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ABSTRACT

ENDURING REFORM: THE IMPACT OF MANDATED CHANGE ON MIDDLE CAREER TEACHERS

by

Corrie Stone-Johnson

Interest in educational change has continued to grow over the past three decades (Fullan, 1982; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). One focus has been the challenge of implementing sustainable reforms, particularly in secondary schools, which have traditionally been resistant to change (Goodson, 1983; Hargreaves, 2003; Louis & Miles, 1990; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001). Another has been the role of teachers in implementing, sustaining and also resisting change (Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1994; Kennedy, 2005; Little, 1996). In spite of challenges—and arguably lack of success—wave after wave of reform has attempted to introduce lasting change in schools (Sarason, 1990).

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) represents the latest wave of reform. This wave requires a relentless focus on achievement and improvement. The impact of NCLB is felt at the state level, where high-stakes, standardized tests are given annually as a means to measure progress (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). In Massachusetts, the test is the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS).

While the effects of mandated change are undoubtedly felt at all levels, it is teachers in mid-career for whom the stakes might be highest. Will reform work successfully stimulate and support them, or will it feel like an additional and unwanted
burden on their already full schedules? My dissertation thus explores the following question:

- What are the effects of contemporary high-stakes mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers?

Related to this broad question, I explore the in-school conditions and generational factors that influence these change commitments and capacities.

The surprising findings revealed that most teachers, representing both high and low performing schools in urban and suburban districts, felt that the MCAS in particular and the standards movement in general offer a neutral to positive opportunity for teachers to assess their students and to hone their curricular and teaching strategies. This statement holds true for the quantitative data as well; teachers generally appear to feel more control and influence over their work than in the recent past.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Julie is in her eighth year of teaching at one of the top suburban high schools in the New England state in which she lives. She teaches history and psychology at both the general and Advanced Placement levels and has been at this same school since she began her career in teaching. After the birth of her son almost two years ago she has been working a reduced schedule, which she hopes to continue into next year as well. Julie is in her mid-thirties and teaching is her second career; prior to teaching she worked in political organizing.

Like many other teachers of her generation, Julie struggles with the balance between home and work life, with the types of changes she is being asked to make to her curriculum as a result of standardized testing regimes, and with her role as a teacher as she moves from being the new kid on the block to one of the more veteran teachers on her staff. She loves teaching but is considering a move into counseling, which would allow her to continue to work with students but perhaps offer something exciting and new in terms of her personal career development. She expresses little to no interest in being in administration, although she has held multiple leadership positions in her school over the course of her eight years there.

Julie’s main subject area, history, is not currently tested under her state’s testing policies, although testing will begin in the next few years. Her students take practice tests but suffer no penalties for not passing. As procedures are put in place to prepare students for the test, Julie and her department are working collaboratively to structure the
curriculum in such a way as to best prepare them for success. At this school, test failure is not an option. Nearly every student passes the state exam. The atmosphere in the school around the test is one of certitude and calm; there is little anxiety as there is little history of failure. In our conversation, Julie expresses the same positive feeling about the test: her students will pass, and her curriculum will be stronger as a result of knowing exactly what it is that she should be teaching her students.

Harrison is also a teacher in mid-career at a public school in the same state. In his late thirties, he works at a public middle school in an urban, under-performing school district. He has taught for fifteen years and has changed schools multiple times. He currently teaches pre-algebra to students in the eighth grade. At his school, math is one of the most scrutinized subjects, as the school has not made Adequate Yearly Progress as required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Harrison’s teaching is monitored tightly and he feels very little professional freedom at present, a change that he feels undervalues him as a professional. Curricular changes are dictated from the top down; there is little to no collaboration with colleagues regarding change.

Harrison enjoys teaching but always keeps his eye on job listings for placements outside of his school. He would like to be an administrator but feels that his status as an African-American male works against him. He has applied for multiple administrative positions only to be turned away time and again. He feels he is well-compensated for his work and takes on extra opportunities to make more money, so he is not eager to leave the field entirely, especially within the district in which he works which, while challenging, pays well. He has a wife and small child at home, and until his wife goes back to work he feels obligated to stick it out.
These two teachers, on the surface, have a number of things in common: both are in mid-career, both are in their mid- to late-thirties, both teach in secondary public schools in a state that has had high-stakes testing in place for several years. Both enjoy teaching, both have young children, and both are slightly uncertain as to what the future holds in terms of their career growth and development. Yet in spite of the similarities, there is a story beneath the surface that is just beginning to develop, one that might not be noticed by a casual observer to the careers of these two individuals yet one that needs to be told in order to better understand the lives and careers of today’s mid-career teachers. For those teachers who are presently in mid-career—teachers who are members of the generation known for trying to have it all, on their own terms—will the reforms currently in place under NCLB change the quality or the duration of their careers? For the leaders who work with these teachers, will the mandated changes drain or sustain these teachers over time? Can anything be done to keep these teachers satisfied in their careers, or will these teachers, like so many other people in their generation, hop to the next job, the next opportunity, the fields that seem so much greener when viewed from their own challenging workplaces? This dissertation will attempt to shed light on these questions and the others that arise out of such a powerful and all-encompassing reform act as NCLB, and in particular the MCAS, the statewide high-stakes test in Massachusetts that fulfills the requirements of NCLB to measures student progress.

**Background**

Interest in educational change and its successes and failures has continued to grow over the past three decades (Fullan, 1982; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). One area of focus has
been the challenge of implementing sustainable reforms that have a lasting impact on schools and schooling, particularly in secondary schools, which have traditionally been resistant to change because of their size, bureaucratic complexity, subject traditions and identifications, and closeness to university selection (Goodson, 1983; Hargreaves, 2003; Louis & Miles, 1990; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001). Another focus has been the role of teachers in implementing, sustaining and also resisting change (Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1994; Kennedy, 2005; Little, 1996). In spite of challenges—and arguably lack of success—within these focal areas, wave after wave of reform has continued to attempt to introduce lasting change in secondary schools and upon the teachers who work in them (Sarason, 1990).

Recent changes to United States education policy in the form of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) represent the latest wave of reform. This wave requires a relentless focus on achievement, as measured by standardized tests; constant innovation; and continuous improvement, as measured by Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Schools that cannot ride this wave, but instead struggle in the undertow, must undertake pre-approved and scientifically based whole school reform models to ensure progress forward (Datnow, Hubbard & Mehan, 2002). Strict monitoring, school takeover, and student opt-out are just some of the consequences of failure to demonstrate improvement.

The impact of NCLB is felt not only nationally but at the state level, where high-stakes, standardized tests are given annually as a means by which to measure progress (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). In Massachusetts, the site for the qualitative component of this dissertation, the test is called the Massachusetts Comprehensive
Assessment System (MCAS) (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2002). Originally designed to meet the requirements of the Education Reform Law of 1993, this test measures performance on the Massachusetts Curriculum Framework learning standards and is presently the means by which Massachusetts schools measure AYP. Students are tested in grades three through ten (Anthony & Rossman, 1994; Massachusetts Department of Education, 2009) and are currently required to pass the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections in tenth grade to be eligible for a high school diploma.

This newest wave of reform raises questions about the impact of school change efforts on the lives and careers of teachers. Will reform work successfully stimulate and support teachers to use tools that make lasting changes in their classrooms and schools, or will it feel like an additional and unwanted burden on the already full schedules of overworked teachers? Will reform work encourage and support new and veteran teachers to remain in the classroom by providing them with the support and success that they need, or will it push them out in unprecedented numbers? Fullan writes

[I]nnovation can be a two-edged sword. It can either aggravate the teachers’ problems or provide a glimmer of hope. It can worsen the conditions of teaching, however unintentionally, or it can provide the support, stimulation, and pressure to improve. (1991, p. 126)

The impact of contemporary mandated reform on teachers’ practice is a topic in critical need of further exploration--not just in terms of its impact on the day-to-day lives of teachers, but also in terms of the overall effect it can have on their careers.
While the effects of mandated change are undoubtedly felt at all levels of the teaching career, it is teachers in mid-career for whom the stakes might be highest. However, while others have extensively researched the impact of change and reform on teachers in all career stages (Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1994, 2003; Huberman, 1989; Little; 1996), much of the research about specific stages has focused on new teachers (Johnson, 2004; Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993) or older teachers (Bailey, 2000; Riseborough, 1981). Little work has focused specifically on teachers in mid-career (in this study defined by 7-20 years experience) (Drake, 2002; Lacey, 1977). Even more importantly, little to no research has focused on a teacher’s generational identity (Hargreaves, 2005a), and specifically not on Generation X, although recent work has focused on the impact of standardization on the Boomer generation (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006) and on the challenges facing the Millennial generation (Johnson et al., 2004). According to Mannheim, in the classic text “The Problem of Generations,” (Edmunds & Turner, 2002; Mannheim, 1970) a generation is shaped, held together by, and ultimately determined by common events that form its worldview. The majority of teachers in the qualitative component of this study fall into Generation X, born in the late 1960s through the 1970s (Twenge, 2006). These teachers bring with them different understandings of teaching as both an art and a profession. These understandings are shaped, as Mannheim suggests, by the time in which these teachers experienced their own schooling and the world events that impacted their views of the world around them. They are also shaped by the teachers both who taught them and with whom they currently work. It is this group of teachers, though, for whom mandated reforms may have the most substantial impact, as they have both invested much of their professional lives in
their careers yet also have many more years ahead of them before retirement, and whether and how they integrate the changes into their existing lives and practice will almost certainly impact their teaching experience.

This study seeks to explore just how problematic the impact of contemporary, high-stakes mandated reform is for secondary public school teachers in mid-career, and specifically from Generation X. By speaking in-depth with and utilizing survey data from a broad range of teachers, I hope to deepen what is known about how mandated reform affects the change commitments and capacities of this under-studied cohort of teachers.

Focus of the Study

This dissertation will attempt to document the effects of mandated reform on middle career teachers in public schools at the secondary level. The study will explore the impact of specific changes, in particular *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) at the federal level and the MCAS and Education Reform in Massachusetts at the state level. Massachusetts and the MCAS offer a unique perspective, as the move to high-stakes testing occurred not because of the NCLB but instead as a reaction to a state Supreme Court case that found educational opportunity for students to be unequal and mandated standards and a test to measure the standards as a means to rectify the inequity. The study explores both the impact of mandated reform at the national level through the use of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and at the state level through the use of interviews of current and former teachers.
Using data from the SASS, this study documents teachers’ responses to questions about their efficacy in, satisfaction with, and feelings of control over their teaching careers. Two datasets are used: these datasets comprise surveys issued in 1999-2000 and 2003-2004. The data include teachers of all subjects and all grade levels; they do not only represent secondary teachers in mid-career due to the limited accessibility of the second dataset.

Individually, each dataset provides a moment-in-time snapshot of the lives of teachers. Taken together, the two datasets provide an interesting contrast in pre- and post-NCLB attitudes toward teaching. While NCLB cannot be the sole influence on teachers’ lives, certain trends emerge from the data which suggest that its impact may not indeed be as negative as presumed. The qualitative data, comprised of semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998) with teachers from around the state of Massachusetts, shed light on the impact of NCLB, and specifically mandated high-stakes testing and educational reform, on teachers in mid-career. Prior research on the teaching career has indicated that there are numerous factors that determine a teacher’s success with integrating reform, including structural (Louis & Miles, 1990), emotional (Hargreaves, 2005b; Little, 1996), political (Bartlett, 2004; Blase & Anderson, 1995; Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993), and personal factors (Burden, 1982; Evans, 1996; Farber, 1984; Fessler, 1995; Fullan, 1993; Gitlin & Margonis, 1995; Hargreaves, 2005a; Huberman, 1989; Riseborough, 1981; Smylie, 1999; Woods, 1999). The interviews that form the basis of the qualitative component of this study suggest that other factors, such as a teacher’s generational identity, may play equally important roles. The interviews also suggest that the aforementioned factors that affect a teacher’s success
with integrating reforms may also need revising and revisioning in an era of standardized reforms.

The study focuses primarily on mid-career teachers in secondary public schools for a number of reasons. First, given the large number of teachers in the country, the choice to limit the data makes the analysis more manageable. Second, as mentioned above, secondary schools come with their own unique set of challenges, adding to the already challenging nature of a career of teaching. Third, the bulk of literature on educational change has focused on elementary or primary education, perhaps because secondary educational reform is so complex; this study will shed needed new light in an area that is too often avoided. Finally, it is in secondary and public schools that the nature of standardized testing truly becomes high-stakes; rather than being held back a grade or needing extra tutorial sessions, students who fail to pass tests during the high school years are denied a diploma. For the teachers of these students, it is no longer enough to usher students through a year-long curriculum with the hopes that they will accumulate the skills and knowledge needed to go on to the next grade. Instead, secondary public school teachers must now ensure that their students pass the critical test for graduation. For these reasons, the focus of the study is limited to secondary public school teachers in mid-career.

The focus on Massachusetts is also unique. Other work (Falk & Drayton, 2004) has focused on the impact of MCAS on teachers’ practice by speaking with teachers currently struggling with the implementation of high-stakes testing. This study enhances that work by comparing a qualitative Massachusetts sample with a broader, national look using the SASS data. The closer focus on Massachusetts in particular is also valuable as
Massachusetts implemented standardized testing several years before the introduction of NCLB, although the high-stakes nature of such testing coincided with it. Thus, the teachers in my sample had been working in a standardized context longer than many of the teachers in the national SASS sample and the effects of working in such a context are longer-standing.

**Research Questions**

In sum, it is known that mandated reform can have a negative impact on teachers’ careers, causing them to either withdraw from practice or depart from the field altogether (Huberman, 1989; Little, 1996). It is also known that teachers in the middle stages of their careers are the most content with their work, the most confident in their abilities, and the most likely to engage positively with at least some reforms over a period of time (Drake, 2002; Huberman, 1989; Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985). Finally, it is also known that as the teaching force ages and retires, and as new teachers continue to leave the profession in high numbers, the number of middle career teachers will continue to drop (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997; OECD, 2005). In the current context of standardization and accountability, which brings rapid and successive changes to schools—changes that teachers must participate in and demonstrate success with—these facts take on new meaning. Thus, my dissertation will explore the following question:

- What are the effects of contemporary high-stakes mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers?

Related to this broad question is a subset of more in-depth questions. Specifically:
• How does mandated reform in an era of standardization and high stakes testing impact the mid-career stage of secondary teachers?

• What in-school conditions influence the impact of reform on these commitments and capacities?

• What generational factors influence the impact of reform on these commitments and capacities?

**The Need For More Research**

Is it possible, though, that educational researchers who study teachers’ careers are not approaching the question of how best to understand mid-career, or teachers at any stage, correctly? Could the changes that occur over the teaching career be due to more than the types of reform that teachers are asked to integrate into their teaching, or the stages of the teaching career, or just aging? Could it be possible that what both drives teachers out *and* keeps them in teaching is something unique to their peer group, their generation?

Strauss and Howe (1991, 1997) have written extensively on the topic of generations and argue that generations occur in cycles. Specifically, they argue that there are four generational types that recur in cyclical patterns over time. Each generation has a personality type and reacts to social changes in predictable ways—although different from each generation to the next. The current generation of teachers in mid-career is what Howe and Strauss call “thirteeners” and what others commonly understand as Generation X (Twenge, 2006). These teachers were born between the years 1961 and 1981 and are now in their mid-twenties to mid-forties. Most of the research on aging teachers,
however, has focused on teachers of the previous generation, what Howe and Strauss call the “boom” generation, born between 1943 and 1960. Both of these generations have very different understandings of career. The current generation of new teachers, called “millennials,” have yet another set of concerns that differ from their predecessors and that will indeed differ from future generations. Johnson and her colleagues’ work (2004) points to these generational differences, but focuses largely on how the “next generation” of teachers would fare in today’s classrooms. This study will focus on the current generation of teachers currently in classrooms, not just as a “generation” of teachers but also as a “generation” of adults different from those both before and after them. It will look specifically at how this generation of teachers is responding to mandated change. While earlier research has shown that aging teachers tend to react more conservatively and/or combatively toward such change, this research will delve into how today’s mid-career teachers experience change.

Significance of the Study

I am interested in exploring the potential intersection between career and life stage, mandated reform, and teachers’ experiences of change as a relatively neglected part of the teacher life cycle. The study of this relationship is important for several reasons. First, researchers such as Huberman (1989) and Little (1996) have demonstrated a relationship between teachers who engage in large scale reform and dissatisfaction with practice, but little qualitative or quantitative research—especially in the United States—has looked at this relationship in the current context of large-scale and other regulated
reforms such as *No Child Left Behind*, which requires certain teachers and schools to be involved in whole school reform.

Second, this study focuses on how reforms affect teachers in a crucial and relatively neglected part of the career lifecycle—mid-career. For the purposes of this study, mid-career is defined as teachers with seven to twenty years’ experience. This choice is made to narrow the choice of possible participants to a small but reasonable number and is based on two representative studies: Sikes, Measor and Woods (1985), in their five phases of the teaching career, look at teachers from age 28 to age 40 in phases two and three, after which point the career plateaus and then levels off; and Huberman (1989) identifies five career stages, with mid-career being years 4 to 30. This study uses the Sikes, Measor and Woods model.

Presently, the most rapidly expanding groups of the teaching force are older teachers close to retirement and young teachers, both of which also have the highest levels of attrition (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997). A fair amount is known about how these two groups of teachers respond to change (Hargreaves, 2005a; Huberman, 1989; Sikes, Measor, & Woods, 1985). Younger teachers, while keen to participate, can move from reform to reform without the institutional memory to question why certain changes are occurring or what their potential impact on the school might be. More senior teachers, whose memory of reform can be very long and often not without sore spots, are more hesitant to engage. These studies, while helpful, follow teachers on a path from beginning stages of teaching through to retirement. But what about teachers in the middle group, whose lives and careers have stabilized in the profession, and whose career investment mainly precludes the possibility to leave? How do they experience reform?
Recent work by Hargreaves (2005a) suggests that age is a predictive factor in how teachers respond to change, and that teachers in their mid-career are more comfortable about their job and their skills and still respond to change positively. Earlier research also suggests that teachers in mid-career are at their peak (Sikes, Measor, & Woods, 1985). This study, unlike prior work, asks questions about a particular situation: In a context of rapid and pressurized reforms, what will happen to this group of experienced, potentially change-minded teachers?

Little research is done on teachers in mid-career or those closer to retirement, as the changes that occur within their professional lives are not rapid and easy to study but are instead more complex (Lacey, 1977). This study begins to explore an under-researched area, and can begin to broaden understanding of what happens to this group of teachers in a critical phase of their careers.

Third, earlier work by such researchers as Huberman (1989) and Sikes, Woods and Measor (1985) was conducted within systems and times with traditional career structures, where a new teacher might expect to enter teaching and remain for the duration of the career, or move after a period of time into leadership positions or into a better school (Becker, 1952, in Burgess, 1995). In this structure, leadership meant leaving the classroom, and moving away from learning and instruction as a teacher. Teachers who did not progress to leadership but stayed in the classroom were most likely people who deliberately chose not to move up, or people who, by their own judgment or others’, simply lacked the capacity to lead. As a result, disillusionment might be explained by the teachers who “can’t.”
Now, teachers have different leadership opportunities that do not necessarily take them away from the classroom. Leadership and its relationship to teaching and learning is positioned differently. Teachers are encouraged to take on more roles, and to take them earlier, than their predecessors (Bartlett, 2004; Lieberman & Miller, 1999). Administrative roles are often shunned by people in this particular age group as they are viewed as taking teachers away from the very students whom they desire to serve (Donaldson, 2007). This study will incorporate the changed understanding of teachers’ roles regarding practice and leadership in a way that earlier studies, situated in a more traditional, linear career model, could not.

The choice to focus on middle-career teachers in spite of the fact that their numbers are waning warrants discussion regarding both teaching policy and practice. That the number of middle-career teachers continues to shrink is not surprising. First, many teachers with several years experience under their belt go on to leadership positions and leave the classroom behind. Second, many leave due to outside commitments such as raising families (Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985). The critical reason to focus on this group, even though they currently do not comprise the largest segment of the teaching population, is for the future. If these teachers leave the field or move out of classrooms and into leadership positions, and if new teachers continue to leave in large numbers, who will be in the classroom? Studying just who remains—and why and under what conditions—can provide insight into teacher retention past the new teacher phase. If, as Sikes, Measor and Woods suggest, teachers in mid-career have made significant personal investments that prevent them from leaving, yet they wish to leave, what can be done to
re-invigorate their work? These questions regarding policy and practice will be explored in this study.

Fourth, this study will fill several gaps in the literature on teachers’ careers. First, much of the literature in the field is primarily from the 1980s and early 1990s. Work in the current context of *No Child Left Behind* may provide different understandings of the career cycle. Second, the best-known work in the field, namely Huberman (1989) and Sikes, Measor and Woods (1985) takes place outside of the American context. While these studies undoubtedly provide insight into the paths of teachers’ careers, they do not address the unique American context, post-*A Nation at Risk* and up to and including *No Child Left Behind*. And last, the issues that face the teachers in the other work on teachers’ careers, such as generational mission (Goodson, Moore, & Hargreaves, 2006; Riseborough, 1981) and gendered patterns of mid-career choice, such as homemaking (Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985) may no longer apply. This study will shed new light on the issues facing mid-career teachers in the present, post-millennium, American context.

Finally, this study will explore an area that has yet to be examined by researchers, that of generational identity of teachers, particularly those considered Generation X. Most teachers in mid-career now fall into this generational category, and the issues that face them as they progress through their careers differ to a great extent from those of the generations before them. These differences warrant a new field of study, one that intersects both the study of teachers’ careers and lives and the leadership issues that affect this new crop of mid-career teachers, both in terms of what type of leadership is needed to keep them engaged and involved in the classroom but also one that understands how they progress into newly defined leadership roles of their own.
Coming to the Problem—Locating the Researcher in the Study

This study is not only potentially useful to teachers, teacher educators, school leaders and policy makers; undertaking the research, theorizing about generational differences and exploring the effects of mandated reform on mid-career teachers has revealed a great deal to me about my own experiences as a teacher, my own interests—and biases—as a researcher, and about how I as a former teacher and current researcher see a way forward in a conflicted and conflicting era of standardization and scrutiny.

