8	1.73	.7317
Handling single discipline problems without interrupting instruction	56	10	1.64	.6988	56	9	1.75	.7198
Getting to know students as individuals	56	11	1.64	.6447	56	10	1.75	.7447
Keeping order in my classes	55	1	1.42	.6293	55	11	1.80	.6777

TABLE 18.--Continued.

Professional Concern	Beginning Concerns				Now Concerns			
	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation
Dealing with "troublesome" students	54	4	1.54	.6054	54	12	1.80	.6258
Individualizing instruction	55	19	1.87	.7467	55	13	1.82	.7956
Establishing classroom operating procedures	55	6	1.58	.7121	55	14	1.85	.7308
Providing instruction for gifted learners	55	21	1.89	.6790	55	15	1.87	.7215
Using evaluation techniques other than tests	55	23	1.93	.7417	55	16	1.89	.7858
Evaluating students with special needs	55	25	1.98	.7069	55	17	1.91	.6461
Avoiding showing favoritism	56	18	1.82	.7887	56	18	1.95	.7488
Dealing with groups of students	55	17	1.81	.6409	55	19	1.98	.7069
Handling administrators' observations of my teaching	56	12	1.68	.7162	56	20	2.09	.6682
Knowing the principal's expectations of me as a classroom teacher	56	13	1.68	.6904	56	21	2.12	.8104
Understanding the school's unwritten rules	56	26	1.98	.6464	56	22	2.12	.6623
Dealing with problems of drug use	55	35	2.18	.7224	55	23	2.14	.7308

TABLE 18.--Continued.

Professional Concern	Beginning Concerns				Now Concerns			
	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation
Designing evaluation instruments to measure individualized instruction	56	29	2.09	.7693	56	24	2.18	.7412
Dealing with parent criticisms	56	31	2.11	.7306	56	25	2.18	.6062
Having students like me	56	15	1.77	.6873	56	26	2.18	.6062
Getting to know other teachers	56	20	1.87	.6342	56	27	2.20	.7488
Constructing tests	56	22	1.91	.6682	56	28	2.21	.5943
Conducting individual parent conferences	53	30	2.11	.5428	53	29	2.21	.6894
Determining grades (report cards, etc.)	56	27	2.02	.6740	56	30	2.21	.7062
Getting along with the principal	56	28	2.05	.6986	56	31	2.21	.7796
Interpreting the results of teacher-made tests	55	40	2.25	.6997	55	32	2.24	.6929
Arranging furniture to facilitate learning	55	37	2.21	.7559	55	33	2.27	.6513
Understanding and following administrative directives	55	32	2.11	.6287	55	34	2.31	.6346
Using bulletin boards	56	44	2.34	.6948	56	35	2.34	.6948

TABLE 18.--Continued.

Professional Concern	Beginning Concerns				Now Concerns			
	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation
Keeping records (attendance, etc.)	56	34	2.14	.6988	56	36	2.34	.7693
Achieving tenure	56	36	2.21	.7062	56	37	2.36	.6158
Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member	56	24	1.95	.6444	56	38	2.39	.7053
Asking other teachers for help	56	38	2.23	.6873	56	39	2.41	.6260
Handling criticism from other teachers	56	39	2.25	.7920	56	40	2.46	.6596
Asking questions at faculty meetings	56	48	2.48	.6028	56	41	2.46	.5709
Implementing the school's grading system	54	47	2.48	.5743	54	42	2.48	.6063
Finding supportive colleagues	56	33	2.12	.7151	56	43	2.48	.6028
Knowing the school's expectations for me outside the classroom	56	42	2.30	.6006	56	44	2.48	.6322
Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are	56	46	2.39	.6231	56	45	2.50	.5721
Operating audio-visual equipment	56	45	2.36	.7243	56	46	2.50	.6030

TABLE 18.--Continued.

Professional Concern	Beginning Concerns				Now Concerns			
	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Rank	Mean	Standard Deviation
Writing behaviorally stated instructional objectives	54	43	2.34	.6404	54	47	2.52	.5718
Dealing with non-instructional personnel (custodians, secretaries)	56	49	2.61	.6231	56	48	2.57	.6283
Doing lesson plans for the administration	56	41	2.30	.7366	56	49	2.64	.5197
Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests	56	50	2.61	.6790	56	50	2.71	.5629
Handling racially mixed classes	54	51	2.80	.5623	54	51	2.81	.5167

The five largest concerns were:

1. Providing instruction for slow learners,
2. Organizing instruction for the year,
3. Having adequate instructional materials available,
4. Determining students' academic needs,
5. Finding appropriate instructional materials.

All dealt with instruction in one way or another. Three of the five were also in the first five "Beginning-of-the-Year" concerns. The remaining two were areas where the teachers' concerns increased between "Beginning" and "Now." Four of the five concerns reflected problems of classroom management/discipline, or knowing students.

At the other end of the spectrum, the lowest concerns were (in descending order):

1. Writing behaviorally stated instructional objectives,
2. Dealing with non-instructional personnel,
3. Doing lesson plans for the administration,
4. Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests,
5. Handling racially mixed classes.

Supplemental Findings

The identification of first-year teachers' professional concerns and an investigation of the differences in these concerns among groups of teachers categorized on the basis of eleven factors were the two objectives of this research. The findings have been reported.