My interest in conducting this study initially stems from my own experiences as a new teacher undergoing mandated reforms in a challenging school in New York City. As a part of the Teach For America program, which places recent college graduates in hard-to-staff schools around the country, I entered teaching armed with only a 5-week crash course in curriculum and pedagogy and a burning desire to be a “good” teacher. I do not remember what my image of a “good” teacher was at that point; as I stayed in the school, I had only what I perceived as negative examples against which to compare my own teaching. Most of the teachers were either brand-new, like myself, or teetering on the edge of retirement. These veteran teachers discouraged the new teachers at every turn, pleading with us to please leave while we could, to not bother to try because our work would be to no avail, to get out while the getting was still good. I even witnessed teachers pass photocopied worksheets out to their students and then put their feet up on their desk to read the daily newspaper.

The school itself, while typical, or perhaps even slightly above average, for a New York City public middle school, was bursting at the seams both literally and
metaphorically. More than 1500 students attended grades six through eight. Every class had thirty-five students, some even more. The majority of the students came from Spanish-speaking Dominican backgrounds, although only about one third of the students were in specifically bilingual classes. Overcrowding was only one issue at the school, however. Around the time I began teaching, “standards” became the buzzword in New York City schools, especially in schools similar to the one where I worked, in which the majority of students tested below grade level. Teaching to the standards became the goal of the English department, of which I was part. Being new to teaching, I did not really have a curriculum to revise, so I listened and learned alongside more seasoned veterans who struggled with the changes they would have to make.

As I observed, I came to see that teaching to the standards meant teaching to the test. The specific test was the citywide reading test given each spring. Students at my school typically performed poorly on this test. To combat low test scores, handbooks were printed and distributed; test guidebooks were purchased and pushed on teachers. After school courses were offered to students to help them prepare for the citywide exams in the spring. Changing the curriculum was less about authentic learning goals that matched the standards with students learning needs and more about making sure that certain topics were covered and that students would be prepared to answer test questions covering these topics. From what I could see, most people’s standards handbooks ended up in their locked teachers’ closets, never to be unearthed.

I cannot say that I, as a new teacher, revolted or in any visible way fought against these changes. Achinstein and Ogawa (2006) write about new teachers who subtly resist change by not following the mandated reforms, and how these teachers offer insight into
how new teachers do not necessarily buy into the political culture of the school simply because they are new teachers, as other research suggests (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993). I, however, bought lock, stock and barrel into the school culture, partly out of fear of being noticed and having my teaching scrutinized, and partly in the interest of not making waves so as to be sure to keep my job. In terms of the standards, this meant I worked extra hard to incorporate the changes into my curriculum. To make extra money, I taught the after-school test-prep courses. While on the inside I was angry about the narrowing of the curriculum, I never let my displeasure show.

I weathered this environment for three years. Ultimately, the tension between my teaching ideals and the mandated change became too much to bear. At the end of the spring marking period, in my third year of teaching, I was urged to fail students who, despite performing excellently in my class, failed the reading test. I found this practice abhorrent, not least because my students were not native English speakers and, while failing the test, showed marked improvement from the previous year. I did not fail them, although I felt pressure to lower their grades, as my assistant principal felt I could not give a high grade to a student who failed the reading test.

Thus, the circumstances surrounding the introduction of standards and subsequent high-stakes testing pushed me out of the school in which I was working, and probably teaching in general. I did not change schools but instead left teaching for the not-for-profit sector. I was offered another teaching job but felt I was too burned out and indeed too sad to commit much more than a year, and the school that offered me a job wanted a minimum two-year commitment.
As a new teacher, it was somewhat easier for me to leave teaching. I was twenty-five years old and halfway through my master’s degree. I knew I wanted to stay in education as a field, but was fairly certain that I did not want to be in the classroom any longer. I had no children, was renting my apartment, and had little debt. The decision to leave affected only me. Through my review of the literature, however, I have come to see that this position is perhaps unique to new teachers. Veteran teachers with more experience often do not have the luxury of such choices (Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985). As Susan Moore Johnson and her team of researchers (2004) learned through their in-depth study of new teachers in Massachusetts, finances and family often drive teachers’ decisions about both staying in and leaving teaching.

In some ways, perhaps my research into the topic of how mid-career teachers experience mandated reforms helps me to probe my own feelings about how I handled such change. If I had not been scared of losing my job, would I have been less likely to follow the script? Would I have silently subverted, or would I have been more vocal? I left the school after three years, in part due to my displeasure with the way mandated change was being handled in the school. Rather than stay on and work with others in my department to integrate the changes in a way I felt to be more meaningful, I left my classroom. As I approached this research topic, I hoped to talk to teachers who decided to stay, to tough it out or toe the line, to find ways to make the change more workable for themselves and their practice. I also hoped to speak with teachers who stayed on but who did not handle the change in the way they feel they should have. Finally, I hoped to speak with teachers who reacted as I did. The main difference in this third category is that the teachers with whom I spoke were more experienced than I was. I was curious to
see how they, with their years of experience behind them, came to the decision to leave the classroom.

My career path, I have come to learn, is fairly typical for someone in my generation. As Gen Xers, we enter into and leave jobs with some rapidity (Watters, 2004). Some of this job change has to do with dissatisfaction with the circumstances surrounding particular jobs. Some of the change has to do with the idea that we want—and feel we can have—it all. Because we marry later and have children later, if at all, our freedom and flexibility are much greater than that of our parents and of the generations who came before them. As I began this dissertation, I could not help but think that part of what drives teachers out of the classroom might not be the job itself, but might instead have more to do with who we are as a generation of teachers. It is this topic that led me to consider theorizing teachers’ responses to mandated reform from a more generational angle, something heretofore not undertaken by researchers. There is a great deal in the popular media these days about Generation Y and their needs in the workplace, but I have found much less about Generation X. From speaking with teachers, however, it has become clear that this topic is one that needs equal attention. Failure to consider the unique changes that face each generation as they move through their careers may mean a generation of dissatisfied and disengaged employees. For this reason, I feel this study fills a critical gap in the literature and in the field. I hope it provides a meaningful and significant contribution not only to the literature but to the lives and careers of those teachers it seeks to document.
Research Design

In order to explore the effects of mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers, this study incorporates a mixed methods approach using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The quantitative component of the study focuses on two data sets (1999-2000 and 2003-2004) from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) undertaken by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). In particular, I look at how teachers answer questions about their teaching career, and how these answers have or have not changed over time. To test for significance between data sets, z-tests were performed.

The qualitative component of the study utilizes data from semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998) with twelve participants. The data were coded and analyzed to uncover and explore common themes. In this manner, generational theory was developed directly from the data at hand and developed in an on-going and generative manner best suited for qualitative research (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The choice to use a mixed methods approach centered on the ability to examine a wide swath of teachers to see a larger picture of what is happening in classrooms across the country while also being able to talk to individual teachers about their own experiences with change. No one source of data tells a complete story. For that matter, even multiple data sources cannot unveil a universal truth. Instead, this mixed methods study presents macro- and micro-views of a particular moment in time, six years after the implementation of NCLB, and seven to twenty years into the careers of twelve teachers in one New England state.
Limitations of the Study

This study, while addressing a much-needed area of research, is not without its limitations. Perhaps the largest limitation is the sample size of the qualitative component of the study and the resulting questions about reliability that come with such a small and localized sample. With only twelve participants confined to one geographic area, any generalizations to a larger population of teachers may be problematic; with such a small sample, the study may not be as replicable as with a larger group. While these claims cannot be entirely dismissed, they can be addressed with two responses. First, the mixed methodology allows for a broader sample of teachers to be represented. Although this sample includes teachers who are not mid-career and not in secondary schools, it does expand the picture to show how the demands on teachers have changed over time and how these demands impact and influences teachers’ feelings of efficacy and satisfaction in their work. Second, the choice a qualitative methodology means that I, as a researcher, am not looking for universally applicable results but instead focusing on ways to explain a very unique phenomenon, that of Generation X teachers experiencing educational change in mid-career.

A second limitation is the snowball design for gathering participants. I relied solely on word of mouth from participants and colleagues to find the teachers who comprised sample. While this methodology was chosen to protect the participants, about whom I asked personal questions about their career and further aspirations, the sample was not randomized. Again, the use of SASS data begins to address this issue, as it is based on extensive survey data, but ultimately the data generated from my study will be
from the interviews conducted. As a qualitative endeavor, as mentioned above, this study does not seek to speak for an entire phenomenon but rather aims to provide beginning data points from which other research, both qualitative and quantitative, can be drawn. The interviews, while limited in number, go much further in-depth than a larger but more randomized sample could, and provide information that a different study could not.

The choice to use a mixed methods approach was made to offset as many limitations as possible. This study does not aim to be indicative of an entire phenomenon but does begin to explore and examine some of the challenges that arise as teachers in mid-career face the implementation of mandated change in their classrooms.

**Definition of Terms**

This dissertation utilizes many terms which, although most likely familiar to the majority of readers, warrant explication. Some definitions are crafted by me, while others come directly from the literature and reflect others’ understandings and utilizations of the terms.

**Mandated reform**

For the purposes of this paper, the key aspects of mandated reforms are that:

1. They originate externally from teachers’ classrooms;
2. Compliance and success (or avoidance of failure) with the reforms are expected; and
3. There are personal, professional, and political consequences for not participating.

Mid-career

For the purposes of this study, mid-career is defined as teachers with seven to twenty years’ experience and is based on two representative studies: Sikes, Measor and Woods (1985), in their five phases of the teaching career, look at teachers from age 28 to age 40 in phases two and three, after which point the career plateaus and then levels off; and Huberman (1989) identifies five career stages, with mid-career being years 4 to 30. This study uses the Sikes, Measor and Woods model.

Generation

A generation is “shaped by events or circumstances according to which phase of life its members occupy at a time” and “follow observable historical patterns” (Howe and Strauss, 2007)

Generation X

Howe and Strauss (2007) offer the most succinct and descriptive definition: Generation X (born 1961-1981, now age 26-46) grew up in an era of failing schools and marriages, when the collective welfare of children sank to the bottom of the nation's priorities, and dozens of films portrayed children who were literally demons or throwaway survivalists. Xers learned early on to distrust institutions, starting with the family, as the
adult world was rocked by the sexual revolution, the rise in divorce, and an R-rated popular culture. With their mothers entering the workplace before child care was widely available, many endured a latchkey childhood. By the mid-1980s MTV, hip-hop, and a surging interest in business and military careers had marked a new and hardening pragmatism in their mood. Surveys (and pop culture) pointed to greater risk taking among the young. Over the next decade crime and teen pregnancy rates soared. After navigating a sexual battleground of AIDS and blighted courtship rituals as young adults, Xers have dated cautiously and married late. Many of them have begun to construct the strong families that they missed in childhood. In jobs they prefer free agency over corporate loyalty, with three in five saying they someday "want to be my own boss." They are already the greatest entrepreneurial generation in U.S. history; their high-tech savvy and marketplace resilience have helped America prosper in the era of globalization. Of all the generations born in the twentieth century, Gen X includes the largest share of immigrants. Xers have made barely any impression in civic life; they believe that volunteering or helping people one-on-one is more efficacious than voting or working to change laws.

Generational identity

For the purposes of this study, generational identity is used to describe the characteristics people within a particular generation use to define themselves. It also
incorporates the characteristics utilized by people in other generations to describe a particular generation.

**Overview of the Study**

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. The first chapter is an introduction to the study. It identifies the issues and topics under study and provides both a theoretical rationale to frame the study and a description of the methodology used to explore the data. The second chapter presents a review of the literature, both theory and research, in the fields relevant to the study. The third chapter outlines the research methodologies used for the study as well as the rationale for choosing the particular methodologies. The fourth and fifth chapters describe the data under study. The fourth chapter details the quantitative data from the SASS and the fifth chapter details the qualitative data from fifteen semi-structured interviews. In each chapter, data gathering, sampling procedures and data analysis are described in detail. Finally, the sixth chapters offer tentative conclusions about the data, as well as policy implications and suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER II:
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To say that times in the field of education are changing would be an understatement of the obvious. Teacher demographics are changing, becoming increasingly more female, White and middle-class, while student demographics are becoming more and more diverse (Cochran-Smith, Davis & Fries, 2002; Goodwin, 2002). This discrepancy leads to more and more teachers coming from different racial or socioeconomic backgrounds than their students (Cochran-Smith, Davis & Fries, 2002; Sleeter, 2000-2001; Sleeter, 2001), and being increasingly unprepared to meet the needs of many of their students-urban schoolchildren in particular--due to both their own prior knowledge and their lack of teacher education that prepares them to succeed in diverse classrooms (Goodwin, 2002; Grant, 1994; Haberman, 1994; Howey, 1999; Jenks, Lee & Kanpol, 2001; Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Smylie & Kahne 1997; Zeichner, 2003).

The teacher employment market is also changing (Lytle, 2000). Teachers have more opportunities to work in varied settings that may be very different from traditional elementary and secondary schools. Charter schools, alternative schools, and even home schooling, where teachers can work as consultants, provide new work environments for teaching that may require different skill sets than those needed by more traditional forms of schooling.

Yet another change is the shift to more collaborative and cooperative forms of teaching and learning. Once, teaching was viewed as a closed and individualistic activity that valued autonomy (Lortie, 1975); teachers worked in private classrooms and kept
their ideas to themselves (Little, 1990), ‘tinkering’ in their own classrooms with the practices that they determined to work best for them (Huberman, 1989). More recently, research has urged teachers to become more collaborative (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001) and to take on leadership roles not just in their classrooms but in their schools (Lieberman & Miller, 1999). This expanded view of the teaching role is more likely to include responsibilities outside the classroom, such as teacher involvement in directing the school’s curricular, pedagogical, and assessment programs.

At the same time and paradoxically, teachers are also being drawn out of their individual classrooms and into a more collaborative environment through professional learning communities, which bring professionals and evidence together through formal and informal means in order to create deliberate improvements in practice and results (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Meier, 2002). Professional learning involves and promotes collaborative work and discussion among the school’s professionals and focuses on improving student learning (Newman, King & Youngs, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995).

The field of teaching is also becoming increasingly standardized (Hargreaves, 1994, 2003). While advocates of standardization argue that standards define what is to be taught and what kind of performance is expected, are necessary for equality of opportunity, and supply accurate information to students, parents, teachers, employers and colleges (Ravitch, 1995), others argue that standardization has not succeeded in motivating all students, particularly those at risk of failure, to do better (Roderick & Engel, 2001), and that standardization deskills teachers (McNeil, 2000) by limiting curricular content and the teacher’s control over what is taught, as well as intensifying
teachers’ work so that in practice they have less rather than more time to access the expertise and support of their colleagues (Hargreaves, 2003). Finally, standardized testing regimes often replace learning for understanding with learning for testing (Kohn, 1999; McNeil, 2000). Teachers, in this standardized and politically intensified environment, are not encouraged to think proactively and reflectively but instead need to think reactively in defense of their material needs (their jobs, curricular materials). They cannot take professional risks that may help them grow but instead must work to maintain their status quo. Schools, particularly urban schools that struggle with student achievement, are urged to adopt Comprehensive Reform models that are scientifically proven (Lytle, 2000; Datnow, Hubbard & Mehan, 2002; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). These models often come with scripted teachers’ guides and activities for students that minimize individual teachers’ contributions to the curriculum and the learning of their students while simultaneously increasing the monitoring necessary for assessment and accountability, which are more strictly monitored and more closely tied to the evaluation of the school (Hargreaves, 2003).

Thus, at the same time that the evidence from educational research urges teachers to work collaboratively and in professional communities, they are being asked to take on and comply with new roles that encourage them to do otherwise. Instead of working together to share best practices, teachers are being encouraged to focus on testing. Research into similar reforms (Fullan, 2003) has shown that such a relentless focus on increasing achievement, without taking into account the more personal, moral and emotional needs of teachers, as well as the conditions under which change occurs comes at a huge cost—a very noticeable loss of teacher morale. It is into this standardized and
pressurized context that new teachers are entering the profession, and from which more experienced teachers are exiting. Do these reforms impact middle career teachers in other ways as well?

Reform and Change

Perhaps one of the most compelling reasons that people enter into—and stay in—the field of teaching is a desire to see students succeed and to feel as though they have helped them in that process (Fullan, 2003; Lortie, 1975). Fullan (1993) writes that for some there is even a moral imperative in teaching, and that those teachers who feel most rewarded are those who embrace this imperative. Often, unfortunately, eager beginning teachers who enter schools with dreams of reforming education quickly encounter stagnant school environments that are resistant both to change and to the teachers who try to bring it about. This experience of “praxisschock” (Veenman, 1984) is not a temporary condition easily remedied but instead a multi-layered and multi-faceted amalgam of concerns for new teachers to navigate. These teachers, armed with their knowledge of theory and practice, become quickly “buried under” the expectations for performance in their new settings (Long, 2004, p. 145). In these environments, new teachers are asked to trade in knowledge from their university preparation programs—and with it their hopes for change—for a more local and contextualized knowledge that is valued by veteran teachers in the school (Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993). Teachers—who became more idealistic through teacher preparation programs—become more conservative and utilize more traditional methods of teaching and classroom management as they navigate through the first years of teaching (Veenman, 1984).
The locus of change can also impact whether or not a teacher meets success or satisfaction with the process of experimentation. Huberman (1989) suggests that more experienced teachers, those who reform at the classroom level—but do not engage in school-wide reform—are the most content and most successful. It is the teachers who meet with success in experimentation who go on to lead productive teaching careers. It is when teachers begin to invest in larger-scale reform, at the school or district level, that they are most likely to report feeling burned out (Little, 1996).

Finally, literature over the last two decades (Huberman, 1989; Little, 1996) has shown that the type of reform undertaken has a significant impact on a teacher’s satisfaction with its implementation. In particular, mandated reform work is nearly always viewed negatively. Huberman (1989) suggests that experienced teachers who reform at the classroom level—but do not engage in school-wide reform—are the most content and most successful. It is when teachers begin to invest in larger-scale—and often mandated--reform, at the school or district level, that they are most likely to report feeling burned out (Little, 1996). Little calls teachers whose experiences with reform lead to frustration “disappointed reform enthusiasts.”

More recently, and specifically within the context of the MCAS, Falk and Drayton (2004), in looking at the effects of mandated reform on science teachers’ practice, found that the impact “depends” (p. 381). In their case study analysis of six districts in Massachusetts, they found that what matters for teachers’ practice depends not necessarily on the reform itself but on the district’s interpretation of the test, whether the changes the district requires also require changes in pedagogy, and whether teachers view the test as a reasonable target for their students.
Mandated or planned reform does not have to be as broad or wide-ranging as NCLB. For example, many schools adopt particular reform models, such as those promoted by the Coalition of Essential Schools or the Gates Foundation’s small learning communities. Other schools, such as charter schools, take on whole-school reforms of their own. For the purposes of this paper, the key aspects of mandated reforms are that:

1. They originate externally from teachers’ classrooms;
2. Compliance and success (or avoidance of failure) with the reforms are expected; and
3. There are personal, professional, and political consequences for not participating.

The difficulty of keeping one’s desire for change and reform alive is only part of the problem when it comes to enduring school reform, particularly in an era of mandated reform and standardization. Enduring, here, is meant in both senses of the word—both living through and living on. Current research on educational change suggests that change that is lasting and is achievable by teachers at different levels of experience is difficult for myriad reasons: structural, emotional, political, and personal. All of these factors all play a role. Each of these factors is explored below.

**Structural Factors**

The difficulty of change can be structural, particularly in secondary schools. (Louis & Miles, 1990). First, change models are often borrowed from the private sector, and schools operate very differently from the businesses on which these change models are based. Second, secondary school staff, who may have experienced several reforms
over the years, face difficulty and frustration in trying new models, and may, instead of fully buying into the change, just “mouth the rhetoric of improvement” while reverting back to their old ways (p. 5). Third, while there is some consensus on what should be taught in elementary schools, namely the “basics,” there is not consensus about the aims and purposes of secondary education. Finally, the very structure of secondary schools themselves may inhibit the success of reforms; the size, organizational complexity, student movement through the school, and ability grouping make pervasive change more difficult than in less complex environments (p. 8).

**Emotional Factors**

Part of the difficulty of change is emotional. Reform requires more than just physical labor and technical know-how from teachers; it demands emotional labor that draws on and utilizes different resources and different modes of coping. Emotional labor requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others…This kind of labor calls for a coordination of mind and feeling, and it sometimes draws on a source of self that we honor as deep and integral to our individuality. (Hochschild, 2003, p. 7)

Particularly susceptible are workers who must always put on a pleasant face—physically and socially—to their clients (Ehrenreich, 2001; Hochschild, 2003). Teachers are susceptible to this emotional labor as well; they must present feelings of confidence in the reforms they are supporting to both their students and their superiors. While many teachers experience positive emotions associated with reform work in their classrooms,
they may also experience feelings of frustration or disappointment when colleagues do not support their ideas or when their reforms do not succeed (Little, 1996). Teachers, particularly experienced and successful teachers once enthusiastic about reform, “backslide” from reformed and innovative practice to traditional practice when they feel that they are not meeting with the progress from students to which they were accustomed (Muncey & McQuillan, 1996). What was once positive becomes emotional labor when conflict affects classroom and school life in ways that visibly affect students.

**Political Factors**

Part of the difficulty of reform is political, indeed micro-political. Micropolitics explores the daily realities of teachers in schools: their search for the materials, the resources, and the relationships that will maintain and sustain their professional and personal lives in the classroom (Blase & Anderson, 1995). According to Blase and Anderson, teachers act in both positive and negative ways to achieve these ends; positive ways include smiling, joking, sharing and small talk, while more negative ways include flaunting, spying, or lack of involvement. Kelchtermans and Ballet (2002) suggest that micropolitics act as protection:

> Through micro-political actions teachers and principals will strive to establish the desired working conditions, to safeguard them when threatened or to restore them if they have been removed. (p. 108)

They argue that teachers learn the micropolitics of the school in order to protect their self, material, organizational, cultural-ideological and social-professional interests. In order to protect these interests, teachers will resort to
talking, pleading, arguing, gossiping, flattering, being silent and avoiding comments, avoiding taking sides, accepting extra duties (in exchange for a contract), changing the material working conditions, the use of humour, etc. (p. 117).

The most popular strategy is silence; teachers formed a society of the silent…afraid to express opinions to peers and administrators that might be considered controversial and thus jeopardize their chances for success and survival in the school. (Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993, p. 468)

These school politics affect both new and experienced teachers. New teachers are at their most vulnerable to these experiences during the induction phase of teaching, in which they are walking the tightrope between wanting to enact their reforms in their own classrooms and at the same time wanting to fit in with colleagues—and even wanting to maintain their employment in the school (Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993). New teachers must learn the “cultural codes” of the school in order to maintain, or advance, their careers (p. 462).

Veteran teachers are also impacted by politics, particularly toward the end of their career. This issue can be seen, for example, when a new, younger administration takes over in a school. Older teachers, confident in their teaching abilities and eager to be rewarded for long years of intensive service to a school, may act out against the new principal’s change efforts to show their dissatisfaction when instead of being rewarded they are given lower level classes or are perhaps not promoted as they had expected to be (Riseborough, 1981). They may form bands of veteran teachers who act against the new
administration, thwarting these changes. Veteran teachers may also disengage from school life simply as a matter of the normal aging process (Evans, 1996). As their attention turns away from career and toward personal life, older teachers are less inclined to fully engage in the life of the school, thus setting them up to appear oppositional to change, whether or not this is actually the case.

The political difficulties of change do not just happen at the level of the teacher within a school, particularly when it comes to mandated reform. Oftentimes, politics play out at the district and even the state level. Datnow, Hubbard and Mehan (2002) suggest that “structural constraints and relations of power had as much to do with reform adoption as the information about the reforms themselves. In most cases, principals realized that they would be able to garner additional resources and curry favor from the district if they adopted a reform. As a result, they encouraged their teachers to vote in favor and vote quickly.” Thus, the politics of mandated reform do not just occur at the level of the teacher; principals, district administrators, and even state officials participate in the dance that takes place between reform designers and reform implementers.

**Personal Factors**

Structural, emotional and political factors are not the only hindrance to change. Personal concerns caused by a variety of issues can play an equally important role in how teachers respond to change. These factors include, but are not limited to, gender, age, prior experience with change, and career stage.
Gender.

To begin to understand what is known or has been studied about the relationship between gender and reform, I conducted a search of the educational database ERIC. Using the keywords gender AND reform, I found articles from 159 peer-reviewed journals. Limiting further, the keywords gender AND reform AND teacher brought up 33 articles. Of those articles, only a handful appeared to be useful or relevant for the terms of this study. The studies I excluded tended to be about gender and reform as they relate to students in the school (changing the curriculum to better teach girls or boys, for example), focused on school leaders and not teachers, and outside the United States. Datnow and Hubbard (2000, p. 116) write that “while there is considerable research on the role of teachers in school change, gender issues are seldom considered in the process.” Even nine years later, this still appears to be the case.

Using the bibliographies of the articles mentioned above, I was able to find other articles, not specifically about gender and reform but about gender and the teaching career, that shed light on why this dearth of literature exists. Acker’s (1995-1996) review of the literature on gender and teaching was perhaps the most enlightening. She points out that while some literature has focused on divisions (elementary/secondary, variations among schools, subjects), few writers have paid distinct attention to gender. In what does exist

Functionalist studies often show an awareness of women’s presence within teaching but tend to rely on stereotypes; interactionist studies prefer to downplay or ignore the role of gender (Nias, 1989); and critical studies
have sometimes recognized gender as an influential dimension but have not yet developed a consensus on its role. (p. 113)

Acker further writes that if one were to use a spectrum, with one end being literature that ignores gender and the opposite end being literature that places gender at the center of analysis, most literature would fall on the former end, and little to no work at the latter end.

Several themes, echoing themes Acker found, emerged from the articles I included. First, while the literature base is small, much of what is written focuses on the micropolitics of teaching as it relates to gender. For example, Datnow (1997) examined competition between what she called the “Idea Team” (comprising all women) and the “Good Old Boys” (comprising all men) for a detracking effort within one American high school. (add more). Similarly, Datnow and Hubbard (2000) focused on the relations among teachers in implementing both small and whole-school reform and found that “who advocates for a reform, whether a reform is adopted, and ultimately, whether a reform is successful” has much to do with gender politics (p. 118). Those reforms advocated or supported by women within a school and were viewed as “women’s work” ultimately failed (p. 119). Loder (2005) also suggested that much reform work is about mothering, although her work focused on female African-American school leaders, in particular those who came of age during the Civil Rights movement.

The second theme, while it related to gender issues, focused on new and veteran teachers, not those in mid-career. Bruno (2000) statistically explored multiple factors to better understand school reform, specifically urban school reform. His study was based on survey data from 1,000 classroom teachers across several urban schools undergoing
large-scale reform. His subjects were what he described as younger male and younger female teachers (under 30) and older male and female teachers (over 50). His findings suggest that as teachers age, they tend to want more time to focus on personal activities outside the school rather than those related to earning a living. The school reform efforts that pay teachers extra for their time beyond the typical boundaries would therefore not succeed with this group of teachers. In terms of gender, Bruno found that “older male teachers tended to want more time for self or personal development, whereas older female teachers thought that some school reforms were not worth their time” (2000, p. 156). He also suggested a generational component to change; more on this will follow.

The other study focused on professional development. Torff and Sessions (2008) explored how teachers’ demographic characteristics (age, years of teaching experience, gender, grade level (elementary versus secondary), and level of educational attainment) are associated with their attitudes toward professional development (p. 124). They found that most teachers felt positive about professional development in general, and that teaching experience was the best predictor of attitudes. After nine years of teaching, none of the other factors was a statistically significant predictor of attitudes.

In summary, little literature exists on the relationship between teacher gender and reform and what does exist does not focus truly on gender. What does exist focuses on the relationships between teachers as they navigate the reform process or on teachers at the beginning or ends of their careers. As stated above, the teachers in my study are all in mid-career, with experience ranging from seven to fifteen years in the classroom. The one study that included this demographic focused on professional development, not reform, and also found gender to be statistically insignificant.
Age.

Research on teachers and aging has shown that as teachers age they often become more conservative (R. Evans, 1996; Hargreaves, 2005a; Riseborough, 1981). First, aging plays a critical role in how teachers both experience their careers and handle change within these careers, especially teaching (R. Evans, 1996). As teachers age, their focus often shifts from concerns at work to concerns at home. Instead of spending energy planning for the workday, older teachers begin to think about the future, about retirement and life after work. As such, they are less able to invest in changes or reforms occurring in their schools. Older and more experienced teachers also tend to have a more cynical view of reform, as over time they have seen reform after reform in their schools and classrooms, and may have less faith in the permanence of the changes (Hargreaves, 2005a). Finally, older teachers often wish for a time when, as they remember it, things were easier in the school, and they understood how to behave within an understood system. As the school changes and new administrators, often younger than themselves, come into power in the school, more senior teachers can rebel by refusing to cooperate or implement new reforms (Riseborough, 1981).

While conservatism or refusal to participate in reforms on the part of older teachers may appear as stubborn or unwilling behavior, many researchers feel that it is actually quite a sensible response to change. Some teachers show unwillingness to change until their own material needs are met (Gitlin & Margonis, 1995). Conservatism also acts as a way of making meaning of a changing environment. Marris (1986, p 11) writes, “[T]he impulses of conservatism—to ignore or avoid events which do not match
our understanding, to control deviation from expected behavior, to isolate innovation and sustain the segregation of different aspects of life—are all means to defend our ability to make sense of life.” Thus, conservatism may be considered a normal reaction to change, rather than as a negative or deviant one.

Changed attitudes toward reform are not only the result of disillusionment in beginning teachers. Evans (1996) argues that not youth, but its opposite, is a critical factor in resistance to change: “[U]ndergoing personal change in addition to school change, teachers are often treated as though the only changes happening are at school; people look to work for stability, not change, in this time” (p. 100). Further, Evans writes that teachers in midlife experience different stresses, and that these stresses impact their motivation, performance, and response to planned change (p. 97). Veteran teachers also have longer memories of teaching and reform, and are thus more inclined to feel a sense of loss as changes are made within the school (Hargreaves, 2005a)

**Prior experience with change.**

Teachers handle change in a variety ways. There are at least three responses: thriving/accepting, resistance, and burnout. These responses are of course closely tied with other factors such as age and the school environment in which a teacher works, but regardless take on certain similar characteristics.

Some teachers thrive in an environment where change is the norm and are able to accept and handle changes as they come through. These teachers actively engage in reform efforts at various levels to ensure the success of their students. Fullan (1993) refers to these teachers as change agents and ascribes to them four capacities:
• *Personal vision-building*—teachers must question for themselves what difference they are trying to make and develop a vision to enact it;

• *Inquiry*—“the formation and enactment of personal purpose is not a static matter. It is a perennial quest” (p. 15). Inquiry requires continuous learning on the part of the teacher;

• *Mastery*—the “skill and know-how” (p. 16) of successful change. Mastery involves strong professional development that begins in teacher preparation and extends through in-service staff development; and

• *Collaboration*—the ability to work with others to enact change.

He writes:

Those skilled in change are appreciative of its semi-unpredictable and volatile character, and they are explicitly concerned with the pursuit of ideas and competencies for coping with and influencing more and more aspects of the process toward some desired set of ends. They are open, moreover, to discovering new ends as the journey unfolds (p. 12).

Such teachers see colleagues who work to maintain the status quo as “traitors” (p. 14) and do not consider themselves successful unless they are constantly striving to make changes in their own practice and perhaps even in the school communities in which they work.

Other teachers, while not actively working against change, are more prone to accept change as an inevitable process of the teaching experience.

Still other teachers resist change, for multiple reasons. Gitlin and Margonis (1995) suggest that resistance may not be subversive behavior but instead “good sense;”
by not participating in the changes, teachers are demonstrating that their concerns—time, space, effort—need to be taken into consideration before change efforts are introduced. Some teachers, particularly those with many years of experience, resist because of their prior experience with reform (Hargreaves, 2005a). These veteran teachers, having taken part in reform after reform over the course of their career, simply cannot invest the energy needed to fully engage in new projects, as they believe that new changes are bound to fade away instead of enduring. As mentioned above, veteran teachers may also resist change because they feel as though their years of work within a school are not being rewarded (Riseborough, 1981). Age is also a factor (Evans, 1996); older teachers simply have other concerns beyond implementing change in their schools, and these concerns take more and more precedence as teachers move closer to the end of their teaching careers and the lifecycle.

Finally, some teachers, perhaps after going through each of these stages or perhaps due to other more environmental factors, burn out altogether. Particularly in an era of mandated reform and standardization, where expectations are raised for teachers in terms of performance and accountability, stress on teachers can lead to burnout (Smylie, 1999). Teachers may also burn out because they believe that teaching is a moral job; they take on more and more roles that they cannot handle because they feel that not doing so would let their students down (Bartlett, 2004).

Burnout theory suggests that teachers who burn out try to do well and “attempt desperately to succeed against all odds, risking their physical health and neglecting their personal lives to maximize the probability of professional success” (Farber, 1984, p. 328). Such teachers will not let their practice slide, and they leave teaching rather than
allowing it to do so. Farber (1984, p. 328) also suggests that a separate phenomenon may be at play; teachers are worn out, not burned out—“Instead of burning out from overwork, they turn off to the job and stop attempting to succeed in situations that appear hopeless.” These worn out teachers have experienced blows to their self-esteem, and have lost their desire to maintain the highest levels of performance; they do not necessarily leave the classroom, however.

The intensification of the teaching career leads teachers to find ways to handle change (Woods, 1999). Woods suggests that teachers either successfully adapt to change by *accommodation*, or fail to by means of *nonaccommodation*. Accommodation takes on four forms. Teachers may contest change, through resistance and opposition to reforms. This stance is often motivated by teachers’ beliefs and principles against which new reforms chafe. Teachers may appropriate change by forming alliances with their colleagues; they are more likely to appropriate change when it is seen as working in concert with the philosophy of a school rather than attempting to change it. Teachers may take strategic action against change, appearing to look as though they are still doing their jobs when in fact their energies are being drawn elsewhere. Finally, teachers may realign, merely implementing the new curriculum in order to protect against stress and burnout.

Not all teachers accommodate change. Personal factors such as commitment, career, and values may cause them to be unable to adapt. They may be so bound by their personally defined role as teacher that they simply cannot accommodate the new reform. Their values may conflict to such a degree that they cannot continue in their job. Unfortunately, teachers in mid-career are at most risk for nonaccommodation, and yet
they are “stuck” in a sense, having already invested so many years in their career (p. 129). Newer teachers who start under new regimes of reform may find it easier to accommodate, as they know no other way, whereas more seasoned teachers are left to either completely change their identity and their practice or leave the job altogether.

**Career stage.**

The stage of the teaching career has a significant impact on the teacher’s satisfaction with implementation (L. Evans, 2000; R. Evans, 1996; Hargreaves, 2005a). Teachers at the beginning of their career are more likely to embrace changes as they are handed down from district offices or school administrators, and have less difficulty moving from one change to another in shorter periods of time (Hargreaves, 2005a). New teachers may have difficulty implementing reform into their own practice, though, as they are still learning the basics of teaching, and adding on new layers of technique often only happen well after a teacher has more experience (Drake, 2002). These teachers have not experienced the same feelings of loss at failed change efforts as their more veteran counterparts (L. Evans, 2000). At the other end of the spectrum, more senior teachers have difficulty with mandated change efforts as they increase in scope, speed and rate of repetition (Hargreaves, 2005a). Experienced teachers often feel marginalized by mandated change, as such changes tend to ignore or even violate their own beliefs about teaching (Bailey, 2000). This difference is both a result of their experience with multiple changes over time within a school as well as the impact of aging and other lifestyle factors on their career (Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985; Huberman, 1989; R. Evans, 1996; Hargreaves, 2005a).
Although change can be difficult on many levels, it is still part of the cycle of the teaching career. Typically, once a teacher is established in his or her own classroom, he or she begins to experiment, to tinker, in the classroom (Huberman, 1989). Teachers who reach the stage of experimentation are viewed as mature (Burden, 1982, in Fessler, 1995). However, this stage can also be where teachers begin to meet with higher levels of frustration in the classroom (Fessler, 1995). This stage typically happens mid-career but is increasingly being seen in newer teachers (Fessler, 1995).

Teachers can get stuck at the experimentation level; their teaching careers, instead of stabilizing as a linear teacher career-cycle model would predict, can end abruptly; the process of frustration might happen over a period of years, but it might happen after only a period of months or even weeks (Fessler, 1995).

In sum, there is much literature to support the notion that change for teachers is complicated, and that the reasons for this complexity stem from factors that are structural, emotional, political and personal. Schools and teachers have historically struggled with how to innovate and improve. One factor that is gaining more recent attention, however, combines these factors and explores educational change from a generational perspective.

**Generations and Teaching**

As Hargreaves (2005a) has written, different generations of teachers experience change differently. However, most of the research on how teachers experience change assumes that teachers of all generations experience the teaching career cycle in the same way. In contrast, generational research suggests that a new teacher entering the field today need not have the same career path and patterns as a teacher thirty years her senior
(Johnson et al., 2004; Strauss & Howe, 1991). Johnson and her colleagues’ work in Massachusetts demonstrates how today’s new teachers are very different from their predecessors. They may not have entered teaching through traditional routes such as education schools or education majors in undergraduate institutions; they may be more likely to be men, to be different races, to speak different languages. These insights into how new teachers differ from veteran teachers as they begin their careers touches on the different types of knowledge we will need to have to understand the concerns of “new” teachers as they move up through the ranks.

The use of the term “generation” in human population terms is thought to have originated with Karl Mannheim’s publication of the essay “The Problem of Generations” (Edmunds & Turner, 2002; Mannheim, 1970; Strauss & Howe, 1991). According to Mannheim, a generation is shaped, held together by, and ultimately determined by common events that form its worldview. People within generations experience these events at the same time. Earlier work by Eisenstadt (1956) conceptualized generations in terms of age groups; biologically speaking, every person travels through stages of life (childhood, adulthood, old age, etc.) in predictable ways. Mannheim’s work took this age-based understanding further by introducing the impact of society on these age groups.

Anthropology and biology only help us explain the phenomena of life and death, the limited span of life, and the mental, spiritual, and physical changes accompanying aging as such; they offer no explanation of the relevance these primary factors have for the shaping of social interrelationships in their historic flux. (Mannheim, 1970, p. 381)
As modern generational theorist Jean Twenge observes, “The society that molds you when you are young stays with you the rest of your life (2006, p.2).

Generational conflict arises because members of different generations experience these same events in different ways (Edmunds & Turner, 2002). Mannheim’s work, and for that matter Eisenstadt’s as well, supposed that generally speaking, each generation traveled through the stages of life in basically the same way, experiencing the same types of lifecourse events (birth of children, aging, moving out of home) in the same basic ways even as societal events (wars, politics) differed. Strauss and Howe’s work (1991) builds upon other work, in particular work by more “popular” theorists such as Gail Sheehy (1974), Cheryl Merser (1987), and Ethan Watters (2004), who talk about how not only do generations experience the same events differently, but that generations themselves are actually quite different from one another, and that how one generation acts over time may not be the same as another acts, even given the same types of societal events. Take, for example, career entry. Older generations began careers either directly after high school or college, where today’s Generation Xers and even Generation Y/Millennials may delay traditional job entry until several years after graduation, opting instead for travel or graduate school (Watters, 2004). Views about marriage, too, as Watters and Sheehy describe, have shifted; while marriage used to be a typical part of a person’s early 20s, many young people are delaying marriage until their 30s or 40s or even opting not to marry. Merser’s work grew out of feeling that she did not feel like was progressing in the same way generations of women before her did; she supposed, as does Watters, that her generation might be fundamentally different from those that came before, not only in how they respond to external events but also in the ways they take on
expected life roles and react to typical life events. Conflict, then, arises not only when two generations experience the same societal events differently, as Mannheim described, but also when understandings about how life should progress differ.

At present, there are five living generations (Strauss & Howe, 1991), four of which are in the workplace (The G.I. generation being the exception): G.I., Veterans/Traditionalists, Boomers, Generation Xers, and Millennials. Table 2 describes the boundaries for each of these. Different scholars use different age boundaries to define each generation but the bulk of the age group is roughly the same (Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Lovely & Buffum, 2007). There are roughly twenty-two years between generations, shown below in Table 2 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Table 2.1 Living Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Age in 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.I.</td>
<td>1901-1924</td>
<td>Age 84 to 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent/Veteran</td>
<td>1925-1942</td>
<td>Age 66 to 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomer</td>
<td>1943-1960</td>
<td>Age 48 to 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13er/Generation X</td>
<td>1961-1981</td>
<td>Age 27 to 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>1982-present</td>
<td>Age 0 to 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Adapted from Strauss & Howe, 1991

Each of these generations has its own unique “peer personality” (Strauss & Howe, 1991) defined by a common age location, common beliefs and behavior, and perceived membership in a common generation (p.64). Table 3 charts some of these personality characteristics.
Table 2.2 Unique Characteristics of Each Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Veterans</strong></th>
<th><strong>Baby Boomers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedication/sacrifice</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>Team orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Personal gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>Health and wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for authority</td>
<td>Personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed reward</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty before pleasure</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Generation X</strong></th>
<th><strong>Millennials</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking globally</td>
<td>Civic duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technoliteracy</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>Morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>Street smarts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Adapted from Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000

While it is helpful to see the peer personalities of each of these generations, this chapter focuses largely on only the Boomer and Generation X generations.

The forces that shaped the Boomers and Generation X respectively clearly influenced the worldviews of each group (Strauss & Howe, 1991). The Boomers’ parents raised them with the wisdom of child expert Dr. Benjamin Spock, who advocated affection and permissiveness with children. The launch of Sputnik revolutionized their education, moving a more traditional curriculum to focus on science and math to ensure American students could keep up with their global peers. As teenagers and young adults, Boomers participated in the Summer of Love, in peace rallies around the country, in Woodstock and in protests at Kent State. They were feminists and civil rights pioneers who advocated equal rights for all. As young adults they were hippies who believed in peace and love; as they aged they became yuppies who espoused more materialistic...
goals. Boomers were the first generation to have access to legal abortions through Roe v. Wade and were the first to be able to prevent pregnancy with the use of birth control pills.

The children of the Boomers became Generation X, and the legacy of the Boom generation is clear. Literally and metaphorically speaking, this was the first generation whose parents chose to have—or not to have them—because of their abortion and birth control freedoms. They were latchkey children left at home while both parents worked. Generation X views themselves as “survivors”: they survived skyrocketing divorce rates, stock market crashes, and outsourcing. Lovely and Buffum (2007) suggest that this survivor mentality is what shapes their view of work: they have lower expectations of what jobs can offer and lower trust in authority figures as a result of their difficult upbringing.