To supplement the findings a brief report of some of the major issues found in the open-ended section of the questionnaire, together with a brief comparison of before and after responses is included here to help sharpen the focus of the research findings. In the open-ended portion of the questionnaire, four questions were posed. Question One asked:

1. If I could give advice to first-year teachers before they enter the classroom in September, I would tell them the following: _____.

The responses to this question were sorted by topic. One-hundred eighteen pieces of advice were provided on varying topics. Forty-eight of these dealt directly with discipline/classroom management concerns. Sample remarks were:

Be firm. Kids HAVE changed since you were in school.

Be prepared for much teacher disrespect on the part of students.

Try to get to know the students quickly.

Don't be hasty in forming good or bad opinions of your students.

Refrain from showing favoritism.

Be strict. Demand that the students be in their seat when the bell rings, etc.

Be as unyielding and stubborn as you possibly can in the beginning of the year.

Don't try to be a friend of the student. They will walk all over you. Get their respect first.

Remember that your pupils are people and treat them that way.

Make up a card file on all the students describing behavior and background.

Thirty-four of the remarks dealt with instructional organization and other instructional concerns. Sample comments were:

Know your subject inside out--front--back--side--top--bottom.

Be prepared when you enter the classroom each day.

Do long-range planning.

Practice writing lesson plans. It was hard for me to write lesson plans a week in advance.

Be organized and be consistent.

Be prepared to be discouraged. It's different from what you learned in college. It is discouraging to find that all high school students are not as enthusiastic about education as you are.

Teach the subject, but do not get so involved in it that you forget the student's basic needs; teach values as well as subject material.

The remaining suggestions were widely scattered among fifteen other topics with no more than three comments per topic. Samples were:

Do not tolerate racial difficulties (fighting, name calling, etc.). Kids think racial name calling is the thing to do to be "cool." You have to make them see it's not, even though you kick a few students out to do it.

Ask for the help of experienced teachers.

Ask for criticism and help from your fellow teachers.

Really want to teach.

Forget the idealism taught in college of education classes and learn to be practical.

Question Two stated:

2. If I were a junior or senior high school principal (and money and resources were no problem), I would help first-year teachers by: _____.

There were seventy-four topical responses. Thirty suggested providing for more adequate instructional materials or closely related suggestions. Samples were:

Providing orientation and instruction on the use of A-V materials.

Providing all the needed instructional materials and supplies.

Low-level classes need materials. I would make sure they had books that were chosen by the teacher working with that level student.

I would also get games and lab materials applicable to the subject.

Having the latest and newest editions of texts and materials for the teachers--not necessarily for the students.

Seeing that they have adequate supplies. I was without creature comforts like a wardrobe, and adequate bookshelves for the entire year. This makes organization rather difficult, to say the least.

Giving them more materials.

Remaining suggestions covered ten other topics.

Samples of comments in these areas were:

Offering a wider orientation.

By making sure they were communicating with at least one of the experienced teachers and at least one of the other first-year teachers.

Discussions with older, experienced teachers to see how they organize for instruction.

Giving them in-service workshops.

Having a teacher aide for each first-year teachers, especially those teaching low-level classes, no matter how small.

Among the comments were suggestions for principals in their dealings with teachers:

Principals should make it perfectly clear what the administration expects from teachers.

First establishing a personal relationship with them so they aren't threatened when they walk in.

Backing them up when they have discipline problems.

Checking with them every week or so in the beginning to see if they had any problems or needs I could help them with. First-year teachers are sometimes very shy about seeking help themselves.

Question Three dealt with proposals for designing teacher education courses. Hopefully first-year teachers' suggestions would suggest ways they saw of solving problems that caused professional concerns. The question asked:

3. If I were in a position to design teacher education courses and the student teaching experience, I would do the following: _____.

Sample suggestions were:

Students who intend to be teachers need to get into classrooms with junior and senior high students as soon as possible. I needed more experience in the classroom.

Have a lot of experiences outside of the college classroom working with children.

In education courses stop lying to prospective teachers. Don't tell them if they make their courses interesting enough they won't have discipline problems.

Eliminate seminars.

Preparing lesson plans, unit plans, and behavioral objectives were fine, but no one ever spoke of preparing individualized lesson plans.

Teacher education courses I experienced were worthless. I believe much discussion of classroom management and educational incentives should have been stressed.

Do away with all education courses except directed teaching.

More help with lesson planning.

How to individualize lessons.

See that student teachers get a varied experience with all available school situations such as urban, suburban, city, etc.

Finally, Question Four asked:

4. Some concerns I have had this year that have not been mentioned in this questionnaire are: _____.

Sample responses included:

Am I doing the job? It is hard to know whether a first-year teacher is successfully completing the teaching assignment.

Legal aspects of teaching.

I am gravely concerned with the lack of training in dealing with the incorrigible child.

Being involved in curriculum changes.

All the paper work!

How to deal with the utter discouragement that one can experience in teaching.

I had barely enough energy to come home and eat during my first few weeks of teaching.

Being 22 years old and having kids 18 years old.

Providing significant alternatives in the public schools for children (i.e., free school, etc.).

As a rule, the findings in this study showed that the concerns first-year teachers had at the beginning of the year had diminished by the end of the year, and while they were still concerns, they were rated much lower in the "Now" column. There are notable exceptions to the rule. Some of the concerns listed at the beginning of the year received higher rankings at the end of the year. Caution must be exercised in interpreting these changes in rank. There are not corresponding changes in mean values, indicating that while there was movement among concerns with respect to ranking, the absolute value of the concerns varied very little. The concern which increased to one of the highest levels, "organizing instruction for the year,"

was ranked in seventh place at the beginning of the year.