**Generations in the workplace.**

The peer personalities of each generation affect many aspects of their lives, including attitudes toward family and community (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Watters, 2004). Similarly affected are a generation’s attitudes toward work and behavior in the workplace. Table 2.3 describes the “generational footprint” of each group in the workplace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>How They Perform on the Job</th>
<th>How They Integrate on Teams</th>
<th>How they Lead Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>Driven by rules and order</td>
<td>Are okay with the power of collective action, as long as a central leader is in charge</td>
<td>Value dedication and loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strive to uphold culture and traditions</td>
<td>Respect experience</td>
<td>Equate age with status/power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to leave work at work</td>
<td>Want to know where they stand and what’s expected of them</td>
<td>Impose top-down structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need more time for orientation</td>
<td>Eager to conform to group roles</td>
<td>Make most decisions themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Find technology intimidating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep work and personal life separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>Have a strong need to prove themselves to others</td>
<td>Enjoy and value teamwork</td>
<td>Shy away from conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May manipulate rules to meet own needs</td>
<td>Expect group to stick to the schedule and agenda</td>
<td>Tend to lead through consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deferral to authority</td>
<td>Willing to go the extra mile</td>
<td>Generally apply a participatory approach, but may struggle with delegation and empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on product outcomes</td>
<td>Good at building rapport and solving problems</td>
<td>Embrace leadership trends and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can become political animals if turf is threatened</td>
<td>Embrace equity and equality</td>
<td>Expect people to put in their time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work long hours</td>
<td>Want credit and respect for accomplishments</td>
<td>Less flexible with change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>How They Perform on the Job</th>
<th>How They Integrate on Teams</th>
<th>How They Lead Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Strive for balance, freedom and flexibility. Strong dislike for corporate politics, fancy titles or rigid structures. Expect to have fun at work. Prefer independence and minimal supervision. Good at multitasking. Value process over product.</td>
<td>Like to work on teams with informal roles and freedom to complete tasks their own way. Do well on projects calling for technical competence and creativity. Work best with teammates of their own choosing. Detest being taken advantage of. Struggle to build rapport with other group members.</td>
<td>Drawn to leadership for altruistic reasons—not power or prestige. Casual and laid-back. Try to create an environment that is functional and efficient. May lack tact and diplomacy. Able to create and support alternative workplace structures. Willing to challenge higher-ups. Adapt easily to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>Anxious to fit in. Respectful of authority, but unafraid to approach their boss with concerns. Value continuing education. Exceptional at multitasking. Drawn to organizations with career ladders and standardized pay/benefits.</td>
<td>Accepting of group diversity. Determined to achieve team goals. Respond well to mentoring. Enjoy working with idealistic people. Expect to be included in decisions. Need a bit more supervision and structure than other groups.</td>
<td>Open to new ideas. Able to work with varying employee styles and needs. Prefer flattened hierarchy. Hopeful and resilient. Display more decorum and professionalism than Xers. Lack experience handling conflict and difficult people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only are each group’s beliefs about work and the workplace different; in fact, their very understandings of career differ sharply, and this too affects their work lives in terms of dedication to their job and to their career. Lancaster and Stillman (2002) argue that the two older generations in the workplace, Traditionalists/Veterans and Boomers, who came of age in an era of American productivity, are motivated by “job security” (p.53). Job security is staying with one company, working one’s way up, and protecting oneself on a track record of high performance and stability. Younger generations, however, operate under a “career security” model (p. 54). Career security is premised on creating a varied set of skills and experiences that will make a person marketable in a variety of circumstances. To obtain these skills and experiences, those seeking career security may change jobs several times. Generation Xers, who came of age as American job stability waned, are more likely to seek career instead of job security. Table 5 describes generational differences around career goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Career Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalists</td>
<td>“Build a legacy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>“Build a stellar career.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Xers</td>
<td>“Build a portable career.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>“Build parallel careers.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Lancaster & Stillman, p. 55

Generations and the teaching career.

Each of the generations views just about everything differently, including careers in general and also teaching in particular. Generational research suggests that a new teacher entering the field today need not have the same career path and patterns as a teacher thirty years her senior (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Johnson et al., 2004). Johnson and her colleagues’ work in Massachusetts demonstrates how today’s new teachers are
very different from their predecessors. They may not have entered teaching through traditional routes such as education schools or education majors in undergraduate institutions; they may be more likely to be men, to be different races, to speak different languages. These insights into how new teachers differ from veteran teachers as they begin their careers touches on the different types of knowledge we will need to have to understand the concerns of “new” teachers as they move up through the ranks.

Strauss and Howe (1991) have written extensively on the topic of generations and argue that generations occur in cycles. Specifically, they argue that there are four generational types that recur in cyclical patterns over time. Each generation has a personality type and reacts to social changes in predictable ways—although different from each generation to the next. They urge researchers to think of aging using train and station metaphors. As they describe it, most people, when studying aging, focus on “stations.” Every train goes through the same stations; every generation in this metaphor represents a different train. So, if stations are childhood, youth, midlife, old age, etc., each generational train passes through each station. The trains are fairly identical using this metaphor. What Howe and Strauss argue, in contrast, is that generations need to be framed as trains and that each train should be viewed differently although they pass through the same stations.

Stretching this metaphor, we can view teacher generations as “trains” as well. The current generation of teachers in mid-career is what Howe and Strauss call “thirteeners” and what others commonly understand as Generation X (Twenge, 2006). These teachers were born between the years 1961 and 1981 and are now in their late-twenties to late-forties. Most of the research on aging teachers, however, has focused on
teachers of the previous generation, what Howe and Strauss call the “boom” generation, born between 1943 and 1960, and an emerging body on the new “boom” of Millennials. The current generation of new teachers, called “millennials,” have yet another set of concerns that differ from their predecessors and that will indeed differ from future generations, but the work of Johnson and her colleagues (2004) in relation to this new generation that is now entering the workforce in large numbers to replace their retiring Boomer colleagues focuses largely on how this “next generation” of teachers will fare in today’s classrooms, not on the issues facing teachers presently in mid-career. This chapter focuses on the middle generation of Generation X teachers currently in classrooms, not just as a “generation” of teachers but as a “generation” of adults different from those both before and after them.

**Conclusion**

The impact of change on a teacher’s career has been heavily researched. Less researched is the impact of mandated change, specifically in the United States. What happens to teachers who engage in mandated school reform over time? If they do not leave the classroom, what does their career cycle look like in comparison to teachers not involved in reform? How will they cope with the mandated reforms of NCLB? Even less researched are the impact of change on teachers specifically in mid-career and the role that a teacher’s generation plays in integrating this change into their understandings of career. This dissertation will explore these questions and will offer suggestions, based on an in-depth look at case studies of such teachers, as to what schools can do to support these teachers, and perhaps even renew and invigorate their practice.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN

This dissertation is a mixed methodology inquiry (Greene & Caracelli, 1997) into the impact of mandated reform on teachers in middle career (7-20 years teaching). Specifically, the study explores how teachers’ career stages and generational identities affect—or do not affect—their commitments to and capacities for educational reform and change in their teaching careers. Data were gathered from the Schools and Staffing Survey, produced by the National Center for Education Statistics, and through individual semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998) with twelve teachers in the state of Massachusetts. This particular approach to data collection provides a rounded and robust picture of how teachers view their careers at present and how this view has changed over time, specifically after the implementation of standardized and mandated state and national reforms.

This chapter details the research question that guided the study, as well as the sub-questions that helped to explicate the phenomenon under study; the methodological procedures used for gathering both qualitative and quantitative data; sampling; data gathering procedures; methods of data analysis; and formats for reporting the data.

Research Question

This dissertation explores the following question:

• What are the effects of contemporary high-stakes mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers?

Related to this broad question is a subset of more in-depth questions. Specifically:
• How does mandated reform in an era of standardization and high stakes testing impact the mid-career stage of secondary teachers?
• What in-school conditions influence the impact of reform on these commitments and capacities?
• What generational factors influence the impact of reform on these commitments and capacities?

Research Methodology

Mixed Methods

This dissertation utilizes a mixed methods approach to data collection and analysis to investigate the question, “What are the effects of mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers?” A mixed methods approach “intentionally combines different methods—that is, methods meant to gather different types of information” (Greene & Caracelli, 1997, p. 7). Mixed methods can help to “understand more fully, to generate deeper and broader insights, to develop important knowledge claims that respect a wider range of interests and perspectives” (p. 7). Individually, qualitative and quantitative research techniques necessitate making a decision “between breadth and depth and between generalizability and targeting to specific (sometimes very limited) populations” (Frechtling & Sharp, 1997). In addition, qualitative and quantitative research designs also have different philosophical assumptions. Simplified, qualitative inquiries are based on “the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds,” while a quantitative approach “takes apart a phenomenon to examine component parts” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6).
A mixed methodology, however, does not require “prior resolution of epistemological or ontological debates about our social worlds” but “represent[s] a plurality of interests, voices, and perspectives better” (Greene & Caracelli, 1997, p. 14). By using both quantitative and qualitative approaches, I aim to broaden the understanding of the impact of mandated reform on teachers’ lives and careers.

With the goal of generating deeper and broader insights, I chose the mixed methods approach to explore the phenomenon of teachers’ experiences of change on two levels: macro and micro. The macro level approach is explored using the quantitative data. By using two national databases with a total of more than 80,000 public school teachers and across five years, I was able to look at how teachers view their careers, their commitments, their workloads and their sense of control and efficacy over their work during two points in time, pre- and post-No Child Left Behind. It is important to note here that even though the first data set, 1999-2000, is pre-NCLB, the survey the data reflects was still taken during an era of increased standardization (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006).

Even though the quantitative data provide a very clear glimpse into the work of teachers, mere numbers and percentages do not, nor cannot, tell the complete story of how teachers perceive their work. Thus, the decision to utilize qualitative interviews to speak with teachers arose out of the need to flesh out the story, to make it more robust, more recognizable, more real. While the qualitative data encompass teachers in only one geographic area, they offer a deeper insight than survey questions alone. The qualitative questions explore some of the same topics as the SASS, and also examine other areas of interest regarding teachers, reform and the teaching career. These two methods, in
concert with one another, provide a view into the realities of teachers’ existences in today’s schools that neither method could independently offer.

**Quantitative.**

The quantitative component consists of analysis of data collected by the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which “provides data on characteristics and qualifications of teachers and principals, teacher hiring practices, professional development, class size and other conditions in schools. SASS data are designed to allow comparisons of public and private schools and staff and permit the analysis of trend data” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005). The SASS data were used to provide a broad overview of the teaching career in the United States over the past several years. The sample includes public school teachers at the elementary and secondary level. Although the qualitative component of my dissertation focuses specifically on secondary teachers in mid-career, the SASS data provide an incredibly useful lens into understanding the teaching career at two moments in time and across several years.

Two data sets were used in this study. The first set is teachers’ responses to the SASS in 1999-2000 (n= 42085); the second set is teachers’ responses in 2003-2004 (n=44678). The data for the first set were publicly available and published on a CD-ROM. Every teachers’ response to each question was available and searchable using SPSS. The second set of data was not publicly available at the time of the dissertation writing. Instead, a software application on the NCES website called the Data Analysis System (DAS) allowed for percentages of teachers’ responses to be given to particular
survey questions. Because of this restriction on the availability of raw data, it was not possible to separate the data to focus on limited subsets such as secondary school teachers or teachers in mid-career. Thus, the decision was made to use a general exploration to provide an overall portrait of the teaching career in America. However, because NCES provided an online tool to explore frequencies to each variable, it was possible to make comparisons between the frequencies of teachers’ responses between data sets and to see whether the differences in the frequencies of responses were statistically significant.

The choice to use these two particular data sets also allows for exploration of a critical change in American education: the introduction of No Child Left Behind. The 1999-2000 data set encompasses the trend since the early 1990s toward a more standardized curriculum and increased external controls over the teaching career (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006; McNeil, 2000), but the second set includes the beginning stages of teachers’ experiences under NCLB and the even greater intensification of standardization, testing regimes and accountability.

Using the SASS data, I explored teachers’ responses to a variety of questions regarding their feelings of efficacy, control, satisfaction, and commitment. In each data set frequencies were generated using either SPSS or the online application on the NCES site to provide descriptive statistics, which were recorded in table form.

In exploring the relationships between these questions and answers and between the data sets, I was searching for whether and how trends in the teaching career over time can be observed. I also explored whether new demands on teachers have changed the nature of their work and their capacity for reform, as evidenced by their responses in how much change they feel they do—or CAN—engage in within their own school contexts.
To make comparisons between the two data sets, I conducted z-test analyses to test for statistical significance. While the results of these analyses in no way prove causation between the introduction of NCLB and teachers’ changed feelings about their careers and their work, there does appear to be statistically significant differences between the data sets that warrant deeper investigation.

Several analyses using SASS data have been previously undertaken (See for example Ingersoll, 2001; Murphy, DeArmond, & Guin, 2003; Shen, 1997; Weiss, 1999). However, most of these studies utilize one data set at a time, typically to explore teacher retention. These explorations offer an excellent snapshot of what was happening at a particular historical moment. In contrast, I used two data sets: 1999-2000 and 2003-2004. The comparison of these data sheds light on the teaching career and how shifts in the teacher role over time may have influenced teachers’ capacities for reform.

**Sample.**

The sampling for the quantitative component of this dissertation was determined by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the designers and implementers of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) upon which the quantitative section is based. According to NCES:

\begin{quote}
To make sure that the samples contain sufficient numbers for estimates, SASS uses a stratified probability sample design. Public and private schools are oversampled into groups based on certain characteristics. After schools are stratified and sampled, teachers within the schools are also
\end{quote}
stratified and sampled based on their characteristics (from NCES site, retrieved 12/11/07).

The sample includes both charter and traditional schools. The data included here are only from public schools. While the larger focus of the dissertation is on mid-career teachers, the data from SASS could not be limited by career stage and thus include teachers at all levels.

**Data collection plan.**

Data for the first dataset of the quantitative component were on a CD provided by the National Center for Education Statistics, www.nces.edu.gov/surveys/sass. These data were converted into an SPSS file. No specific raw data were publicly available for the 2003-2004 dataset; all data used for this dataset are reported in percentages and come solely from the DAS tool on the NCES site.

**Data analysis.**

As reported above, the 1999-2000 data were analyzed using SPSS. SPSS was chosen for its ability to present frequencies that can be displayed in graphic bar charts upon which proportions can be superimposed. Using the frequency function, each question was analyzed to determine the proportion of teachers responding in a particular way to each question. The responses to each of the questions under study were all scaled using a Likert scale.

One inherent limitation was the lack of raw data available for the 2003-2004 dataset. Comparisons were thus made using the given proportions instead of raw data.
Using Microsoft Word, tables were created setting up side-by-side comparisons of the frequencies for each response. These data figures are presented in the data analysis chapter, Chapter 4, of this dissertation.

Once the comparison charts were created, $z$-tests were performed to test the statistical significance of the differences found in the proportions reported. The results of these tests are also reported in Chapter 4.

**Qualitative.**

The quantitative component of this dissertation provide a large-scale picture of the issues facing teachers today and demonstrate the changes to these teachers’ practice and lives, if any, after the implementation of mandated reform. The survey responses from thousands of teachers nationwide show the wide-ranging scope of the effects of change. However, quantitative data can only provide a limited portrait of a phenomenon. For a more nuanced glance, qualitative research is much better suited.

The qualitative component of the dissertation comprises twelve semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998) with teachers at various points in mid-career in the state of Massachusetts. The questions in each interview remained fairly similar from respondent to respondent yet allowed me, as the researcher, to delve deeper or skim over where needed.

As a partly qualitative study, this dissertation attempts to make sense of a particular phenomenon—mid-career teachers’ experiences of mandated change—in terms of the meanings this particular group of people brings to it (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998) using data gathered from the people involved in the phenomenon itself. Furthermore, as
a qualitative study, it does not attempt to draw causation or emphasize that which can be measured; instead, the focus is on the “socially constructed reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” (p. 8). Since this qualitative component is situated within the larger context of a mixed-methods study, however, it is important to emphasize that neither the qualitative nor the quantitative data are privileged, but instead explore and attempt to make sense of entirely different questions and work in conjunction with one another to form a fuller picture of the phenomenon under study.

The original design called for case studies of four to six teachers, each to be interviewed three times. However, as the interviews progressed, it became clear that the case study methodology (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003), which explores systems that are more bounded instead of fluid, was not appropriately suited to the data at hand, and that an approach that allowed for more interviews with a greater number of teachers and a chance to go from the data to the analysis and back to the data again was much more prudent. Thus, the design of the study then changed from multiple, in-depth, semi-structured interviews with four to six participants to single interviews with multiple participants. In total, twelve interviews were conducted, ranging in time from approximately 45 minutes to approximately 75 minutes.

**Sample.**

For the qualitative component of the dissertation, I focus on twelve secondary school teachers with seven to twenty years of teaching experience. These teachers are considered established and in the mature phase of their teaching (Burden, 1982, in
Fessler, 1985; Sikes, 1992), and imposed change experienced by teachers in this stage of their careers will have different effects on them than perhaps on teachers more or less experienced. The sample is limited to secondary teachers primarily because, as mentioned previously, change is notoriously difficult in secondary schools due to their size, bureaucratic complexity, subject traditions and identifications, and closeness to university selection (Goodson, 1983; Hargreaves, 2003; Louis & Miles, 1990; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001). This limit is based on my understanding that a teacher who remains in the class after seven years has committed significant emotional, physical and financial resources to her career as a teacher and thus has a certain level of investment in—and identity with—her role as teacher (Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985). The study is also limited to public school teachers. I did not limit the study to urban or suburban but instead allowed sampling to encompass either type of school.

To obtain participants, I utilized snowball sampling (Goodman, 1961). In this methodology, the researcher begins with a random sample of people from a finite population. Each person in the sample is then asked to name other participants in the same population to participate until a satisfactory number of participants is reached. While inferences can be drawn statistically from such a sample, the approach used here is qualitative.

Snowball sampling is not without its critiques, namely that inferences about individuals rely mainly on the personal understandings of participants in the initial sample; that the sample can be biased toward those subjects who are most willing to participate; that the sampling process can allow participants to protect friends by not
referring them for participation, a process called “masking”; and that participants with large personal networks may be oversampled (Erickson, 1979, p. 299).

While these critiques are valid, snowball sampling does offer a sense of protection that more randomized sampling cannot. Snowball sampling is one of the most often used methodologies for studying hidden populations (Heckathorn, 1997); these are groups whose size is unknown and thus for whom a sampling frame cannot be developed, and among whom exist privacy concerns that might hinder cooperation, such as engaging in illegal behavior. While teachers do not traditionally fall into this category of a hidden population, the teachers in whom I was most interested—those in mid-career—may harbor desire to leave their job specifically or the career of teaching generally or may hold negative feelings about their school, students or colleagues that could make them reticent to discuss their professional lives. In a sense, these teachers could be hidden within the general teaching population. By using snowball sampling to first gain access to teachers, I was utilizing teachers’ personal networks and their own stated tendencies to socialize with like-minded teachers to find other teachers who might be either making such considerations or willing to explore them with me. Thus, a more randomized sample might not have led me specifically to teachers who were struggling with the reform process or thinking about making career changes.

When considering the sample for this study, the issue of the representative nature of the sample arises: to what extent does my sample represent the population from which it is derived? With such a low $n$, this issue becomes slightly more complicated. As I utilized a snowball design to get participants, I had somewhat less control over the representative nature of the subjects. For example, the whole sample could have been
White female teachers. It so happened that unlike the majority of the teaching population, which both now and even twenty years ago is White, female and middle class, my sample includes more males than females.

**Size.**

The design of this study was originally planned to be four to six case studies using narrative research to unpack teachers’ responses to how their careers and commitments are impacted by mandated change. Four initial participants were selected, using a purposive sampling procedure based on personal networking connections. As the initial round of interviews progressed, and as I began to delve into the qualitative methodology literature, the case study format felt both awkward and unsuited to the data at hand. First, the interviews felt fairly complete; there was little additional information that I was hoping to get from the participants. Second, as I read through my data, I found myself coding and looking for themes between the cases. I became less interested in each teacher’s individual story per se but instead greatly interested in the similarities that were occurring between and among their stories. I was not seeing each case as an individual set of data, but instinctively looking for patterns and commonalities between the interviews. Conversations with my advisors and personal reflection led me to shift the methodology toward a grounded theory approach.

As with all sample sizes, there are inherent advantages and drawbacks. The advantage to a larger qualitative sample size is the ability to include more voices and thus perhaps be able to generalize more confidently about the findings. What is sacrificed, however, is a certain level of depth with each participant. With a smaller sample, each
participant in the study would be interviewed multiple times over the course of the data collection period. Increasing the sample size takes this possibility away. For the purposes of this study, however, I believe that a larger sample will help uncover more, and perhaps deeper, themes than a smaller sample size would permit.

Even though the sample size was expanded, a major limitation of this study is, of course, the generalizability of the data from such a relatively small sample. When considering generalizability, it is important to remember that most qualitative research does not strive to have its findings generalized to an entire population writ large. For example, it would be impossible for me to say that from the twelve teachers with whom I spoke, it is clear that mandated reform has negative effects on all mid-career teachers’ practice and pedagogy. This limitation is mediated by the inclusion of quantitative data that spans tens of thousands of teachers across the country. While the interviews sample only a small population, echoes of the voices of the larger population are clearly present in the words and ideas of the sampled teachers.

A final limitation is the geographical nature of the qualitative sample. While the quantitative sample is nationally representative, the qualitative data is limited to teachers in the state of Massachusetts. This choice was made for a number of reasons. First, time and financial limitations made it more feasible to limit the data to what could be gathered without extensive travel. Second, having lived and studied in the state of Massachusetts, I have a sense of the educational atmosphere at both a state and local level. The popular news, conversations with colleagues and peers, and academic research all have enhanced my understanding of the educational climate in the state. Both of these factors weighed largely on my decision to limit the data to what could be gathered locally. Additionally,
though, the fact that the qualitative data are limited to local teachers provides a coherence to the sampled teachers’ responses; they are all talking about the same reform, so its impact can perhaps be better understood than if I were comparing and contrasting teachers under different testing regimes.

**Access.**

Sampling for this study was purposive and relied on a snowball design to get participants (Merriam, 1998). I began by posting a message to a listserv for parents to which I belong, asking for teachers in a public school in a major subject area with seven to twenty years of teaching experience. From this post, I found four participants. These teachers referred me to other teachers they know, thus expanding my sample.

As mentioned previously, utilizing a snowball design, while useful to gain participants for the study, is not without inherent issues that must be addressed. The major issue is that the sample is not randomized and may appear to be fairly homogeneous. However, demographic trends note that at this moment, the teaching force itself is fairly homogeneous. While a diverse sample, should it happen, would in no way harm the study, it should not be expected in this particular study, given the makeup of the current teaching force.

**Site access, institutional approval, and other ethical considerations.**

As all teachers were interviewed outside their place of employment and participation in the study was deemed to be low-risk, this study was exempt from needing a full review of the Internal Review Board of Boston College. The exemption was
granted by the IRB after an application proving that the study indeed posed only a minimally low risk to the participants involved. Copies of the relevant application documents from the exemption are included in Appendices A and B.

Each participant signed an informed consent letter, apprising them of their rights as participants in the study and giving them the opportunity to withdraw at any time or ask any questions they made need to raise their own levels of comfort. Participants were informed that their responses would be kept anonymous and confidential and that all identifying markers about their schools would be appropriately coded. The informed consent letter is included as part of the aforementioned exemption packet.

In the reporting of the data, all care was taken to ensure that no identifying markers about either the participants’ identities or schools were present. Pseudonyms were used to describe each teacher, and schools were described by their type and general location (i.e., urban, suburban). In general, each teacher came from a different school, so there would be little in the way of possibility to identify particular teachers by their comments about the context in which they work.

These precautions were taken only for the use of the qualitative data. The quantitative data, as presented in the SASS, have already undergone such procedures in the design and development of the survey tool. There are no identifying markers in the data presented for the SASS.

**Participants.**

Twelve teachers from multiple school districts in the state of Massachusetts participated in the qualitative component of this study. The participants were from major
subject areas in secondary public schools: English Language Arts, Science, Mathematics, and History/Social Studies. Special Education was also included, although teachers with this classification worked within the major subject areas. As the study design to gather participants was snowball, there was little consideration for factoring in how many teachers of a particular subject area participated. Also not factored in were gender and race, although randomly members from minority groups in teaching—people of color and men—were included in the sample.

Table 3.1 details the participants in the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Urban MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Suburban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Suburban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Urban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Suburban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Urban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Urban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Suburban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Suburban HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Suburban MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>SPED/English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Urban MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Urban HS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection plan.

Qualitative data were gathered using semi-structured interviews with participants. Interviews took place outside of the teachers’ workplaces, due in part to convenience and in part to the sensitive and reflective nature of the topic. Conducting interviews outside of the school was offered as a way help the participants address the sensitive issues about their teaching career and their feelings about particular reforms in a place and space that is more comfortable and conducive to such conversations. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed.

Data analysis.

The qualitative data come exclusively from interviews with twelve mid-career teacher participants from the state of Massachusetts. I began with five participants. Each interview was digitally recorded and then fully transcribed. As each transcription was completed, I coded the interview using open and axial coding techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). I used line-by-line coding to ensure the most thorough reading of each interview (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Constant memoing (Charmaz, 2006) was used to record themes and keep track of noticeable patterns and trends as well as thoughts for further study.

As interviews were completed, I was able to code between interviews, looking not only for topics of interest within each interview but for patterns that emerged between and among interviews. As the interviews progressed, the process of transcription changed from complete to partial, as I was able to pick up on important themes focus on them. As grounded theory, by design, allows the researcher to search for gaps in the data
to answer questions needed to build theory, I increased the participant base from five to ten to explore more in-depth the existing themes and patterns as well as look for new possibilities. Again, each interview was transcribed and coded, and the process of memoing continued. Finally, an additional round of interviews was added. The total number of interviews at the end of the process came to twelve.

*Why grounded theory?*

The choice to use grounded theory above other qualitative methods warrants discussion. As previously mentioned, the initial design of the study called for the use of case studies to explore the phenomenon of mid-career teachers’ responses to mandated change in their careers. The initial round of semi-structured interviews was designed with this methodology in mind. As the interviews were completed, however, I wondered where to take the subsequent rounds of interviews, and found that I did not necessarily need to go more in depth with my subjects. I did not know where to take these further interviews and felt directionless as to the types of responses such interviews would yield. After speaking with my advisers, the choice to use grounded theory became clear. While the design of the analysis may not truly fit the description of grounded theory, it is deeply influenced by its spirit and intent.

Grounded theory offers many strengths for analyzing the particular types of data revealed by my study. First and foremost, grounded theory offers a new way to think about the data generated by the study. Instead of trying to fit my findings into existing theories, using grounded theory allows me to find new explanations and think about the findings in a framework specifically suited to my particular data (Glaser & Strauss,
In fact, grounded theory as a methodology was formulated with this express purpose in mind. Instead of fitting data into “grand theory,” a researcher can generate her own theory, something startling at the time and still somewhat revelatory.

Second, when used to explore qualitative data, grounded theory offers me as the researcher a way to constantly exist in both the data and theory worlds. As grounded theory necessitates constant comparison between data and theory (Charmaz, 2000), one can never rely too heavily on either. The data must fit the theory, and the theory must fit the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Thus, instead of needing to wait until all data have been gathered before beginning the process of analysis, my analysis is instead bolstered by the continuous dance of data and theory comparisons.

Finally, unlike more positivistic or quantitative methods—which have their own merit—qualitative grounded theory work allows me, albeit briefly, to live the life of the participants, to take their stories and co-construct with them the meaning of their work and their careers (Charmaz, 2000). The data gathered are not my own words, although in some ways they are my interpretations of others’ words. The use of interviews to gather data necessitates a conversation, one with subtle nuances, nodded heads in understanding, eyebrows raised in question. The work will not, as Charmaz suggests it cannot, I, reveal sort of external truth or reality, but will aid instead in the interpretation of these teachers’ specific understandings of the phenomena under study.

This last point, however, is also one of the problematic areas of grounded theory, and one that must also be addressed. Critics of grounded theory, particularly those preferring a more narrative analysis to interviews (Reissman, 1993), suggest that grounded theory breaks up the conversation. Instead of allowing the participant’s full
story to be told, a grounded theorist takes the chunks of conversation that fit particular themes and rebuilds, in a sense, the story, in some ways even creating a new and different story from the asked for and being given by the participant. Charmaz (2000) responds that grounded theory does not attempt to explain a reality, but instead only offers a different lens by which to understand a particular phenomenon. In the case of this study, what feels most important is not what each teacher has to say specifically but instead the shared themes that arise in listening to the multiple participants’ stories.

**Formats For Reporting the Data**

Because of the mixed methodology used in gathering data for this dissertation, the data do not necessarily fall neatly into traditional chapters. At times, describing qualitative and quantitative findings together makes more sense than to do so separately. The converse is also true. To this end, I have created three chapters that individually explore the larger themes that emerged from both sets of data. The first chapter details the quantitative findings from the analysis of the SASS and begins a conversation of what these data can and cannot elucidate. In this chapter, I explore teachers’ feelings of influence and control over their work and their teaching environment. This chapter also focuses on teachers’ feelings about their careers over time.

The second chapter presents the qualitative data from the study. In addition to the topics discussed in the quantitative chapter, this chapter focuses on what is unique about teachers in mid-career and how a teacher’s generational identity affects his or her career. Both mid-career status and generational identity are used as lenses through which to
explore teachers’ capacities for reform. This chapter uses only the qualitative data
gathered from interviews.

The third chapter details larger themes that emerged from the data as well as
policy implications for teacher education, teacher retention, and school leadership. This
chapter ties together the significant points learned from the research and proposes
thoughts on why these data are important and what impact they may have on future
teachers and their careers, as well as on the current generation of teachers in mid-career
in secondary public schools in the United States. This chapter also details how the
findings from this study both differ from and reflect historical and current literature in the
field. While it is a lofty goal to attend to so much information in one space, it is
nonetheless a necessary endeavor, one that has proven both intellectually challenging and
stimulating.

The methodology for this dissertation, while perhaps not typical, reflects in many
ways my own generational identity. As a Gen-Xer, it should surprise no one that I do not
believe the data can fit into traditional boxes or be understood in traditional ways. My
own research lens—bias, if you will—necessitates looking at and reporting the data in
new and different ways. It is my hope that using such methodology and reporting will
help the data to be understood in the most clear and useful way.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS: QUANTITATIVE
CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT OVER TIME

This chapter details the findings and data analysis of the comparison of survey data from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) across two survey years, 1999-2000 and 2003-2004. A description of the sample and an examination of the research questions are presented below, followed by a description of the analysis procedure and a presentation of the results. Finally, a discussion of the findings and suggestions for further research are presented.

Research Questions

This study examines the effects of contemporary high-stakes mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers, those with between seven and twenty years of teaching experience. The instrument used for this portion of the study, the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) was not designed to specifically answer the research questions. However, several of the survey questions pertain directly to the research topic and thus serve as useful guideposts by which to explore the phenomenon under study on a broad, national level. While the data presented here do not factor out career duration, they do give an overall portrait of the teaching career at two distinct points in time, pre- and post-implementation of No Child Left Behind. The qualitative data in the following
chapter serve as a means by which to flesh out the narrower sample of teachers in mid-career and make sense of these data in greater depth.

Sample

The sampling for the quantitative component of this dissertation was determined by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the designers and implementers of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) upon which the quantitative section is based. According to NCES:

To make sure that the samples contain sufficient numbers for estimates, SASS uses a stratified probability sample design. Public and private schools are oversampled into groups based on certain characteristics. After schools are stratified and sampled, teachers within the schools are also stratified and sampled based on their characteristics. (NCES, 2005)

The sample used in this study—public school teachers--includes both charter and traditional schools in 1999-2000 and only traditional schools in 2003-2004, as the survey changed between survey years. The sample also includes elementary and secondary teachers across all subject areas. The first sample is teachers’ responses to the SASS in 1999-2000 (n= 42085); the second is teachers’ responses in 2003-2004 (n=44678).

As mentioned above, while the larger focus of the dissertation is on mid-career teachers, the data from SASS could not be limited by career stage or teaching placement level and thus include teachers at all levels. This limitation is important to note, but should not take away from the significance, both statistical and educational/political, of the data and findings. The trends demonstrated by the data in this study paint a picture of
what is happening in teachers’ classrooms around the nation across a wide swath of educational settings. A different view of the same phenomenon at a more localized level is presented in the following chapter.

**Survey**

The SASS is designed to provide information about schools and the personnel who work in them. The survey has been administered since the mid-1980s (NCES, 2005) and, after undergoing a few changes, now details teacher supply issues, teacher and administrator characteristics, school programs, and general conditions in schools as well as principals’ and teachers’ perceptions of the school environment, pay and hiring practices. The survey is given to both administrators and teachers in private and public schools. My study focuses only on the survey administered to public school teachers.

The 1999-2000 survey instrument contained 71 questions for teachers to answer about their career and their school. In 2003-2004, the survey instrument contained 83 questions. Of the full set of questions, this study uses 12 questions common to both surveys. The relevant pages of both the 1999-2000 and the 2003-2004 survey are included in Appendices C and D.

Of these twelve questions used for this study, two questions examine teachers’ feelings of influence over policy setting in the areas of curriculum and performance standards in their school; three questions examine teachers’ feelings of control over selecting materials, content, and teaching techniques in their school; five questions ask teachers the extent to which they agree with various statements about workload, effort, school community and satisfaction in their current positions; and two questions ask
teachers to examine their teaching career in terms of how long they plan to remain and whether they would become teachers again. Within the full instrument, these questions fall into the sections entitled Working Conditions and Teacher Attitudes and School Climate. All of the questions that are used in this analysis were measured using a Likert or similar scale.

**Procedure**

To explore differences in teachers’ responses to questions about their career, survey results were tabulated into frequencies and reported as percentages. The frequencies for the first dataset (1999-2000) were computed using the statistical software package SPSS. The frequencies for the second dataset (2003-2004) were calculated using the tool available on the NCES website called the Data Analysis System (DAS), which allowed me to compute proportions to the questions under study.

To compare the differences between the first and second datasets and to test whether these differences were statistically significant, z tests were performed to compare the proportions (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 2003). The z tests were evaluated at the .05 confidence level. The results of the individual tests are included in Appendix E.

**Data Analysis**

The first set of survey questions explored teachers’ feelings of influence over their policy-setting in their work at the school in which they presently work. In the 1999 survey, the questions were asked using a five-point scale, from 1=no influence to 5=great deal of influence, and 2, 3 and 4 signifying the middle range of responses to the question,
“How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL?” in the areas of setting performance standards for students of this school and establishing curriculum. The 2003 survey used a four-point scale, with 1=no influence, 2=minimal influence, 3=moderate influence, and 4=great deal of influence.

To make comparisons between the two groups that used different scales, I combined responses for the 1999 survey to make four groups instead of five. Collapsing categories is useful when data were initially coded in one way and then recoded in another (DeVaus, 2002), as was the case across these two survey years. It is important to note here that while the middle three categories were collapsed into two, the two poles—those which expressed “no influence” or “great influence” for example—remained intact throughout; it is the middle categories, which ranged from minimal to moderate in one year and did not have worded coding in the other, which changed. As the results of this analysis focus largely on the two poles, it is important to keep this distinction in mind.

To collapse the categories, I split the third response into two and added one half to the second response and one to the fourth. The resulting categories again provide only estimates for teachers’ responses to these scaled questions. I used the same method of combining results to collapse responses for the three questions of control. The remaining seven questions used the same scales and did not need to be collapsed.

**Findings**

This study investigates the impact of mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of teachers in mid-career. When looking at how teachers engage with reform, capacity can be viewed as a teacher’s skill and knowledge to
understand and teach in ways advocated by reformers (Spillane, 1999, p. 159). Capacity can also be linked with efficacy. Day (2008) distinguishes between perceived effectiveness, or the extent to which teachers feel they can work to the best of their ability and is more of an internal measure, and effectiveness as a measure of student progress and achievement, which is valued externally. To me, capacity can be defined as a teacher’s ability to use her professional judgment and personal experience to make decisions about her work and is used in this study as a personal, internal measure as opposed to an external one.

Commitment, too, has many dimensions: Organizational, personal, professional, to name a few. However, while often spoken about by educators, its definition of is rarely made explicit (Day, Sammons, Stobart, Kington & Gu, 2007). Organizationally speaking, commitment has been defined as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong intent or desire to remain with the organization (Reyes, 1990). Personally, teachers who are committed are “motivated, willing to learn, and who believe that they can make a difference to the learning and achievement of students” (Day, Sammons, Stobart, Kington & Gu, 2007, p. 215). Becker (1964, in Burgess, 1995) says

A person is committed when we observe him pursuing a consistent line of activity in a sequence of varied situations. Consistent activity persists over time. Further, even though the actor may engage in a variety of disparate acts, he sees them as essentially consistent; from his point of view they serve him in pursuit of the same goal. Finally, it is a distinguishing mark of commitment that the actor rejects other
situationally feasible alternatives, choosing from among the variable courses of action that which best suits his purpose. In so doing, he often ignores the principle of situational adjustment, pursuing his consistent line of activity in the face of short-term loss. (p. 92).

Applied specifically to teaching, commitment refers to acceptance of the profession, willingness to exert considerable effort for the profession, and a strong desire or intent to remain in the profession (Chan, Lau, Nie, Lim & Hogan, 2008). Becker (1964, in Burgess, 1995) writes that a teacher can be viewed as committed if he or she refuses to change jobs even though the new job might offer better conditions or rewards. The process of becoming an adult, to Becker, is a process of acquiring more and more commitments that ultimately force a person to follow a particular pattern through the remainder of life. According to Day (2008, p. 254), teachers who are committed

Have an enduring belief that they can make a difference to the learning lives and achievements of students (efficacy and agency) through who they are (their identity), what they know (knowledge, strategies, skills) and how they teach (their beliefs, attitudes, personal and professional values embedded in and expressed through their behaviors in practice settings).

For the purposes of this study, I define commitment as a teacher’s dedication to her work as evidenced by her desire to work to her highest capability, her concern for her students, colleagues, and school, and her wish to remain in her job or school.

The Schools and Staffing Survey addresses these two topics by asking teachers about their decision-making capabilities and their working conditions, attitudes and
school climate. Figure 4.1 shows the questions I have analyzed to investigate teachers’ feelings of capacity, and Figure 4.2 shows the questions used to investigate teachers’ feelings of commitment.
### Figure 4.1 Capacity questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy <strong>AT THIS SCHOOL</strong> in setting performance standards for students of this school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy <strong>AT THIS SCHOOL</strong> in establishing curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much control do you think you have <strong>IN YOUR CLASSROOM</strong> at this school over selecting textbooks and other instructional materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much control do you think you have <strong>IN YOUR CLASSROOM</strong> over selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much control do you think you have <strong>IN YOUR CLASSROOM</strong> over selecting teaching techniques?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my job of teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4.2 Commitment Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long do you plan to remain in teaching?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below, I present the findings of my analysis. First, I detail the ways in which teachers’ responses to issues regarding capacity have changed over time. Second, I detail the ways in which teachers’ responses to questions about commitment have changed over time. Finally, I discuss possible reasons as to why these changes are occurring and suggest further ways in which they can be understood or explored.

**Capacity**

Historically, educators and educational researchers have struggled with understanding who controls teachers’ work (Ingersoll, 2003). Two major viewpoints have emerged. The first, what Ingersoll (2003) calls the school disorganization perspective, views schools as too disorganized and as lacking control over teachers’ work. In this perspective, the solution is one of tightened centralized control and increased teacher accountability. The most recent incarnation of this perspective can be seen in scripted teacher curricula and high-stakes testing. The second perspective, what Ingersoll refers to as the teacher disempowerment perspective, views schools as too tightly controlled and bureaucratic. The solution to the problem of tight control is to decentralize schools and increase the autonomy and professionalism of teachers.

The issue is not just one of who controls teachers’ work, however. At play at the same time is the issue of just what teachers’ work should be. Again, there is a spectrum of perspectives. On the one hand, as Hargreaves (1994) writes, many view teachers’ work as becoming increasingly professionalized. Professionalized work includes, for example, more teacher collaboration, more professional development, and more work in learning communities. On the other hand, others view teachers’ work as being
intensified. In this viewpoint, teachers are being asked to do more—take on more students with greater special needs, work in professional learning communities outside and beyond the scope of traditional teaching, plan lessons together--in less time. In fact, the changed nature of the work is not in dispute. What is disputed is the way in which that changed work is viewed: does the increased work show respect for teachers’ professionalism and experience, or does it devalue their time and expertise in the name of expediency?

Whether one views teachers as having more or less control, or their work being more or less controlled, there can be little dispute that the context in which it is taking place has become increasingly standardized. Some research views the standards movement as a positive measure aimed at securing a high quality education for the greatest number of students (Ravitch, 1995). Barber (2004) writes that while accountability (and standards as guidelines for accountability) has become synonymous with testing, it in fact means a great deal more. He writes that while accountability is controversial for two reasons—one, that it was perceived as a governmental measure of taking power away from educators and two, that the goals that stronger accountability measures were to measure were still in dispute—it is still been “the key to driving equity” (p. 10). Still, a great majority of the educational literature views standardization as problematic for the work of teachers, particularly in regards to their professionalism (Booher-Jennings, 2006; Hargreaves, 1994; Hargreaves & Shirley, 2008; McNeil, 2000). According to McNeil (2000, p.3), “Standardization reduces the quality and quantity of what is taught and learned in schools.” Booher-Jennings (2006) talks about how teachers, who use standards as a means to raise the educational achievement of certain students,
must triage their resources and ultimately neglect other students, both those who are perceived to be capable of passing standardized tests without help and those for whom all hope has been lost. As more schools, particularly struggling schools, move to scripted curricula and as scrutiny of teachers and their work intensifies, it seemed almost logical to me that teachers would feel the effects of such shifts to be negative, particularly in terms of their capacity to work as professionals respected for their teaching expertise. The first part of my research question explores the impact of mandated reform on the capacity of teachers in mid-career. Within this context, I hypothesized that the teachers in the second survey would report feeling decreased capacity, as the second survey was administered after, albeit only shortly after, the implementation of NCLB, characterized by its tight controls of teachers’ work.

What I found, however, both confirms and rejects my hypothesis. Using z tests to compare the proportions of teachers who responded in one way to the first survey (1999-2000) to the proportion of teachers who answered the same way in the second survey (2003-2004), I found that overall, after collapsing teachers’ responses to only allow for four response categories, most teachers reported feeling moderate to great influence over setting policy in both performance standards and curriculum and that this remained true over the two datasets. As predicted, the proportion of teachers who responded feeling no influence increased in a statistically significant way, from 9.8% to 13.6% over setting curriculum and from 13.8% to 16.0% over performance standards. What stands out, however, is that teachers’ responses to feeling great influence increased over time, from 17.9% to 21.9% over setting curriculum and from 13.5% to 18.0% over performance standards.
Table 4.1 shows the frequency and percentage of teachers’ responses to the question of influence over setting performance standards in their current school, and Table 4.2 indicates the prevalence of teachers’ responses to the question of influence over curriculum at their current school. A z test of each category in for these two questions showed that the change in proportion was significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.1 Influence over school policy in the area of setting performance standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of influence</th>
<th>Total Sample 1999 (n=42085)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample 2003 (n=44500)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>5804</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7149</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal influence</td>
<td>13408</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>12644</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate influence</td>
<td>17212</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>16665</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of influence</td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8042</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42085</td>
<td></td>
<td>44634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Influence over school policy in the area of establishing curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of influence</th>
<th>Total Sample 1999 (n=42085)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample 2003 (n=44634)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>4129</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6076</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal influence</td>
<td>11818</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>11974</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate influence</td>
<td>18600</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>16799</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of influence</td>
<td>7538</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9785</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42085</td>
<td></td>
<td>44634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same trends held true when looking at teachers’ responses to feelings of control over selecting textbooks and instructional materials; selecting the content, topics and skills to be taught; and selecting teaching techniques. As predicted, the proportion of teachers who responded feeling no control increased significantly. And, as with questions over influence, the proportion of teachers who reported feeling great control increased significantly over time. Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 show the frequency and percentages of teachers’ responses to questions about control.
Table 4.3 Control over selecting textbooks and other instructional materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling of control</th>
<th>Total Sample 1999 (n=42085)</th>
<th>Total Sample 2003 (n=44677)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8873</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18800</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of control</td>
<td>11484</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Control over selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings of control</th>
<th>Total Sample 1999 (n=42086)</th>
<th>Total Sample 2003 (n=44678)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>2523</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8381</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19203</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of control</td>
<td>11979</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Control over selecting teaching techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings of control</th>
<th>Total Sample 1999 (n=42085)</th>
<th>Total Sample 2003 (n=44634)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15524</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of control</td>
<td>23809</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, in the area of capacity, I also hypothesized that given the increased scrutinization of teachers’ work in the context of high-stakes accountability, a higher proportion of teachers would report feeling that routine duties and paperwork interfere with their teaching. As with the other areas of capacity, I found that the percentage of teachers who strongly agree went up, although slightly and not in a statistically significant way, and the percentage of teachers who strongly disagreed went up, although again only slightly and not significantly. Table 4.6 details the percentages and frequencies of teachers’ responses in this category.