At the end of the year it was ranked in second place.

"Providing instructional variety within individual lessons," moved from sixteenth to sixth place. "Having students respect me as teacher" went from fourteen to seventh place. "Individualizing instruction," moved up six places to thirteenth. Others experienced upward movement were:

1. Providing instruction for gifted learners,
2. Using evaluation techniques other than tests,
3. Evaluating students with special needs,
4. Dealing with problems of drug use.

The third part of the questionnaire--sources seen by teachers as having been helpful in dealing with first-year teacher concerns--provided supplementary evidence to keep sharpen the foci of the study. Seven areas of potential concern were listed:

1. Classroom management,
2. Grading student,
3. Planning for instruction,
4. Adjusting to the job,
5. Dealing with parents,

6. Teaching your subject,
7. Finding instructional materials.

Teachers were asked to rank resources that were most helpful "1," next most helpful "2," and so forth. Categories from which choices could be made were:

1. School administration,
2. Fellow teacher,
3. Secondary student,
4. In-service program,
5. Undergraduate education course,
6. Student teaching,
7. Course(s) taken this year,
8. Other.

Tabulating and combining the number of responses "1," "2," and "3," (first, second, and third most helpful) showed without question that the most helpful sources in the perceptions of first-year secondary teachers were fellow teachers; the second most helpful source was the experiences gained from student teaching. All other sources are ranked considerably lower (see Table 19).

A summary of the research findings and a description of the limitations of the study, as well as implications for future research, will comprise Chapter V.

TABLE 19.--Sources Ranked "Most Helpful" by First-Year Teachers.^a

Area of Concern	Sources of Help							
	School Administration	Fellow Teacher	Secondary Student	In-Service Program	Undergraduate Education Course	Student Teaching	Course(s) Taken This Year	Other
Classroom Management	14	35	3	0	4	23	0	8
Grading Students	9	21	4	1	11	29	0	1
Planning for Instruction	2	25	3	1	13	36	3	2
Adjusting to the Job	15	38	2	2	1	24	0	5
Dealing with Parents	21	24	0	0	2	16	0	9
Teaching Your Subject	3	26	3	0	16	34	3	6
Finding Instructional Materials	9	42	0	2	11	16	2	4
Total	73	211	15	6	58	178	8	35

^aCombined totals for sources ranked first, second, and third most helpful.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The responses of fifty-six first-year secondary teachers in selected public schools in Michigan were examined in this pilot study. More specifically, the study was designed to (1) determine their professional concerns, and (2) investigate the differences in these concerns among groups of teachers categorized sequentially on the basis of eleven factors:

1. Teaching level,
2. Satisfaction with present teaching level,
3. Average class size,
4. Attendance at in-service meetings, 1971-1972,
5. Enrollment in college graduate courses, 1971-72,
6. Average of building faculty,
7. Type of community,
8. Racial composition of student population,
9. Age of first-year teacher,

10. Extent of teaching assignment in major field of study,
11. Degree of philosophical congruence between themselves and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.

The identified concerns were measured with a check list of fifty-one potential concerns in two basic areas, Instruction and Personal Relationships. Results showed that these teachers were most concerned, particularly at the end of the year, about instructional considerations, such as dealing with slow learners, organizing instruction for the year, having adequate instructional materials, and other similar concerns. Classroom management/discipline and teacher/student relationship concerns ranked next in priority.

The one-way multivariate analyses of variance of the eleven stated hypotheses indicated:

1. There were no significant differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers:
 - a. at the various teaching levels;
 - b. with varying degrees of satisfaction with their first-year teaching level;
 - c. with varying average class sizes;
 - d. with varying frequencies of attendance at in-service meetings;

- e. employed in varying types of communities;
- f. in buildings with varying racial compositions;
- g. teaching to varying extents in their major fields of study;
- h. with varying degrees of philosophical congruence between themselves and fellow teachers, administrators, and communities.

Factors which showed significant differences in the areas of concern were:

1. Ages of first-year teachers,
2. Average age of building faculty,
3. Enrollment in college graduate courses.

Looking at the composite picture of ranked concerns, compared differences, information about helpful sources, and open-ended responses, several points stand out. Age as a factor showed significant differences twice: as average building faculty age and as respondent-teacher age. Cell means showed that as the average faculty ages of teachers in various buildings increased, so did the degree of first-year teachers' concerns. At the same time, however, first-year teachers showed in the third part of the questionnaire that their greatest source of help during their first year was fellow teachers. There were significant differences in concern among first-year teacher respondents of varying ages. Younger

(twenty-three years of age or less) teachers had a higher degree of concern than older (twenty-four years of age or more) teachers.

In other areas, the results for "attendance at in-service meetings" and "enrollment in college graduate courses, 1971-1972" provided interesting parallels. In both areas, although there were significant differences among groups for "enrollment in college graduate courses, 1971-1972" and not in "attendance at in-service meetings," teachers who were "non-attenders" and "non-enrollers" also exhibited the least concern in both areas, Instruction and Personal Relationships. Finally, with all eleven hypotheses, cell means showed greater concern in the area of Instruction in contrast to Personal Relationships.

Implications for Teacher Education and In-Service Education

What implications does all this have for teacher educators and in-service planners? The strongest implication is that each has a major area of strength on which it should capitalize: student teaching (for colleges and universities) and contributions of fellow teachers (for public schools). Ways should be found to provide prospective teachers with increased contact time with students before, during, and after student teaching. A substantial portion of this time should be spent helping

helping prospective teachers explore effective classroom management principles. Hopefully, this would occur in a public school classroom with secondary pupils. While lectures in college classes and discussions of case studies may be good starters, respondents are saying in the open-ended portion of the questionnaire that they want more practical experiences and a substantial number of those experiences should be about "handling kids" in the classroom.

In the same setting much greater concern must be given to exposing prospective teachers to the multitude of instructional materials and equipment available. At the same time public schools should listen carefully to the first-year teachers who are saying that it was not equipment, in-service speakers, or conferences that helped the most. It was their fellow teachers: a resource every school has. Needless to say, a simple bringing-together of teachers is not the "pat" solution. Each school must find its own answer, but the intent of the message is clear.

There are some first-year teacher concerns that have fairly tangible solutions. Examples of these include:

1. Finding instructional materials,
2. Having adequate instructional materials available,

3. Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are,
4. Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a teacher.

All of these areas can be covered at the time the teachers sign contracts. New teachers can be shown existing instructional resources and, within school budget limits, can be encouraged to suggest resources to be ordered that will be helpful to them as they plan instruction for the fall. Tenure evaluation criteria and principal's expectations can be discussed in detail as well.

In summary, first-year teachers are saying that helpful resources do exist. It is up to the universities and public schools working together to find many options for prospective teachers to pursue using these resources in present educational settings as starting points toward reducing teacher concerns through constructive solutions.

Limitations of the Study

1. Several notes of caution warrant injection here. It is easy to assess expressed professional concerns at face value, i.e., if teachers say they need instructional materials, this is, therefore a valid need and will be remedied by the provision of the appropriate materials. In this case, for

example, provision of instructional materials may not answer the need at all. The problem may well be a classroom management one that the teacher assumes "improved" instructional resources will solve. The teacher may, on the other hand, recognize the problem, but not be able to discuss it and requests books and other resources as a safe way to seek solutions.

In a similar vein, just because fellow teachers are rated the over-whelming front-runner in "most helpful resources," does not necessarily mean they provide the best kinds of help as far as attitudes toward students, educational philosophy or management techniques are concerned. First-year teachers may, in fact, be exposed to jaundiced, bitter colleagues who may have well-controlled classes seen as "good" by first-year teachers--but also be threatening to students and unconcerned about them as persons.

2. In the same vein, the differences identified and the comparisons drawn in this research do not prove cause and effect relationships.

3. The findings of this study cannot be generalized in a statistical sense to a broad population. Implications can be drawn in a theoretical sense, however, to other populations of similar description.
4. This study deals only with secondary teachers. Its findings may not necessarily be applicable to elementary teachers.
5. It might be implied from this study that the aim of all public schools and universities should be to eliminate all first-year teacher concerns. This is not the intent of the study. Teachers will always have concerns. The recommendation is being made that, where possible, causes of concern be eliminated before they arise and that constructive means be developed for dealing constructively with others as they arise. This is seen as a continuing process, not just a one-year focus.

Implications for Action

1. Provide first-year teachers with ready access to competent, successful, innovative and experienced teachers, both on a consultation basis and a classroom observation basis.

2. Provide a wide range of instructional materials with well-planned in-service programs to help teachers find effective ways of using the materials.
3. Involve first-year teachers in frequent "rap sessions" with the principal. (Using appropriate caution to consider barriers or perceived barriers that may exist between the "administrator" and the "teacher.")
4. In buildings where communication seems poor or minimal, organize well-planned, non-threatening constructive interaction programs to help faculty of all ages and subject areas to relate to one another more effectively. First-year teachers, especially, find it difficult to enter the "main-stream" of activity. Needless to say, this process would not stop when communication reached effective levels, but would change to help maintain and renew the process.
5. Encourage universities, in conjunction with public schools, to develop courses that would be offered especially for teachers during their first year of teaching. These courses would not be just discussion groups or gripe sessions, but opportunities to refine or develop classroom skills.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Assess the concerns of prospective teachers just before they begin their student teaching, and again at the end. Repeat the procedure as they begin their first-year of teaching and as they conclude it.
2. Study orientation programs for first-year teachers: their frequency, format, and content, with implications for helping eliminate some of the causes of concerns of first-year teachers.
3. Conduct a study which would identify the ways in which fellow teachers can best help first-year teachers taking care to choose effective, positive, open veteran teachers.
4. Conduct a study similar to the one reported here, but study the professional concerns of more experienced teachers (e.g., fifth-year teachers).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Abraham, Willard. A Handbook for the New Teacher. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.
- Combs, Arthur. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Eye, Glen G., and Lane, Willard R. The New Teacher Comes to School. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1956.
- Gelinas, Paul J. So You Want to Be a Teacher. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Huggett, Albert J., and Stinnett, T. M. Professional Problems of Teachers. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1956.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.
- Mason, Ward S. The Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: Status and Career Orientations, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Miller, George. Letters From a Hard-Boiled Teacher to His Half-Baked Son. Washington, D.C.: The Daylton Company, 1935.
- National Education Association. The Real World of the Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1966.

Yauch, Wilbur A., Bartels, Martin, and Morris, Emmet. The Beginning Teacher. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1955.