Table 4.6 Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my job of teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is also noticeable is that in the area of capacity, answers at the two poles increased for every question. Said another way, the proportion of teachers who answered either that they have great or no control or influence increased from the first survey to the second. Teachers felt more strongly either positively or negatively in the second survey.

In summary, regarding capacity, the proportion of teachers who felt great influence or control over their work and who felt no influence or control over their work increased, and the overall proportion of teachers who felt these opinions strongly as opposed to moderately increased as well.
Commitment

The second part of my research question explores the impact of mandated reform on the *commitment* of teachers in mid-career. The first area of commitment that I compared was the environment of collegiality and shared beliefs in the school. The two questions regarding environment asked teachers whether they agree or disagree that their colleagues share their beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be and whether there is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members. I included these questions because I felt that a teacher’s commitment to his or her career may be impacted by the way he or she feels about his or her colleagues in the school and the extent to which these same colleagues see eye to eye, particularly regarding the ways in which mandated reform is played out within the school building. As mentioned above, organizational commitment is formed by a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values (Reyes, 1990). By exploring teachers’ views about shared beliefs and their ability to or desire to work together, I hoped to understand what might environmentally impact commitment. While I cannot, given these particular datasets, argue that the school environment has changed directly because of the implementation of mandated reform, I believe that teachers’ responses to these questions demonstrate change over time.

For these two questions I hypothesized that the environment of the school would change in a context of high-stakes accountability, from one of collegiality and cooperation to one of privacy. I expected a lower proportion of teachers to respond that they agreed with statements regarding shared beliefs and values and cooperative effort among staff members in the school. As others have suggested (Hargreaves, 1994, 2003),
mandated reform can discourage the sharing of ideas between and among teachers and foster an environment of privacy and protection. To an extent, I found the opposite to be true. The proportion of teachers who strongly or somewhat agreed increased by 6.9, from 81.2% to 88.1% between 1999 and 2003. Similarly, fewer teachers disagreed, down from 18.7% in 1999 to 11.9% in 2003. However, the same data also show a degree of decreasing collegiality. Between 1999 and 2003, a statistically significantly lower proportion of teachers said that they strongly agreed that their colleagues share their beliefs and values. Thus, more teachers in the later sample agreed that their colleagues share their beliefs and values, but fewer strongly agreed with this sentiment. Table 4.7 shows teachers’ responses to the question of shared beliefs and values.

Table 4.7 Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, most teachers somewhat or strongly agree that there is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members, with the proportion of teachers who strongly agree or somewhat agree increasing by from 76.5% in 1999 to 83.2% in 2003. Again, the proportion of teachers who strongly agree increased significantly, from 31.0% to 40.7%. Table 4.8 shows teachers’ responses to the question of cooperative effort among staff members.
Other questions on the SASS also explore teachers’ commitment, in particular regarding effort and satisfaction. These questions demonstrate commitment by examining the extent to which teachers feel willing to work as hard as they can and whether this work pays off, as reflected in their satisfaction in their present position. As above, I expected that more teachers would answer that is a waste of time to try to do one’s best and that fewer would say they are generally satisfied as a teacher in their current school. Similar to the other questions above, teachers responded in the opposite way than I predicted.

When asked whether they agree or disagree that it is a waste of time to try one’s best, most teachers across both survey years either somewhat or strongly disagreed. However, the proportion of teachers who responded that they strongly disagreed increased significantly, from 60.0% in 1999 to 67.8 in 2003. Table 4.9 shows teachers’ responses to the question of effort.

Table 4.9 I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5.0 (2109)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>17.3 (7296)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>17.7 (7435)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>60.0 (25245)</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether they are generally satisfied as teachers in their current schools, most teachers either somewhat or strongly disagreed. The proportion went up
between the survey years, from 89.5% in 1999 to 90.9% in 2003. Table 4.10 shows teachers’ responses to the question about feeling satisfied in their school.

Table 4.10 I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>51.7 (21769)</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>37.8 (15918)</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>7.5 (3165)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.9 (1233)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, teachers in the SASS were specifically asked whether, given what they know now, they would become teachers again, and how long they plan on remaining in teaching. The answers to these questions demonstrate teachers’ commitment to the field of teaching. I hypothesized that a greater proportion of teachers would respond that given what they now know they would not become teachers again, and that teachers would answer that would be inclined to leave teaching sooner rather than later.

As with other items, my hypothesis was disproved. A greater proportion of teachers responded that they would become teachers again, and a greater proportion of teachers responded that they would teach as long as they are able. Tables 4.11 and 4.12 show teachers’ responses to these items.

Table 4.11 If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certainly would become a teacher</td>
<td>37.9 (15931)</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably would become a teacher</td>
<td>27.1 (11393)</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances about even for and against</td>
<td>17.9 (7517)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably would not become a teacher</td>
<td>12.6 (5302)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
<td>4.6 (1942)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12 How long do you plan to remain in teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as I am able</td>
<td>36.8 (15469)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until I am eligible for retirement</td>
<td>35.5 (14932)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will probably continue unless something better comes along</td>
<td>10.8 (4551)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can</td>
<td>3.6 (1526)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided at this time</td>
<td>13.3 (5607)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

In undertaking an analysis of the 1999 and 2003 SASS to explore changes in teachers’ responses over time, particularly the time in which *No Child Left Behind* was implemented, I expected to find several trends. Namely, I predicted I would find that

- Teachers would report feeling less influence and less control over their work, materials and environment
- Teachers would report that their environments were less collegial and cooperative
- Teachers would feel less satisfied and effective
- Teachers would report feeling less likely to say they would become teachers again knowing what they know now and would report wanting to leave their careers sooner rather than later.
To me, the responses to items regarding these questions would demonstrate a sense of lessened capacity and commitment in the face of the implementation of mandated reform and would follow the general negative view of the impact of standardization on the teaching career in the literature. My predictions were based on the literature of the impacts of mandated change, my own experience teaching, and my conversations with current and former public school teachers. While of course I did not seek to prove causation, or for that matter correlation, I expected to show that teachers’ feelings about their career and their work experiences changed over time, and I expected that the trends would be negative in this regard.

What I found both confirmed and contradicted expectations, particularly in the area of capacity, and almost universally defied expectations in the area of commitment. Regarding capacity, it is true that a greater proportion of teachers reported feeling less control and influence over their work, in terms of the content, context and materials, and that in some cases fewer teachers reported feeling moderate levels of influence and control. It is also true, however, that a greater proportion of teachers responded that they felt more control and influence over these areas.

Even further, instead of reporting a diminished sense of commitment, at least by the terms I used to measure it, a significantly larger proportion of teachers reported feeling a greater sense of commitment, both to their jobs and to the career generally speaking. They were more likely to say they would stay in their careers as long as they were able and to agree, even strongly agree, that they would become teachers again knowing what they know now. They were more likely to say they were satisfied as
teachers in their school. More felt that their colleagues were on the same page as they were in terms of values and mission.

How can this be, given the presumed constraints of No Child Left Behind? What is the significance—both statistical and otherwise—of these responses? In this section, I will detail the nature of these constraints, the possible factors that might contribute to teachers reporting differently than predicted, and areas of further exploration that might shed light on how different teachers in different contexts experience the phenomena associated with the imposition of mandated change.

**Constraints**

The bulk of educational literature does not suggest that mandated reform offers much in the way of positive change for teachers. Hargreaves and Shirley (2007) perhaps state this sentiment most succinctly: “It’s time to accept that standardization has gone down like a lead balloon, utterly failing to inspire teachers, students, or the public at large.” Increased standardization is seen as deprofessionalizing teachers (McNeil, 2000). When teachers engage in this type of reform efforts typically promoted by heightened standardization, it can even impact their teaching career, making them less satisfied and disengaged from their work (Huberman, 1989; Little, 1996). In particular, the type of reform promoted by No Child Left Behind—high-stakes, quickly-implemented, top-down—tends to be regarded especially lowly by educational researchers and professionals in the field (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2008).

NCLB has certain features that, at least on the surface, appear to constrain the work of teachers and schools. Curriculum is increasingly scripted as schools purchase
curriculum systems instead of allowing and encouraging teachers to engage in creating and developing their own curriculum, as they have done historically. Teachers are asked to spend more time teaching to the test and less time engaging in creative and innovative teaching and learning. Underperforming schools, in particular, needing to demonstrate Adequate Yearly Progress, are under the gun to provide measurable means by which to prove they are reaching achievement targets, making it more and more difficult to use more novel forms of assessment such as portfolios instead of showing gains on standardized, high-stakes tests. Schools are cutting back their offerings in science and the arts to bulk up their resources for areas that are tested. It is no wonder that so many educational researchers view these changes negatively as they cut deep into the heart of what makes teachers’ work so unique and rewarding.

However, as mentioned multiple times above, this analysis of the SASS data over time seems to be showing, at some incontrovertible level, that many teachers are not being affected the way researchers would expect them to, and that in fact some teachers, if not many, are even more satisfied with the work they are doing. There could be any number of reasons for this discrepancy, but there are at least a few that I believe to be worth further exploration.

Factors affecting teachers’ responses

One possible and convincing reason that teachers’ responses regarding their work and their careers show some positive changes in spite of increased standardization is that overall there has been an increase in more collaborative forms of teaching, which have been demonstrated to make teachers more satisfied in their jobs and schools (Bartlett,
2004; Lieberman & Miller, 1999). Professional learning communities, which bring professionals together through both formal and informal means to improve practice, are springing up in schools that are both already successful and those that are struggling to become so (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Hargreaves & Stone-Johnson, 2009; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Meier, 2002; Newman, King & Youngs, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). If teachers are being given positive opportunities to work together, it would logically follow that they would report feeling higher levels of collegiality with and even commitment to their colleagues as they share work.

Teachers are also being given expanded opportunities to work as teacher leaders within their schools (Bartlett, 2004; Lieberman & Miller, 1999). While on the one hand these new roles make new and perhaps increased work for teachers, it also holds that teachers who were feeling a loss of control over their own teaching work might feel enhanced control as they take on these changed roles. As a result, these teachers might report higher levels of satisfaction with and control over their work.

A second possible explanation for the positive change in teachers’ responses over time might be the actual timing of the datasets in use for this study. The second dataset was administered in 2003, shortly after the implementation of NCLB. While the trends in teachers’ responses seem to be fairly positive, it is possible that this change is because the full effects of NCLB were yet to be felt. The results from the most recent survey have recently been released; while I do not address them in this study, more research is clearly needed to follow up on these trends.

A third possibility is that while the data indeed show a change, and that the change is statistically significant, the actual change and the way that teachers experience
it is not qualitatively meaningful at all. Ingersoll (2003) also used the SASS to discuss changes in who controls teachers’ work, and he found that over time teachers consistently indicated that they had major levels of control over choosing concepts and teaching techniques, but less than moderate levels of control over making school-wide decisions about instructional programs. Ingersoll suggests that overall little has changed over time, and that while there are changes statistically positive changes, they are small, relatively speaking. A 3 percent change, for example, while statistically significant, does not signify much change at all, according to Ingersoll. To flesh this possibility out, qualitative research is required. The following chapter describes the research I did to further explore this topic qualitatively.

A fourth possibility, which again I will present here but explain in greater detail in the next chapter, is that the qualitative data I collected suggest that teachers like being given clear expectations for what and how to teach, and that NCLB, while perceived as overly tight and prescriptive by educational researchers, actually provides teachers with the type of information they have been searching for to improve their teaching. This finding would support the research of supporters of standardization such as Ravitch and Barber, who argue that standards and the pursuant rise in accountability give teachers a goal to work toward and that previously they felt was missing from their work. As I explain in the following chapter, many of the teachers I talked to said they felt like they were better teachers for knowing the standards to which they were being held and how exactly they were being measured before preparing their lesson plans. Of course, not every teacher felt this way, but enough talked about this sense of increased efficacy that it warrants discussion here and in the next chapter.
Further Exploration

In this chapter, I have presented quantitative data that attempts to answer the question “What is the impact of mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of middle career teachers?” While they do not focus specifically on teachers in mid-career (as explained above), the findings of my analysis suggest that the effects of standardization, particularly in the mandated, high-stakes form of *No Child Left Behind*, may not be as negative as educational research both past and recent suggests, and that more important than whether or not standards and the rise in mandated high-stakes reform are perceived as negative or positive, there is a variation of ways that the change commitments and capacities of teachers are affected. Over time, some teachers report feeling decreased capacity. However, many teachers also report feeling increased capacity. Generally speaking, more teachers feel a greater sense of commitment than in the past as well. These findings are surprising in light of the majority of educational research that suggests that standardization can only have negative repercussions. The data forming the basis of this chapter come from surveys of over 80,000 teachers in public schools across the nation, urban and suburban, rural and charter, large and small, innovative and traditional. Thus, the story that this quantitative analysis tells, while very different from what was expected, is important and incomplete. It is important because it provides a new and perhaps more positive way of looking at the effects of mandated change. It is incomplete, however, because while the quantitative data show statistically change over time, they cannot explain why such changes have occurred. It is this need to find out the “why” that drove the qualitative analysis that follows in the next chapter.
The data are also incomplete because they provide a snapshot of what was happening at two given moments in time, but much has changed since the data were collected. A new survey is underway—will the new data tell the same story, or will we find that the impact is in fact negative as initially predicted? Furthermore, in light of the current worldwide economic crisis and its impact on careers everywhere, will we find that teachers are more committed to their careers, or differently committed, because their job freedoms are less great than in the past? Only time will tell how these changes impact today’s, and for that matter, tomorrow’s, teachers
CHAPTER V

QUALITATIVE DATA

CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT IN MID-CAREER

As stated earlier, this study attempts to answer the question “What is the impact of mandated reform on teachers in mid-career?” In the previous chapter, I explored the change over time in teachers’ feelings of control over, influence over, and satisfaction with their work as evidenced by responses to a national survey given at two different points in time. In particular, this period of time between the two surveys encompassed the introduction of mandated reform in the form of the No Child Left Behind legislation. The data analyzed in this chapter were quantitative and a comparison was made between the proportion of teachers who responded one way during the first survey year compared to the proportion of teachers who responded the same way during the next survey year on a variety of questions about working conditions within their particular schools. Contrary to what I expected to find, teachers reported feeling statistically significantly more control, more influence, and more satisfaction over their teaching. Whether this statistical significance has actual significance for teachers in terms of the way they experience their work, however, may still be up for debate. While the quantitative data offer an interesting picture of what was happening at two particular points in time, it is only with qualitative research that a more in-depth version of the story can be told.

The research for this chapter utilized a qualitative methodological approach, specifically interviews, to look at teachers’ lived experiences of mandated reform. In particular, I examined the impact of high-stakes testing on the change commitments and
capacities of teachers in mid-career. The twelve teachers who participated in the qualitative component of the study all work or at one point worked in the state of Massachusetts, where the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) has been the state-level standardized test since 1998 (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2006), and portions of the examination (English, Mathematics) have been high-stakes since 2003 (Brady-Myerov, 2009) or will become so in the future (Vaznis, 2009), meaning that students who do not pass at the tenth grade level will not graduate from high school. All of the teachers who participated in the study are in mid-career, with between seven and fifteen years of teaching experience. Several of the participants began teaching in a time when standards and the subsequent testing regimes were just being introduced in the early to mid-1990s. This chapter presents findings from the analysis of the qualitative data and suggestions for further research based on these findings.

Sample

As detailed in Chapter III, the qualitative sample comprised twelve mid-career teachers from the state of Massachusetts. Table X shows each teacher’s pseudonym, used for the purpose of anonymity in this study; subject area; and number of years teaching.
Table 5.1 Qualitative sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Number of Years Teaching (at time of study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Special Education/English</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample includes seven male and five female teachers. As the sampling methodology was snowball, it was not designed to reflect the current makeup of the teaching force broadly, which is predominantly (82%) female (NCEI, 2005) or the secondary level teaching force, which is presently closer to 56% female for lower secondary education and 68% for upper secondary education (OECD, 2009). Of the twelve teachers interviewed, eleven were white and one African-American. I do not address race as a category in this study, although I believe it may impact how a teacher experiences reform. Further study would provide more detail about this factor.

The districts represent schools in both urban and suburban areas. Five school districts are represented. School and district profiles are detailed in Table 5.2. Boston is the major urban district in which teachers in this study worked; 6 teachers, or half of the participants, teach or formerly taught in the Boston public school system. As it is the largest (theus50.com, 2009) of the towns in Massachusetts it would be nearly impossible to keep its identity anonymous. I have worked, however, to keep the schools within Boston as unidentifiable as possible. In order to keep the suburban districts...
unidentifiable as described in the methodology section, I give below the population, income and racial profiles, and a percentage quintile in terms of school performance on the state standardized test (MCAS) as ranges rather than discrete numbers. All school district profiles are taken from the news website www.boston.com which reports school data on an annual basis. Town profiles were taken from www.mass.gov and http://factfinder.census.gov; for the purposes of anonymity, specific website addresses that include the names of the towns are not given. To ensure that districts cannot be looked up given the demographic data, I have provided ranges for population, income and race.

Table 5.2 School District Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>District MCAS Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Boston (6 teachers)</td>
<td>Approx 590,000</td>
<td>Median family income between $50,000 &amp; $60,000</td>
<td>49.5% White</td>
<td>Bottom quintile, Math &amp; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Suburban (1 teacher)</td>
<td>Under 25,000</td>
<td>Median family income greater than $100,000</td>
<td>Between 10-15% minority, largest minority group Asian</td>
<td>Top Quintile, Math &amp; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Suburban (1 teacher)</td>
<td>Between 25,000 &amp; 50,000</td>
<td>Median family income greater than $100,000</td>
<td>Between 15-20% minority, largest minority group African-American</td>
<td>Third Quintile English, fourth Quintile math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Suburban (2 teachers)</td>
<td>Between 50,000 &amp; 100,000</td>
<td>Median family income greater than $100,000</td>
<td>Between 10-15% minority, largest minority group Asian</td>
<td>Top Quintile, Math &amp; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Suburban (2 teachers)</td>
<td>Between 10,000 &amp; 15,000</td>
<td>Median family income greater than $100,000</td>
<td>Less than 5% minority, largest minority group Asian</td>
<td>Top Quintile, Math &amp; English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

The Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993 (here-to referred to as the Act) was passed on June 18, 1993 (Anthony & Rossman, 1994) as a response to the ruling in McDuffy v. Webb in the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts which both equalized school funding, which had previously been based on local income taxes, and established a set of curriculum frameworks (Minnesota Promise, no date). Behind the Act was a desire to provide more equitable funding for public education in an attempt to minimize economic disparities between poorer and wealthier school districts, and to hold students accountable to a set of raised educational standards once funding was equalized (Minnesota Promise, no date).

While the organizational aspects of the Act most certainly played an important role in attempting to make public education more equitable for all students in Massachusetts, the most relevant details of the Act, for the purposes of this dissertation, lie in the programmatic aspects of the reform design and implementation. Anthony and Rossman (1994) detail the six programmatic areas designated for remediation:

1. Common core curriculum
2. Time spent in school
3. Early childhood program
4. State-wide technology plan
5. Professional development
6. Parent involvement.
Of these, the first area is the most pertinent. Prior to 1993, Massachusetts did not have a statewide curriculum in place. With the passage of the Act, educational goals for all students were determined and a set of curriculum frameworks was designed.

The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (here-to referred to as MCAS) was created to measure student performance after the curriculum frameworks were put into place and the funding system equalized (Minnesota Promise, no date). The test is high-stakes; passage of the test is a requirement for high school graduation.

Portions of the MCAS are administered in grades 3-8 as well (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2009). In addition to acting as a spur to education reform within the state as mandated by McDuffy v. Robertson, MCAS also fulfills the mandates set forth in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2002), which mandates annual state-level assessments for all public school students to measure student progress.

**Teachers and Reform**

The aim of this study is to explore the effects of contemporary high-stakes mandated reform—here, MCAS—on the change commitments and capacities of mid-career teachers. As described in the previous chapter, capacity can be understood as a teacher’s ability to use her professional judgment and personal experience to make decisions about her work, and in particular about how and to what extent to integrate educational change into this work. Commitment is understood as a teacher’s dedication to her work as evidenced by her desire to work to her highest capability; her concern for her students, colleagues, and school; and her wish to remain in her job or school.
Bearing these definitions in mind, two means of analysis are necessary. First, it is expedient to analyze how the participants in this study spoke about MCAS, the reform at the center of the study. Their experiences, as well as the impact of their experiences on their commitment and capacity, are unique, different from more veteran teachers who have experienced multiple waves of reform and numerous testing regimes, yet also different from their younger peers who have always taught when MCAS and standardized high-stakes testing were the norm.

Second, it is critical to explore how teachers responded directly to questions about commitment and capacity in regard to the reforms at hand and their careers at present. When I designed the study, I was interested not only in how teachers felt about the reform but also about the ways in which their experience with the reform did or did not impact their career decisions at present and going forward.

As a note, it must be stated that the analysis of the qualitative data was performed solely by me, the interviewer and researcher for this study. Qualitative analysis is inherently subjective and shaped by the researcher’s own experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Rossman & Rollis, 1998) and I have tried to maintain the integrity of each interview without projecting my own biases and understandings onto what my participants told me. Thus, when I describe teachers’ attitudes toward the MCAS and toward standardization in general, it is with the power given to me as the interpreter of their words to categorize their responses into negative and neutral/positive. It is not to say that those who felt mostly negatively did not have positive things to say about certain aspects of MCAS, or that those whom I classified as feeling neutral to positive would say that they wholeheartedly support the high-stakes test. It is my most sincere hope that I
have accurately captured the participants’ sentiments about how the reform has impacted their commitment and capacities as teachers in mid-career.

**MCAS and Capacity**

Teachers overwhelmingly—and surprisingly-- felt neutral to positive about the MCAS itself and the general trend, as they saw it, towards holding students to clear and defined standards. As a point of clarification, it should be said that many felt that the test/reform *itself* was neutral or positive; the *implementation* in individual schools was viewed by all participants as neutral to negative, and these more negative feelings will be discussed later. As with many of the findings in this study, this sentiment does not reflect much of the current educational literature about mandated reform and standardization particular, which tends to portray such reform as detrimental to schools and the teachers, staff and students in them (Hargreaves, 2003; Hargreaves & Shirley, 2009; McNeil, 2000).