Periodicals

- Abraham, Willard. "How Are Your Teachers Doing Now?" Educational Leadership, XI (February, 1954), 311-15.
- Archer, Vern B., Edelfeldt, Roy, and Hite, Herbert. "POINT Points the Way." NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 29-30.
- Baker, T. P. "The High School Principal and the First Year Teacher." The High School Journal, XLII (January, 1959), 112-15.
- Butler, Thomas M. "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers." The Clearing House, XXXVI (September, 1961), 11-13.
- Cornett, Joe D. "Effectiveness of Three Selective Admissions Criteria in Predicting Performance of First-Year Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LXII (February, 1969), 247-50.
- Day, Harry P. "Attitude Changes of Beginning Teachers After Initial Teaching Experience." Journal of Teacher Education, X (September, 1959), 326-28.
- Denemark, George W., and MacDonald, James B. "Pre-service and In-service Education of Teachers." Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (June, 1967), 233-47.
- Dropkin, Stanley, and Taylor, Marvin. "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers and Related Factors." Journal of Teacher Education, XIV (December, 1963), 384-90.
- Goodrich, Ronald J. "Advisory Teacher Program Benefits Beginning Teachers." The Clearing House, XLIV (September, 1969), 12-15.
- Hoy, Wayne K. "Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher." The School Review, LXXVI (September, 1968), 312-23.
- Jenkins, Simon. "Reflections on that First Year: Interviews." Times Educational Supplement, 2782 (September 13, 1968), 448-49.

- Jersild, Arthur T. "The Voice of the Self." NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 23-25.
- Kaufman, Bel. "The Real World of the Beginning Teachers." NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 17-19.
- Lemons, Lawrence A. "Education Courses." NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 26-28.
- Mangione, Anthony Roy. "Advice for Beginning Teachers." The Clearing House, XLIV (September, 1969), 41-42.
- Marashio, Paul. "A Proposal for Helping Beginning Teachers." The Clearing House, XLV (March, 1971), 419-21.
- McGinnis, Cecelia. "The Beginning Teacher Project in New York State." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 44-48.
- Nash, Curtis E. "A Conference for First-Year Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, V (December, 1954), 320-22.
- Nelson, Robert H., and Thompson, Michael. "Why Teachers Quit." The Clearing House, XXXVII (April, 1963), 467-72.
- Noda, Daniel S. "Beginning Teacher Development in Hawaii." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 62-72.
- Olson, Carl O. Jr. "Let's Stop Demoralizing Beginning Teachers." Peabody Education Journal, XLVI (July, 1968), 18-23.
- Rehage, Kenneth J. "Induction: When Student Becomes Teacher." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 144-55.
- Rosenberg, Jack. "First Agonizing Term." Times Educational Supplement, 2789 (November 1, 1968), 968.
- St. Germain, Robert. "I Was an Innocent in the Classroom." NEA Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 21.
- Stout, John B. "Deficiencies of Beginning Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, III (March, 1952), 43-46.

- Strickler, Robert W. "Follow Through With the First-Year Teacher." Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (January, 1959), 1-6.
- Swanson, Patricia. "A Time to Teach--And A Time to Learn." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (October, 1968), 74-83.
- "The Beginning Teacher." Today's Education, LX (September, 1971), 54-59.
- Wallace, Morris. "Problems Experienced by 136 Teachers During Their Induction Into Service." North Central Association Quarterly, XXV (January, 1951), 291-309.
- Weaver, D. C. "The Effect of the First Year of Teaching on Teachers' Attitudes to the Professional Element in Their Initial Training Course." British Journal of Educational Psychology, XL (November, 1970), 352.
- Wey, Herbert. "The Difficulties of Student Teachers and Beginning Teachers as a Basis for the Improvement of Teacher Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVII (February, 1951), 98-107.
- Yauch, Wilbur A. "Helping the New Teacher to Succeed." Educational Forum, XX (November, 1955), 37-43.

Dissertations

- Ackerman, Robert Leroy. "An Identification of Professional Problems of Beginning Elementary School Teacher." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1966.
- Brewington, William Cleve. "A Study of First-Year Secondary School Science Teachers Who Completed Preservice Programs at the Ohio State University." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1971.
- Chapman, George Franklin. "A Study of the Problems of Beginning Secondary Teachers in Suburban St. Louis Public Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of St. Louis, 1967.

- Clinton, Thomas Allan. "Beginning Teachers' Problems: A Study of Problems Encountered by One Hundred Graduates of East Texas State University and the Functional Relationship Between These Problems and the Teacher Education Program." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1965.
- Cross, Charles Jack. "The Teaching Difficulties and Teaching Effectiveness of Beginning Secondary Teachers, Who Taught Classes Both In and Out of Their Respective Fields of Preparation, With Respect to Certain Observable Factors." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1955.
- Ducharme, Robert James. "Selected Preservice Factors Related to Success of the Beginning Teacher." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1970.
- Force, William Riley. "System Effects on Beginning Teachers in Innovative and Non-Innovative Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- Franc, Lillian Helen. "Problems Perceived by Seventy-Five Beginning Elementary School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.
- Hester, Harold Eugene. "Orientation and In-Service Training for Beginning Intermediate School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.
- Lane, Frank T. "A Study of the Professional Problems Recognized by Beginning Teachers and Their Implications for a Program of Teacher Education (At State University of New York Teachers College at Brockport)." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of New York, 1954.
- McDavid, Fred Clyde. "The Critical Requirements of the Role of Department Chairman in Orienting First-Year Teachers in Selected High Schools in Illinois." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1965.

- Miller, H. Bernard. "An Analysis of Empirically Selected Components of Pressure, Difficulty and Satisfaction Reported by Beginning Secondary School Intern Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1970.
- Moller, Gaylord Eugene. "A Comprehensive Study of the Problems of Beginning Teachers in Selected Large Senior High Schools." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1968.
- Pilgrim, Beverly June. "An Appraisal of Selected Aspects of the Teacher Education Program at Eastern Texas State University Based on a Follow-Up Study of Beginning Secondary Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1970.
- Stone, Edward H. "Personal and Professional Problems Recognized by Beginning Junior and Senior High School Teachers and the Relationship of the Number of These Problems to Personal Characteristics, Professional Preparation, Teaching Assignment and Career Plans." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1963.
- Taylor, Sol. "Orientation and In-Service Education Programs for Beginning Secondary School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.
- Vesey, Margaret Alice. "A Field Follow-Up Study of Beginning Secondary School Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1957.
- Vinson, Sharon Sue Weeks. "Problems of Beginning Secondary School Teachers of Foreign Languages With Implications for Supervision and In-Service Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1969.
- Vosburg, William A. "A Study to Identify and Analyze Professional Problems of Secondary School Cooperating Teachers in the State Supported Colleges of Louisiana." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northeast Louisiana University, 1970.
- Wampler, David Ray. "A Study of First Year Teacher in Disadvantaged Schools to Determine the Relationship of Preservice Preparation Experiences to Present Attitudes and Effectiveness." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1970.

Publications

Henderson, Gail. "The Stormy First Year." Michigan State University Printing Service (June, 1971), 1-65.

Michigan Education Association. "Report: Teacher Education Task Force." Spring Assembly, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Teacher Education Task Force." Official Minutes, October 9, 1969, meeting, East Lansing. (Mimeographed.)

Oakland County Curriculum Council. "Position Statement on Student Teaching and Pre-service Education." May, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Porter, John W. "Recommendations Regarding Teacher Certification and Professional Development Issues." To the State Board of Education of Michigan, Lansing, October 19, 1971.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO GATHER
DATA FOR THE STUDY

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY
THE
PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

Please respond to the following questions. They are designed to provide information which will help in the interpretation of your responses in Part II. We would appreciate it if you did not discuss this questionnaire with fellow teachers. We seek YOUR opinions. From this information we hope to be able to make suggestions for teacher education programs and in-service programs.

1. What grade(s) do you teach now? (Circle all that apply)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
2. What grade(s) would you choose to teach? (Circle all that apply)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
3. What subject(s) are you teaching? [Please write in the subject(s)]
1. _____ 3. _____
2. _____ 4. _____
4. How many classes (periods) do you teach in your MAJOR field of study?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Circle your answer)
5. How many classes (periods) do you teach in your MINOR field of study?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Circle your answer)
6. How many different class preparations (subjects) do you have each day?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Circle your answer)
7. What is the average size of your classes? (Circle the answer)
Under 20 20-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 Over 40
8. How many extra-curricular programs do you direct or help with?
0 1 2 3 4 5 or more (Circle your answer)
9. Approximately how many in-service programs have been offered in your school system for secondary teachers this year? (Circle your answer)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more
10. How many of the above in-service programs have you attended? (Circle the answer)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more
11. How many college courses have you taken this year? (Circle the answer)
0 1 2 3 4 5 or more
12. What grade levels are taught in your building? (Circle all that apply)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

13. What is the average age of the faculty in your building? (Circle the answer)
 Under 30 30-39 40-49 Over 50

14. Do you hold a current Michigan Secondary Provisional Teaching Certificate?
 ____ Yes ____ No (Check one)

15. If you answered "Yes" to the above, from what institution is your certificate?
 _____ Year Granted _____
 (College or University)

16. Please list your degree(s), college(s), major(s), minor(s), date(s) received.
- | DEGREE | INSTITUTION | MAJOR(S) | MINOR(S) | DATE(S) RECEIVED |
|--------|-------------|----------|----------|------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

17. In what type of community is your school located? (Circle the answer)
 Rural Small town City Suburban Inner City

18. Do you live in the community where you teach? ____ YES ____ NO (Check one)

19. Are you required to submit lesson plans in advance to the principal?
 ____ YES ____ NO (Check one)

20. What percentage of each of the following racial groups is represented in your student population?
 ____ American Indian ____ Black ____ Chicano ____ White ____ Other

21. Approximately how old is the building in which you teach? (Circle your answer)
 1-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years Over 20 years

22. Please circle the response that best indicates the educational philosophy of the following persons:

	Very Conservative			Very Liberal	
YOURSELF	1	2	3	4	5
ADMINISTRATION	1	2	3	4	5
FELLOW TEACHERS	1	2	3	4	5
COMMUNITY	1	2	3	4	5

23. Your sex: ____ Female ____ Male (Check one)

24. Year you were born: _____ (Check one)

All beginning teachers experience many concerns. These concerns fall into many categories. Listed below are some situations you may have thought about this year. Please indicate (by checking the appropriate box) the extent to which this situation has been a concern to you BOTH (1) at the BEGINNING of the year and (2) NOW.