Regarding professional capacity, those teachers who felt neutral to positive toward the MCAS that the MCAS had three key encouraging aspects. First, it did not seem to get in the way of their teaching. In fact, some teachers even felt it had a beneficial effect on their teaching, helping them to hone their curriculum and giving them guidance where previously they felt there had not been enough.

I don’t think about it that much anymore. I think standardized tests have their place. (Julie)
And so it's not a very useful tool for me, the results or the preparation. In terms of pressure or in terms of mandated reform we just don't have something really sweep through the school. (Samantha)

No, it might be a boost because I believe in the standards-based, every course should be looking at these sort of topics. So I guess it's a good aid to that because they are going to be testing these topics so I think these topics should be included in the course. (Andrew)

Most of them. You know, there's always the random standard in there that, you know, is trivial but which I have no tolerance for but for the most part good. I think they appeal [to] the real things that kids can understand and that are engaging and that can be explored through real life experience, which is important. . . I think there's something good about the fact that for those first few years we were sort of meandering in and out which has its value but I also think there's, it's important to come to some sort of focus, come to some sort of direction. I think MCAS pushed us, even if it pushed the pendulum too far in the other direction to go very traditional I feel like we will come back as we get a grip on how our kids are going to do and where they're going to do it. I think we will come back in 10th grade, we will come back in 11th grade and probably find ways to get back to the more innovative ways we think about teaching. (Max)
[They] helped me to be a better teacher because I felt like I was a more informed teacher. (Alice)

The second positive aspect of the standards was that they acted not only as a spur to better teaching but as a “checks and balances” system to monitor student progress and whether their teaching was helping students to meet the goals.

It's got a checks and balance for sure. I wouldn't deny that there's a checks and balance aspect to it. (Max)

And I think it's, you know, checks and balances. And I think that had it done its intended job, which is really, I'd always told my kids, this test is more, is testing me more than it's testing you. This is really trying to find out what kind of teacher I am. If you all fail it, I'm not doing my job and I should get fired. (Sarah)

I feel like it wouldn't be useful for me to just say, I hate MCAS and I'm not going to teach to it but I feel like it also would not be useful for me to say MCAS is the only thing that matters and I'll spend all my time doing it. So that push and pull, especially in a collaborative organization is always really difficult because what I, the balance that I think is acceptable is different from what my colleagues in the department think is acceptable and so it's a conversation that will never end especially as
younger people come on board and like I said, their perspective is a little bit different in terms of how important or how much we need to address the test. Personally I'm at a place where I feel like, okay, we do it, I've peppered it in a way where if I just start to do any more MCAS prep I would feel it would hurt me but I also feel like if I did any less it would hurt the students. I'm at a place where in my own practice I feel pretty good about it and I feel like our numbers are, I feel pretty good. We could be doing better but that would involve so many sacrifices of what I value in our curriculum that I wouldn't want to do it. So as long as we can continue to juggle and as long as we're still having the conversation I guess I feel pretty good about it. (Mike)

And I don't see how those people can be identified unless there is some type of test in place. I don't think the test should be used as a punishment, which is why I understand it's being given at the younger grade levels. I don't necessarily have a problem with the test being given every year so long as it's contained to just a couple of days. I think if all the other tests were sort of streamlined that could be done. In a perfect world we'd have it across all disciplines but I don't know that that's necessarily practical. (Alice)

Finally, several of the teachers spoke about enhanced capacity for reform due to their status as mid-career teachers. When talking about capacity for reform, it is
important to clarify here that these teachers were speaking about their power to use the
MCAS and standards to raise the performance of their students, not their capacity to
engage in new ways of teaching beyond the given curriculum. As teachers in mid-
career, they had enough knowledge and experience to know how and to what extent to
allow the MCAS to impact their teaching.

As a new teacher, Alice feared the MCAS:

The less experienced I was, and I see that also with the newer teachers, I
was very intimidated by the test, very frightened that somehow this test
reflects directly upon their teaching. That they have a child who has been
in their classroom for six months as a seventh grader and now they’re
taking this test and if they don’t perform well, that it means they were a
lousy teacher. Which they aren’t.

When she moved to a new school after her first year of teaching, Alice continued to feel
powerless:

I remember being called out in my second year because somebody
suggested I didn’t read the directions…one of the vice principals…I had
no idea because I was alone with the children and I simply followed the
script as I had done the prior two years. There was some question about
how I read the script. And I had to practice reading the script in front of
her. And it was the most ridiculous exercise I have ever been part of . . . I
remember thinking it was preposterous, that this is what people with
advanced degrees were warned about. They would go into the
classroom…I remember arranging the children in alphabetical order in
rows, and deciding by the look of certain kids...it was the only thing I could understand what it was. After the test had started, asking students to get up and move across the room. It was totally disrespectful of the teaching environment, of the sense of quiet, of the sense of seriousness, of purpose, and to get into respect, that you’re sitting at a desk, you’re taking a test, putting what you can only imagine is their best effort, asking them to pack up their stuff in front of their peers and move across the room for no particular person, maybe because they glanced out of the window at the wrong time.

As she moved into her final position, however, Alice began to feel a new sense of control over her work, and a heightened sense of how best to use the test to help her students. She even felt that because of her experience as a teacher she could, in a sense, dismiss the test as flawed if her students did not do well. It would not reflect her teaching, it would reflect the testing:

The children will be fine, it doesn’t really matter what I teach, I just have to make sure that I cover these major aspects of American history and they’ll be ok, and if they’re not ok, well that’s because the test was stupid and flawed and ridiculous, and more critical of who’s putting together the test and really seeing themselves as separate from it.

Julie also talked about the ways in which mid-career teachers and late-career teachers felt that in their capacity as experienced teachers they could more easily disengage:

Yeah, they say things like we’ve done this before, or it’ll go away or it’ll shift again in 15 years. They’ll give their 2 cents occasionally but they’re
not invested. They’re not going to be there for the change. They don’t care as much.

She contrasts this view with how she perceives the views of the newer teachers:

The new teachers. They definitely have opinions and share them but …I don’t want to say they don’t know what they’re talking about, but they are just too wrapped up in trying to figure out what to teach the next day to really care to have a long term view. And they also, just the lack of experience in seeing how something is actually going to affect you. Know what I mean? It’s more of a we can do that, that doesn’t matter.

Mike also points out similar differences between groups of teachers:

I think, you know, when you’re asking about generational differences I really see older colleagues kind of see this as one more change initiative that they’re going to have to weather and younger colleagues have kind of come of age in testing culture and standards culture and feel much more obligated to address it or teach to it. So… People like me in the middle I think are a little bit more paranoid because I don’t think I’ve been in teaching long enough to see the pendulum that I hear about shifting back and forth from one direction to another. But I think we also have been at it long enough or are far enough removed from this original, from the standards movement to realize that there’s more to learning than just doing well on these tests.
In summary, most of the teachers in the study, teachers who teach across a variety of subjects in contexts both urban and suburban, felt that the standards and the test offered a positive sense of checks-and-balances, trying to ensure that students were held accountable for what they were being taught and were able to demonstrate said learning as well as providing teachers with a clear set of guidelines about what their students were expected to learn. Overall, most of the teachers did not feel that their professional capacity as teachers was challenged by the standards, and some even said their capacity was enhanced. As teachers in mid-career, they were experienced enough to know how to best teach their students yet not quite as cynical as veteran teachers who tended not to engage in the reform work.

The standards, and in particular the MCAS as a means by which to measure the standards, were not regarded by all as positive, however. Four of the twelve teachers in the study expressed decidedly negative opinions about the test and about using standards to measure students. As with the positive aspects, there were several key concerns. First, teachers seemed concerned about the motivation behind the test and indeed the credibility of the test itself.

There's no leeway to do anything. If they tell you to do it you do it. Otherwise quit. There is no room for personal choice. There's scope and sequence and the pacing guide. There's a script you have to follow. And the lesson delivery methodology is all laid out. Either it's like black or white. Either you're meeting expectations or you're not. There's no
middle ground. If you're not meeting expectations they're going to remove you from your position. (Harrison)

My opinion of MCAS is that it's appalling, absolutely ridiculous and unnecessary...It, because I've been around since its inception and been part of experiences such as finding errors on the test, being in the position to have to complain about the cultural insensitivities of the test, such as questions about snow being answered by kids that have never seen snow, for example, if they just moved to the area. That piece of it has been incredibly frustrating. The administration of MCAS, the amount of time that we lose, the number of teaching hours we lose, the stress that it causes. (Doug)

Oh, let's talk about the negatives. First of all, I have a conspiracy theory, I'll admit that right out. I think ed reform came mostly from a desire to discredit the public schools to increase enrollment of private schools where they don't have to take MCAS. I think it was designed to break the public school teachers' unions because as much power as they say we have we weren't able to retain, for example, the lifetime certification, which is probably good but still, the problem the state made for us and broke. Teacher recertification is a joke. You go through a whole bunch of different steps but you really just have to give them the credit card number and much of the testing is, I think, completely irresponsible. The C and MCAS is called the Stanford Comprehensive, as designed originally it was
going to have portfolios and essays and performances and all kinds of things and in the end it comes down to a multiple choice test with college level physics questions under the science, misleading English questions, some, you know, flat out mistakes. It's not a proficiency test. It's a, it's an advanced test. And they give it to 10th graders at the highest level. So by 10th grade, that group of students is supposed to be beyond proficient, which, you know, you don't want to say, I don't want my kids to be beyond proficient but it also hurts those kids who aren't reaching that level. It makes teachers work harder to reach them, that's good, but there has been, I believe, an increase in dropouts. Schools are working to shuffle around their populations because a kid who fails the MCAS is going to red flag that school, so if they can shuffle them from one district to another he doesn't count on the test. There's been a lot of, lot of smoke and mirrors. But I think it all goes back to discrediting the schools, increasing pilot schools and charter schools, lot of money there. I think that's where it came from. (Jim)

I think that a lot of these federally mandated reforms people, people don't push for these reforms because schools are good, they push for them because there are a lot of schools that are terrible. I don't even think they're really afraid of schools and teachers weren't aren't great, you know, pretty good, (inaudible) not bad, I think it's because they're afraid of these schools which are totally underperforming and are terrible. Right. But in
mandating these reforms I think that they can actually drag everyone to a certain state of mediocrity, which is really dangerous as the emphasis becomes more on the test. On the whole I think it's an artificial way to solve a really important problem and the important problem is the state of education in our country on the whole is terrible and the way to solve that I think is to get really good people in the classroom and also you need parent, families more involved and the culture more involved and address any intellectuals in culture and that sort of stuff. That's the biggest problem. But the way that they've tried to deal with the problem is through testing, which is good for politicians because when they're dealing with their constituents who might not know a lot about education but they know the scores when they go up that looks good. Right. It's a very artificial way of demonstrating the educational performance happened. But in the meantime the damage that's done is that it can bring schools which are doing, on the whole really, really well into a state of mediocrity and it encourages teachers who aren't very good in the first place to just teach to the test. And so I think in a way it becomes a superficial and possibly destructive way of dealing with a really serious problem. (Bill)

Second, teachers talked about the impact of the testing (not the test) on the school, both in terms of the time taken away from lessons and the impact of testing on the creativity of teachers to choose their own lessons. Several teachers expressed concern
that the testing was taking time away from the students that could be better spent in more innovative activities.

The administration of MCAS, the amount of time that we lose, the number of teaching hours we lose, the stress that it causes. Because, even though we do well on MCAS, we still take it deadly serious. (Doug)

I’m holding out hope that things will get better. I feel the public is just starting to wake up to the craziness, this over-reform crusade has created. Because it’s their own kids who are getting their gym and art taken away and are not being taught anything except for test-related stuff. I hold out some hope that things might improve. (Harrison)

The teachers were very resentful of the MCAS because it interfered with curriculum. They had medieval festivals that were across grade levels, multidisciplinary units that were compromised because of the MCAS because medieval history wasn’t on the 8th grade MCAS. So huge units that had been in place had been pared down. (Alice)

I think that it basically just keeps away student creativity because, you know, if it’s April we have to do this and we don’t have the poetry unit covered then clearly they’re not going to, you know, know anything about what they need for that particular MCAS that year. (Michelle)
Just, I think the whole idea of educational metrics is scary. . . I think that we're never really, the danger is always, the one step things are much more easy to measure and I think because of that ease of measurement we're confusing that with importance and I think it's one measure but when we let it be the only measure it's really, really dangerous. (Mike)

A final negative effect of the MCAS on teacher capacity centered around teacher voice. Those teachers who felt low levels of capacity for reform felt that their principals invited their input yet did not sincerely take it.

There’s this dog and pony show where they act like they’re asking for input. It’s more like a listening session for the principal. He has this idea of what he’s going to do. He gets input from the other suits downtown and then he gets the teachers together to talk. If he hears any ideas that fit in with his plan then he’ll do it but it’s not like we’re part of the actual planning process. (Harrison)

Yes, but I think we have a lot of teachers are very active and speak up a lot to try and improve the school however the inertia in our school is strange in that some schools are really, really committed to something, right, and it might, it might have everyone on board and therefore everyone who is for it might be committed to something and it might be counter, it might
be contrary to the interest of the teachers rights (inaudible) work against it. Our school is committed to some things but also all over the place in that it is, there’s so many different interest groups in the community that are so powerful, if you will, that it tries to please everyone all the time and is really afraid to say yes and no on certain issues so I think what we end up with a lot of great teachers that do a great job in the classroom but a very sort of loose institution that’s unsure of what it is exactly. So I think we have a lot of, a large voice but in terms of that translating into more concrete institution that says yes to the community, this is what we’re (inaudible) do these three things and no to the community, we’re not about that, we’re not going to do those three things, I don’t know if it really translates into that. I think what we generally do is the teachers are involved and they, you know, speak out on a lot of different issues but what happens to that from the administration point of view is then they sort of take that and say to every single interest groups, yes, we’re going to accommodate you, you, you, you and all of your different needs. (Bill)

I never have independence because I have to follow the IEP. (Michelle)

So I would say my engagement is at a low and that I kind of accept that I can’t have an influence in that right now. But I think definitely my principal has a mission and I respect that she’s really ambitious and she’s justice minded and she dreams big for our school but sometimes she
doesn’t have everybody on board. Right now a lot of people are, not drowning but they’re just, that the administration isn’t responsive to their needs. It’s just, are demoralized. So we took a lot on this year and now we have to, I think we need to slow down a little bit. (Samantha)

The negative feelings surrounding the standards broadly and MCAS in particular center around three concerns--what is best for students, for teachers and for schools—and the ways the teachers interviewed perceive the standards and testing to work against these best interests. The four teachers who express the greatest levels of concern believe—quite strongly—that MCAS and the testing/standardization movement take control away from teachers, hurt students by taking time away from areas of learning not tested, and generally bring even high-performing schools to a lower level by setting a floor above which schools must perform instead of a ceiling toward which schools ought to strive.

In summary, regarding professional capacity, the surprising data come from the majority of the teachers in the study who say that the standards and the MCAS give them a goal to work toward, essentially enhancing their capacity to teach. Additionally surprising, within this subset of teachers (eight out of twelve), five teachers worked in urban schools, and four of those five in low performing schools. As discussed previously, it is the teachers in low performing schools that often struggle the most with standardization (Falk & Drayton, 2004; Lee, 2003). Thus, while four of the teachers expressed decidedly negative feelings about the MCAS and standardization regarding professional capacity, they were in the minority.
MCAS and Commitment

Commitment comes in many different forms. I asked the teachers to talk about their commitment to their students, their schools (personal), their colleagues (organizational) and their jobs (professional). I anticipated that teachers would feel highly committed to their students but would express varying levels of commitment to their colleagues and schools. In a way, this was true. Most of the teachers did not really talk about their commitment to the students per se. The ones who felt committed felt strongly about it; their commitment was “tremendous” and “100%.” Two teachers said their commitment was not to their students; this is not to say their commitment to their students was low, but rather that at this point in their career their commitment energies lay elsewhere.

I think part of it’s a result of being there for a while. I’m really committed to my department head who’s been supportive and helped me learn how to teach. I respect my colleagues. I enjoy the kids. In some ways it’s strange. I feel perhaps less of a commitment to the kids than to the school. It’s not really something I’ve thought about that much before. I guess I feel like to the kids I’m replaceable, you know what I mean? To a great extent I feel that, not entirely. If someone else were to teach the course I teach it would all move along. Which I think the first few years of teaching it’s a little hard to see that. You’re pretty sure you’re the reason they’re going to fail or succeed. (Julie)
In the general sense. Not the kids in front of me necessarily but that’s why I’m there. They lose a day of instruction if there’s a substitute there. And it’s chaos. And the kind of negativity they can inflict upon each other without good supervision. You’re doing a disservice if you’re not there, especially if you’re out for a week at a time. I really wrestled with taking some paternity leave, but that’s just not fair to be gone for a month. It’s just chaos. I see people do it. You gotta make the decision that’s right for you and your family, but. (Harrison)

Another talked about how his commitment to the students was, in a way, enhanced by the MCAS. Because he felt compelled to help his students, he would engage in work that otherwise he would not support.

I mean, last year was the first year I taught a class where the kids were going to take the MCAS at the end of that class, that was a 9th grade engineering class and I would catch myself literally saying things to kids that I never, ever would’ve said to them before like, you know, what are you going to do when the MCAS comes, you know, that kind of thing, which, to me is detrimental to the relationship side of teaching. If that external is coming between me and the person I’m trying to have a relationship and teach with that’s a problem for me so I have to be more conscious of that and it’s bad but I think it’s also possible to keep those separate. I definitely felt the pressure of it. I knew, I remember talking to
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[Mike] actually quite a bit it being my first time doing this, that pressure or feeling like, holy crap, what these kids do is going to reflect on me. Right. I know, I know what’s going to be on that test. I’ve seen the test, not the actual test but I’ve seen past tests. I can assume it’s going to be about the same. I know which kids are getting things. I know which kids are going to be able to answer certain questions and the way that, it became part of my feedback in terms of how do I perceive a kid and how do I, how do I evaluate, how am I assessing and evaluating that kid in, you know, it creeps towards using the MCAS as a way to evaluate and assess a kid which is not really the way I want to see teaching entirely. So it’s dangerous in that way. I think it’s avoidable too. (Max)

Commitment to colleagues was also mixed. Those who felt strongly or highly committed to their colleagues spoke about engaging with like-minded colleagues and said that it was their colleagues who actually made them want to remain in their school, even as they pondered leaving.

It’s going to be the hardest thing, the reason I didn’t leave this year I think is because it’s going to be too hard to leave but I think I have to. That’s what I’ve got to do this year is figure out how I do that in a way that doesn’t feel sad or frustrating or whatever. (Max)
Very committed. I would be very reluctant to leave my school in a large part because of my colleagues. (Mike)

Those who felt lower levels of commitment largely framed their concerns in terms of the lack of collegiality in the school. In other words, it is not that they felt negatively toward their colleagues as people or professionals but that the school did not support an environment in which meaningful relationships could be fostered.

I feel committed, but I wouldn’t say…you don’t really have time to talk to the teachers you don’t see every day. The other physics teachers, I’ll try and touch base with them, so I feel pretty committed to helping them out. The other teachers are kind of hey, how are you doing, kind of in passing. It would be great if we had more time to say hi to the history teacher or an English teacher. (Andrew)

I certainly offered to help and all that but we weren’t part of a team. Plus, like, our so-called teams, like, our small learning communities, got shuffled around every year so you’re never with the same people. Collaborations never lasted more than a school year. (Sarah)

The problem is we get very petty towards each other and resentful because we don’t have someone above us saying, this is the direction where we’re going. Even if I didn’t like the direction that a department head told me
this is where we’re going, if we had that kind of vision I would want to go along with it but really what we have is good teachers kind of doing the right thing. So I’m not so committed to my colleagues. (Jim)

The personal relationships… Some people are more committed… How can you commit to someone who doesn’t have a license? You can’t. So it depends on the colleague, it depends on their level of commitment to the profession. I can’t help them if I don’t know what they’re going to be doing. I don’t even know if they’re going to make it through the year. (Harrison)

My colleagues. Ones who are like-minded I’m quite fond of. I think my personality is a little bit Lone Ranger so sometimes, you know, people, some years they’re, not peeved that I would go the extra mile but sort of like, I can’t do that but now I’m a teacher who’s like, I can’t do everything I want to do and so I’m understanding of that in others. I maybe wasn’t as understanding of that in other teachers in the past. So usually have, like, a core group of teachers who are, that I feel close to who are high achievers also. (Samantha)

Perhaps most interesting, however, were my conversations with teachers about their commitment to the job. Nearly every teacher, even those actively looking for a new job or considering it for the near future, felt highly committed.
I feel things that would make it as high as a seven or eight would be I feel very disappointed in myself when I don’t feel I’ve done a good job. I feel very disappointed when kids feel that they’re not in a useful space or in a space where they’re actually learning something useful. I work pretty hard, I’d say very hard and spent a lot of hours doing what I do so that’s why it would be about as high as a seven or eight. I would say there’s times when it could also be interpreted as low as a seven or eight, like, why not ten. I think there’s reasons for that too. (Bill)

I would say I’m leaving, I would love to stay but I think I’m not going to. I feel tremendously committed to my job but I feel unable to do my job as I want to and that’s why I’m leaving. (Max)

I give 100%, but that’s just me. Since I’ve been teaching 14 years now, I feel like this is a blessing. I’ve never taken a sick day or a personal day in 14 years. But that’s something I’d do anyway. It’s nothing to do with my loyalty to the district. I just have my own work ethic and standards that I abide by. I feel like I’m committed to the profession and my own professionalism. I would say I’m committed in that sense. But not out of a sense of loyalty to the district. (Harrison)
Extremely. Extremely committed. That takes different forms. So I’m no longer spending entire weekends reinventing the wheel in terms of curriculum and that kind of thing but I think the dedication is to my kids and that often overlaps with the job. (Doug)

You know, like I was saying before, the way that I do my job has changed a lot since I became a parent but I feel like I’ve also, I also, maybe I’m lying to myself but I’ve also told myself that there’s a lot of benefits that I bring to the job now that I have the perspective of being a parent and that balances out the fact that I don’t spend four extra hours or five extra hours a day doing the job. If that’s taken into account I feel like I’m very committed. (Mike)

Also of note is the fact that two of the female teachers talked about feeling over-committed.