	(1) AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR			(2) NOW		
	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN
Constructing tests						
Providing instruction for slow learners						
Keeping order in my classes						
Writing behaviorally stated instructional objectives						
Dealing with "troublesome" students						
Dealing with non-instructional personnel (custodians, secretaries)						
Determining students' academic needs						
Conducting individual parent conferences						
Handling single discipline problems without interrupting instruction						
Designing evaluation instruments to measure individualized instruction						
Handling racially mixed classes						
Evaluating students with special needs						
Achieving tenure						
Determining grades (report cards, etc.)						
Implementing the school's grading system						
Using evaluation techniques other than tests						
Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests						
Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are						
Individualizing instruction						
Handling criticism from other teachers						

	(1) AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR			(2) NOW		
	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN
Handling administrators' observations of my teaching						
Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member						
Doing lesson plans for the administration						
Maintaining student respect						
Getting to know students as individuals						
Asking questions at faculty meetings						
Getting along with the principal						
Finding supportive colleagues						
Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher						
Having adequate instructional materials available						
Establishing classroom operating procedures						
Finding appropriate instructional materials						
Using bulletin boards						
Dealing with groups of students						
Understanding the school's unwritten rules						
Having students respect me as teacher						
Operating audio-visual equipment						
Asking other teachers for help						
Knowing the school's expectations for me outside the classroom						
Dealing with parent criticisms						
Understanding and following administrative directives						
Keeping records (attendance, etc.)						

	(1) AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR			(2) NOW		
	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN
Having students like me						
Arranging furniture to facilitate learning						
Getting to know other teachers						
Avoiding showing favoritism						
Interpreting the results of teacher-made tests						
Providing instructional variety within individual lessons						
Organizing instruction for the year						
Providing instruction for gifted learners						
Dealing with problems of drug use						

As you look back on this year, consider what persons were most helpful as you dealt with concerns in the areas listed below. If more than one person was helpful in a particular area, place a "1" below the MOST helpful, a "2" below the NEXT most helpful, etc. If you check "Other", please indicate who that is in the space provided.

	School Administration	Fellow Teacher	Secondary Student	In-Service Program	Undergraduate Education Course	Student Teaching Course(s) Taken This Year	Other	Name Other
Classroom Management								
Grading Students								
Planning for Instruction								
Adjusting to the Job								
Dealing with Parents								
Teaching Your Subject								
Finding Instructional Materials								

In the first parts of this questionnaire you were asked to respond to a number of specific items. In this final portion you are asked to respond to questions of a more general nature. You may reinforce positions you have taken earlier, as well as raise issues that may not have been included in the first two parts. Because all of us have varied backgrounds and experiences, we will respond differently to these questions. This is quite normal and to be expected. We seek your candid responses.

1. If I could give advice to first-year teachers before they enter the classroom in September, I would tell them the following:

2. If I were a junior or senior high principal (and money and resources were no problem), I would help first year teachers by:

3. If I were in a position to design teacher education courses and the student teaching experience, I would do the following:

4. Some concerns I have had this year that have not been mentioned in this questionnaire are:

Thank you again for your support!

Folded in half, this questionnaire will fit in the stamped, addressed envelope for mailing to:

Fredrick Briscoe
301-J Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING MICHIGAN 48821

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM • BRICKSON HALL

May 22, 1972

There are some very special people in your secondary schools who can provide data that will help public school and university staff plan professional development programs. They are teachers who are completing their first year of teaching.

I am conducting a study in cooperation with Professor Charles A. Blackman Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum, Michigan State University, which will identify the professional concerns of first-year teachers and try to relate them to such variables as undergraduate teacher education, class size, and grade level. I would like to visit each of your first-year teachers in the next two weeks to leave a questionnaire for their response. The respondents and school buildings will not be identified in the study or in the questionnaire. Responses will be mailed to me upon completion.

I know that this is not the most ideal time of year to intrude on public schools, but it is the prime time in which to gather the reflections of these teachers. After the study is completed, I would be more than happy to share my findings with interested persons.

I will call shortly after you receive this letter to secure permission to go ahead with the study. At that time I would like to know whom I should contact to get the names of the first-year teachers in your junior and senior high schools. A member of the project staff will contact them individually to leave the questionnaire. This would, of course, be done before or after school or during a prep period and would require less than five minutes. Under no circumstances will we pressure those teachers who are not interested in participating in the study.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Fredrick Briscoe
301-J Erickson Hall

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO DISTRIBUTORS

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO DISTRIBUTORS

Questionnaire

May 22, 1972

Dear Questionnaire Distributor:

Thank you for your willingness to help with this study to identify the professional concerns of first-year teachers. Your job will be to go to several junior or senior high schools to give copies of a questionnaire to first-year teachers individually and explain what the study is about and ask them to participate by filling out the questionnaire and returning it in the mail.

Your specific responsibilities look like this:

1. I will have cleared with the principal and the superintendent. Your first task will be to make an appointment with the principal to show him the attached letter and a copy of the study (if he wishes to see it). You also need to know who to see to get a copy of the names of new teachers--teachers who are completing their first year of teaching. (They must not have taught anywhere else before this year, and they must have started teaching in September.) Assure the principal that these teachers will only be contacted at the times he recommends (probably during a prep hour, after school or before school). Assure him, too, that you will spend less than five minutes with each teacher.

2. When you contact the teacher, introduce yourself, and explain that you are a member of a team that is asking first-year teachers to help provide data that will be of value in planning undergraduate teacher education courses, graduate education courses, and in-service education programs for secondary teachers. Explain that the study will not take more than TWENTY minutes for most people to complete. We would appreciate their cooperation sometime in the next several days. When they indicate their willingness to cooperate, give them a copy of the "First-Year Teacher" letter which is a written explanation of what you told them. It also says that when they complete the questionnaire and mail it they should, at the same time, mail the

attached postcard with their name and address--separately. It will preserve their anonymity completely, but at the same time let us know who responded and who did not. We will not know the building they are from, either.

3. Before you give the first-year teacher his or her letter, fill in the two blank spaces at the bottom of the page. The first one suggests a mailing deadline. Make this THREE days after you contact them--three school days. Write this date in. The second blank is when we will return to pick up any unmailed questionnaires. Make this date FIVE school days after you contact them.

4. Please be sure that your total time with each teacher does not exceed five minutes. It is easy to get into an involved, interesting discussion. AVOID THIS. Be brief, friendly, to the point. Thank 'em. GIT!

5. When you are finished in a particular building, please check out their cooperation (and anybody else, for that matter).

6. Please keep track of the names and room numbers of the teachers who received questionnaires.

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING MICHIGAN 48821

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM • ERICKSON HALL

May 22, 1972

Dear First-Year Teacher:

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study which is designed to identify the professional concerns of first-year teachers and relate them to such variables as undergraduate teacher education, class size, graduate courses, and in-service education programs.

The questions in this study will help you think about concerns that many first-year teachers may have had or may still have. It should take no more than TWENTY (20) minutes to respond to the multiple choice and open-ended questions. Background data is requested on the first pages to help in the interpretation of the responses.

PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This way your responses will be completely anonymous. Your building will not be identified either. I would appreciate it if you did not discuss this questionnaire with anyone while you have it.

A stamped, addressed envelope is provided for the return of your questionnaire. So that we can keep track of who has returned the studies and still retain your complete anonymity, a postcard is enclosed to return at the time you return the questionnaire. This is to be mailed separately. You will also be able to indicate on the postcard whether or not you would like a copy of the results of this study.

We would appreciate having you return the questionnaire by _____.

If you should misplace the envelope, we will be stopping by your building to pick up any unmailed questionnaires on _____.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Fredrick Briscoe
301-J Erickson Hall

APPENDIX E

POSTCARDS RETURNED BY RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX E

POSTCARDS RETURNED BY RESPONDENTS

Fredrick Briscoe
301-J Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

I have completed the questionnaire on first-year teachers and have put it in the mail.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

School Building _____

____ I would like a copy of the results of the study.

APPENDIX F

TABLES FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS
OF VARIANCE

TABLE F-1.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Teaching Level.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 1.8613			
D.F. = 6 and 102.0000 P Less Than 0.0947			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.2840	2.1402	0.1064
Personal Relationships	0.3957	2.1815	0.1013
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 3			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 52			

TABLE F-2.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction With First-Year Teaching Level.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 1.4293			
D.F. = 6 and 102.0000 P Less Than 0.2107			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.1424	1.0104	0.3957
Personal Relationships	0.3831	2.1037	0.1110
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 3			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 52			

TABLE F-3.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Average Class Size.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 0.1621			
D.F. = 4 and 104.000 P Less Than 0.9571			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.0231	0.1586	0.8538
Personal Relationships	0.0178	0.0889	0.9151
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 53			

TABLE F-4.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Attendance at In-Service Meetings.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 0.8186			
D.F. = 4 and 96.0000 P Less Than 0.5164			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.1735	1.3209	0.2763
Personal Relationships	0.2223	1.1826	0.3151
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 49			

TABLE F-5.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for College Courses Taken 1971-72.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 2.8359			
D.F. = 4 and 104.0000 P Less Than 0.0281			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.4727	3.6802	0.0319
Personal Relationships	0.1770	0.9140	0.4072
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 53			

TABLE F-6.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance For Average Age of Building Faculty.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 2.4989			
D.F. = 4 and 100.0000 P Less Than 0.0474			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.5831	4.6240	0.0143
Personal Relationships	0.5895	3.2009	0.0491
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 51			

TABLE F-7.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Type of Community.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 0.9532			
D.F. = 8 and 100.0000 P Less Than 0.4770			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.1590	1.1392	0.3487
Personal Relationship	0.1197	0.6019	0.6630
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 4			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 51			

TABLE F-8.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Racial Composition of Student Population.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 2.1956			
D.F. = 2 and 49.0000 P Less Than 0.1222			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.4530	3.4561	0.0690
Personal Relationships	0.1436	0.7633	0.3865
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 50			

TABLE F-9.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Ages of First-Year Teachers.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 4.4049			
D.F. = 2 and 52.0000 P Less Than 0.0171			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	1.0617	8.4106	0.0055
Personal Relationships	0.6516	3.4664	0.0682
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 53			

TABLE F-10.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Extent of Teaching Assignment in Major Field.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 0.6920			
D.F. = 2 and 53.0000 P Less Than 0.5051			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.1116	0.7889	0.3784
Personal Relationships	0.2679	1.3975	0.2424
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 54			

TABLE F-11.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Philosophical Congruence.

F-Ratio For Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 0.6959			
D.F. = 4 and 104.0000 P Less Than 0.5965			
Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
Instruction	0.1574	1.1218	0.3333
Personal Relationships	0.2401	1.2550	0.2935
Degrees of Freedom For Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom For Error = 53			