I think pretty committed. Probably more committed than I thought I would be or even necessarily want to be. I had a lot of trouble going back this year, partly because I couldn’t have a schedule that I really wanted. There was a change of schedule at the end of last year. I had a hard time going back in a lot of ways but definitely felt a sense of obligation. Ultimately I decided it was probably the best decision for me, but I definitely felt an obligation to the school. (Julie)
The first day of school I put my phone number on the board and say, you never have any excuse, call me, if I don’t answer the phone leave me a message, you know, like, not doing your homework isn’t an option because you can call me and tell me why you can’t do it, you can call me and ask me for help. Spent hundreds of dollars on books. You know, my kids like supplies, you know, pencils, putting white boards up in my room. It’s just, you know, worrying, worrying about these students who they’re not, now I know, they’re not mine. But it, over committed. It stressed me out. (Sarah)

While teachers’ expressed commitment to the job was high, however, there was a complicating factor regarding nearly all of the teachers’ responses. That is, while they all said they were highly committed, nearly every teacher planned to leave his or her job. At the time of the interview, only three teachers said they planned to stay where they were: Andrew, Bill, and Samantha. Four teachers were actively looking for new jobs: Harrison, Jim, Max and Michelle. Three teachers planned to leave in the future: Doug, Julie and Mike. Two were already out of the classroom, although both still identified as teachers and planned to return at some point: Alice and Sarah. This finding, in one way, is not surprising. Ingersoll’s (2001) work on teacher turnover points to this phenomenon; teachers who leave their job for another teaching job, a leadership position, or a job in academia or field related to but not directly in education often still identify as teachers and have not truly left education. Thus, the teachers in my study could still identify as
committed even if technically they appear to be the opposite. This conflict is important to note here, but the reasons for its possible existence will be explored later.

Overall, nearly all the teachers felt committed to their job (only one teacher was considering leaving education totally), some even over-committed. While their commitment may have changed over time, it is clear that these teachers represent a highly dedicated teaching force, even in the face of change.

It is within the context of standardization, though, that I was curious about how teachers’ commitment did or did not change. I asked the teachers about how MCAS impacted their commitment. The general consensus seemed to be that it did not really affect their commitment.

I’m not that tied to it. I think I would like them to do better but I just, I don’t think it’s the end all, be all. It doesn’t, as I said before, it doesn’t give me any new information about their skills. I’m well aware of what their weaknesses are so I’m already trying to address that. (Sarah)

I’m at a point in my career where I wouldn’t worry about it as much as I would have a few years ago. . . I know it will all just kind of work out. (Julie)

In the sense that, I guess I would say in the sense that I feel committed that regardless of how much I hate it I want my kids to pass it. I want them to get over that hurdle and so I would say that if I didn’t feel that sense of
commitment to my kids I guess maybe I would say, oh, fuck MCAS and go about my world and just ignore the moral implications of ignoring MCAS but I don’t think that’s a realistic thing that anyone would really do. Even if they didn’t feel committed to their students. It’s wrong.

(Mike)

Thus, even if the teachers felt neutral to negative about the test, they ultimately still cared whether their students did well and worked hard to ensure that they did so. When I put the question in my interview protocol I expected teachers to say that their commitment levels were lowered by the need to tailor their work to the MCAS, but instead I found the opposite to be true.

**Summary**

In summary, most of the teachers with whom I spoke, representing professionals in both high and low performing schools in both urban and suburban districts, felt that the MCAS in particular and the standards movement in general offer a neutral to positive opportunity for teachers to assess their students and to hone their curricular and teaching strategies. This statement holds true for the quantitative data previously explored as well; teachers generally appear to feel more control and influence over their work than in the recent past. If this is indeed the case on a larger scale, then what issues could be at play that make these teachers’ responses, both in the qualitative interviews detailed in this chapter and the quantitative study detailed in the previous chapter, so very different from what the educational literature suggests?
Factors Impacting Teachers’ Commitment and Capacity

Until fairly recently, literature on maintaining the teaching force focused on teacher recruitment strategies, as a teacher shortage seemed imminent due to the “graying” of the teacher workforce (Murphy, DeArmond, & Guin, 2003; Teacher Magazine, 1995). More recent work suggests that maintaining teacher supply is less an issue of recruitment than one of retention. Scholars of teacher retention focus on the conditions that affect teachers’ retention and suggest strategies not just to bring teachers into the field but instead to ensure that those already in the field do not leave (Ingersoll, 2001, Johnson et al., 2004; Shen, 1997; Weiss, 1999). Ingersoll (2001) in particular argues that the problem of teacher shortages is not due simply to supply issues, but instead to other factors, which he deems organizational, that push teachers out of schools before retirement. These factors include teacher job dissatisfaction and the movement of teachers out of schools to pursue better jobs or different careers. Ingersoll’s research suggests that organizational changes in schools such as increased support from administration and increased teacher input into school decision-making, as well as reduction of school discipline problems, might begin to lower teacher turnover.

This study does not directly address teacher turnover. However, the focus of the study indeed touches on what factors keep teachers in their careers. My mixed methods research suggests that while organizational concerns may impact retention, they do not appear to be what is impacting their engagement with reform or pushing teachers out of their careers. The SASS data, in my analysis, show a statistically significant increase in
teachers’ feelings of control over their work and in within-school decision-making. In many cases, the qualitative data support these claims as well.

This section will focus solely on the qualitative interviews and the possible reasons the teachers interviewed expressed different sentiments regarding the role of standardization and high-stakes testing in their teaching careers. Stated differently, if teachers are reporting feeling an enhanced sense of capacity and high levels of commitment, what impact if any does mandated reform have on their choice to stay in their career? The data reveal two possible streams. The first focuses on what I classify as environmental concerns, specifically the type of workplace in which the teachers work (urban or suburban, high or low performing), whether or not the subject taught is a tested subject, and the collegial norms within these contexts. The second stream focuses more on what I classify as personal concerns, specifically career stage and length of time teaching, gender, and generation.

Before delving into the data, however, it is important to acknowledge one possibility regarding the collected data. Ingersoll (2003) suggests that even though teachers report a slight percentage increase in feelings of control over their work across the datasets on the SASS, this difference does not fundamentally change the fact that teachers have historically had limited control over their work. Ruled largely by districts and by state and now federal-level legislation that mandates, not simply suggests, the type of work in which teachers can and should engage, teachers have always had limited say in what and how they teach. Research on teachers suggests that what teachers are supposed to do and what they actually do behind closed doors (Little, 1990) has not always been aligned, but the fundamental idea that teachers do not create and implement
their own work has long been the case. Ingersoll argues that even though there is a slight positive and statistically significant increase in teachers’ feelings of control, it is too minimal to actually suggest a shift in understanding teachers’ work or the context(s) in which it takes place.

Given Ingersoll’s analysis of the same datasets used in my own quantitative analysis, it could be that he is correct. In some cases a change of as little as 2 or 3 percentage points between datasets was documented, and such a small change feels, well, small. However, given the incredibly large sample size covered by the SASS, even a slight percentage change comes out to be statistically significant. This difference is what necessitates qualitative research and provides the opportunity to truly explore what “significant” means. The question, then, is are we just looking at expected ebbs and flows in teachers’ responses, or are we looking at a fundamental shift in the ways teachers understand and experience their work? This very issue is what I hope to expand upon and broaden in this dissertation.

**Environmental Factors**

To explore the environmental aspects affecting mid-career teachers, this component of the analysis focuses on three four: school location (urban and suburban schools), school performance (high and low performing schools), subject taught (high-stakes or not high-stakes) and collegial norms within schools.
Urban and suburban schools.

In my interviews, I spoke with twelve teachers representing ten different schools in five different districts. Figure 5.1 shows the location of the schools. No rural schools were represented in the sample.

Figure 5.1 School sample: location

In total, six of the participants taught in urban schools (Andrew, Harrison, Max, Mike, Samantha, Sarah) and six in suburban schools (Alice, Bill, Doug, Jim, Julie, Michelle).

Broadly speaking, the literature on high-stakes testing suggests that teachers in urban districts are more likely to suffer the ill effects of such testing regimes, as it is more often than not within urban districts that resources are scarce, curriculum more tightly scripted, and teachers less prepared (Giles, 2007; Lee, 2003). Typical responses, at the district and school level, include a tightening of control over teachers’ work in the forms of scripted curricula and increased monitoring, and punitive measures both to students and teachers. Given these trends, I expected to find the urban teachers in my sample to feel more negatively about the reforms and the impact of such reforms on their reform commitments and capacities.
As mentioned above, however, only four of the teachers in the study expressed overtly negative attitudes toward MCAS. Of these four, three (Bill, Doug and Jim) worked in suburban schools; only one urban teacher (Harrison) expressed a decidedly negative attitude toward MCAS. The five other urban teachers (Andrew, Mike, Max, Samantha and Sarah) felt that overall, there were more neutral to positive aspects of MCAS and that, generally speaking, it did not greatly impact them.

School location did not seem to impact teachers’ feelings of capacity. Nearly every teacher felt capable, in spite of or because of the MCAS. Only three teachers, Harrison, Jim and Michelle, expressed markedly lowered capacities. Of those three, two worked in suburban schools and one in an urban school. It would be hard to draw conclusions regarding capacity from teachers’ interviews in terms of their school location.

Similarly, as reported above, nearly every teacher reported feeling committed. If one made the leap that leaving a job shows a lack of commitment—which I am not doing overall but will to do here to make a point—then the results are also mixed. Nine of the twelve teachers planned on leaving their jobs either in the immediate or in the near future; of those nine, five worked in suburban schools and four worked in urban schools. Again, it does not appear possible to make links between commitment and school environment, at least in terms of the teachers I interviewed.

School location, therefore, did not seem to influence teachers’ feelings about the test itself or their capacity or commitment as mid-career teachers. Teachers across both teaching contexts expressed high levels of capacity and commitment for the most part, and nearly all teachers felt neutral to positive about the MCAS itself.
High and low performing schools.

School performance is another factor that affected teachers’ responses to questions regarding the impact of MCAS on their reform commitments and capacities. School performance, for the purpose of this study, is determined by a school’s MCAS scores. I considered “high” performance to be those in the top quintile and “low” performance to be those in the bottom quintile. The middle range is a bit murkier, but only one of the ten schools fell into this category. This school placed in the third quintile on English MCAS scores and the fourth (from the top) on Math scores. Thus, it is not quite low-performing yet it cannot be said to be high-performing.

In this study, five teachers worked in distinctly low-performing schools. Two of the five worked in the same school. Six worked in distinctly high-performing schools; again, two teachers worked in the same school. The remaining one teacher worked in the school with more of a mid to low performance. Table 5.3 details teachers and school performance.

Table 5.3 Teachers and school performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four teachers who responded feeling negatively about the reforms, two (Bill and Doug) worked in high-performing schools, one (Jim) in a mid-performing school, and one (Harrison) in a low-performing school. Given the data, school
performance does not appear to be an important factor in teachers’ responses to reform, at least not within this subset of teachers.

School performance does not seem to impact teachers’ capacity. The three teachers who expressed the lowest levels of capacity—Harrison, Jim and Michelle—each worked in a different type of school. Harrison worked in a low performing school, Jim in a middle performing school, and Michelle in a high-performing school. Similarly, regarding commitment, at least in terms of who is planning on leaving their jobs, results are also mixed, especially since nearly every teacher planned to leave either at the end of the year or in the near future. It is difficult given the data presented to make conclusions about the impact of school performance on teachers’ feelings of capacity and commitment.

Subject taught.

Another possible environmental factor is whether or not the subject a teacher teaches is a high-stakes subject on the MCAS. In this sample, several teachers worked in History and Science departments. Presently in the state of Massachusetts, these subjects have MCAS tests or tests are in development, but student results on these tests do not impact graduation or promotion and are thus not considered to be high-stakes.
Table 5.4 shows whether each teacher’s subject area is high-stakes.

### Table 5.4 Subject Taught: High-stakes or not high-stakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>High-Stakes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Special Education/English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the twelve teachers in the study, seven teach in subjects that are high-stakes, while five do not. Of the seven who work in high-stakes areas, five felt neutral to positive about the reform. Looking at it another way, of the four teachers who felt negatively about the MCAS, two teach in high-stakes areas (Math and English) and two do not (History). It does not appear, then, that whether or not a subject is high-stakes greatly influences how a teacher feels about the MCAS.

As with the other environmental factors, it is difficult to base conclusions on capacity and commitment on the handful of teachers who fell outside of the norm in the interviews. That said, two teachers, Harrison and Jim, expressed lower levels of capacity than the other teachers interviewed, and they both teach in high-stakes areas. This finding is not unexpected, though; it would make sense that the teachers whose work has been most impacted by the test (those whose students are actually tested) would feel the most impact regarding capacity, especially when they both work in lower-performing schools. Similarly, regarding commitment, of those teachers who plan to stay, two work
in areas that are not high-stakes. Again, it is difficult to say conclusively whether or not the subject tested is high-stakes has an impact on commitment or capacity, but the evidence here points to no.

**Collegial norms.**

Schools that are collegial share four characteristics: in them, teachers frequently and concretely talk about their practice, as opposed to about each other, the students, and the school; are observed and given feedback; plan and design lessons and teaching materials together; and “teach each other the practice of teaching” (Little, 1982, p. 331). This does not always happen spontaneously or organically; Hargreaves (1994) describes contrived collegiality, in which these aspects of teachers’ work are administratively regulated, compulsory, implementation-oriented, fixed in time and space, and predictable instead of genuine in nature (pp. 195-196).

I asked the teachers in this study about collegiality in their schools to get a sense of whether and how teachers work together and to see if any links could be made between how collegial schools are and how teachers experience and enact reforms in their workplaces.

The quantitative data (in previous chapter) suggested that over the last decade, collegial norms within public schools, across both elementary and secondary, have changed. Interestingly, these norms may have changed both for the better and for the worse. On the one hand, teachers reported a change in shared beliefs. In 1999, most teachers strongly agreed that teachers in their school share their beliefs; and 2003, most teachers only somewhat agreed. In fact, the proportion of teachers who somewhat agreed
went up 14.5 percentage points, while those who reported strong agreement went down 7.6 percentage points. On the other hand, teachers reported both a rise in satisfaction within their schools and a rise in cooperative effort among staff members, perhaps suggesting a rise in collegiality. The percentage of teachers who strongly agreed that they are satisfied as teachers in their schools went up 7.5 percentage points, and the proportion of teachers who felt that there was a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members in their schools went up 9.7 percentage points.

I found a similar sentiment among the specific teachers with whom I spoke. The qualitative interviews showed that most of the teachers felt a high sense of collegiality in their schools. Table 5.5 shows teachers’ perceptions of the collegiality within their schools.

Table 5.5 Collegiality level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reported collegiality level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>High*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Low*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although Mike and Max work in the same school, their perceptions of collegiality within this school differ.

Five of the teachers expressed a low sense of collegiality in their schools, and of those five, only two (Jim and Harrison) also felt negatively about the MCAS. Those two also expressed lower levels of capacity and commitment. Given these responses, I cannot
argue with any confidence that there is a relationship between collegiality and how these mid-career teachers experience reform in their schools.

**Summary: Environmental factors.**

The environmental factors I investigated here--school location (urban, suburban), school performance (low, high), subject area taught (high-stakes or not high-stakes) and collegial norms (low, high)--appear to not to be a major influence on teachers’ responses to the MCAS reform, even specifically regarding their commitment. The participants in this study remain highly committed, both to their careers and to enacting change. Most plan to stay in teaching and all but one plan to remain in education for the remainder of their careers. Environmental factors are not impacting the commitment or capacity of this group of teachers. Teachers in high-performing schools expressed discontent with the reform, and teachers in very challenging schools felt that it had positive aspects. Some teachers whose students took high-stakes test felt that the MCAS had positive aspects, and some teachers whose students were not subject to high-stakes testing felt more negatively. The responses tended to run the gamut, without clearly falling into identifiable patterns. I cannot say with certainty that environmental factors play *no* role, but I can say that such factors do not seem to play a great role in the reform commitments and capacities of the participants at this point in their careers. I do believe, given the data, that other factors may play a more important role. Given this distinction, I explore below factors that are more personal in nature.
**Personal Factors Impacting Teachers’ Commitment and Capacity**

As mentioned above, when educational scholars look at the forces that impact teachers’ lives and careers, they tend to focus on two aspects: demographic and organizational. In the previous section I focused on a different set of factors, those I deemed environmental: school location, school performance, subject taught and collegial norms. This section details the more personal aspects impacting the teaching career. In particular, given the particular sample whom I interviewed, I focus on three areas: time in teaching, gender, and generation.

**Time in teaching.**

In this study, I focused solely on teachers in mid-career. The teachers all had between seven and fifteen years in the classroom at the time of our interviews. Mid-career teaching comes with its own strengths and struggles: the benefit of time combined with experience with the drawback of time combined with cynicism (Drake, 2002; Hargreaves, 2005a; Little, 1996).
Table 5.6 shows the teachers in the study in order of years of teaching experience.

Table 5.6 Number of years teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Years Teaching (at time of study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table can be juxtaposed with data from the beginning of this chapter, which details teachers’ experiences with and beliefs about the specific reform in question, the MCAS. Of the four teachers who expressed negative feelings, three are found at the top of Table 5.6. Thus, in this study, the teachers with the most experience also have the most negative feelings about the MCAS.

It is not surprising that the teachers in this study with the most experience have more negative experiences with reform. Other literature, both from the United States and other countries, suggests that as teachers age and/or become more experienced, they tend to lose enthusiasm about both the reforms and the process of reform (Little, 1996). In this study, however, the teachers are all fairly close in age and the difference in amount of time teaching at its greatest is only seven years.

The main and most noteworthy difference, even within the narrow seven-year difference, is that the teachers who began fifteen years ago actually taught in a time when MCAS was not high-stakes, long before the advent of NCLB and its focus on Adequate
Yearly Progress. Harrison in particular remembers a time before the testing was the norm and in which he felt greater control over his work. Jim, too, remembers how it used to be. The newer teachers, in contrast, began their teaching careers when students were already being given high-stakes tests. It is possible, then, that the negative feelings about the MCAS shared by the more experienced teachers in this study reflect having to shift teaching techniques, or feeling as though they must make such changes.

**Gender.**

For this study, I interviewed twelve teachers: seven male and five female. As mentioned earlier, these numbers are not representative of the current American teaching force, which is predominantly female. However, while entirely unintentional, oversampling male teachers provided insight into what could be an interesting component of understanding teachers, the teaching career and reform.

While I began, as I conducted my interviews and analysis, to consider gender as a variable of note, the teachers in my study did not discuss, nor did they appear to be knowingly impacted, by the gender of who implemented or advocated the reform, or for the most part how their own gender did or did not influence their experiences of reform. Without directly stating so, however, gender appears to be one variable in teachers’ change capacity and commitment.

There are several ways to shape the discussion of gender and reform in this study, but two stand out boldly in my conversations with teachers. The first focuses on gender differences in teachers’ reported attitudes about the particular reform (MCAS). The second centers around gender and career and the differing ways reforms shape the
intersection of these factors. In particular, this analysis examines the teaching career and the reasons one is drawn into it, stays in it, or leaves it.

**Gender differences in attitudes toward reform.**

My analysis of the data found that four of the twelve teachers reported negative feelings about the reform (the reform itself, not its implementation) under study. Of these four, all were male. If one were to consider the micropolitical concerns, it is important to note that two of three teachers male teachers who felt more positively about the reforms in general, or at least about the ways they play out in their schools and in their own particular careers, work in the same school. The other five, however, work in different schools with varying levels of collegiality. Of the four men who felt negatively about the reform, two reported high levels and two reported low levels of collegiality in their schools. The two men who reported low levels of collegiality within their schools did not speak of these relations using gender terms. I also did not ask for the genders of the principals at each teacher’s school (if one would consider the principals as the initiators of change at the school level) to gauge whether some of the discontent has to do with who is driving the reform. Given these data, I do not believe that the micropolitical gender concerns suggested by the previously cited research are the primary force behind these teachers’ discontent.

That said, the fact that only male teachers in this study expressed overt and specific negativity toward MCAS needs further investigation. Close analysis of the four male teachers’ interviews revealed four key themes. Two of these themes, nostalgia and control, relate specifically to the male teachers I interviewed. The two remaining
themes, visions of teaching and leadership, relate both to the men and women teachers. When looking for themes, it is difficult if not impossible to disentangle these four from some of the other lenses of analysis I will describe later regarding the personal factors affecting teachers’ responses to reform, and in fact in some ways it is challenging to separate them from one another, but I will attempt to do so here.

Nostalgia.

The topic of nostalgia is certainly not a new one in educational literature. Several authors (Datnow, 1997; Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Riseborough, 1981) have written about nostalgia and in particular how it impacts, and often impedes, the process of educational change within schools. Technically speaking, nostalgia “indicates individuals’ desire to regain some control over their lives in an uncertain time” (Aden, 1995, pp. 21). In a way, it is inherently bittersweet, a desire to return to a time to which it is impossible to do so; it can be contrasted with reminiscing, which is remembering the past, and sentimentalizing, which is more of a fleeting feeling sparked when a current experience echoes a past one. Nostalgia is an active selection of which memories to include and is both emotional and behavioral (Wilson, 1999).

A remembrance of the way things were peppers much conversation with more veteran teachers (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006). Some literature questions whether these memories are accurate or have been altered over time to fit the teacher’s picture of how things used to be. For example, Ladson-Billings (1999) uses an anecdote about “Public School Way Back When” to prepare new teachers for their new students who may not be of the same culture as they are:
Once upon a time there was a mythical time and place somewhere in the U.S. where all the children were just alike. They came from similarly constituted families. They spoke the same language. They held the same beliefs, values, and attitudes. When these children went to school their teachers were just like them and they imparted to them knowledge and skills that everyone had agreed upon. Everybody talked about how wonderful things were back then. "Our teachers really knew how to teach." "The children were so smart and well behaved." "We didn't have to worry about discipline and children who weren't capable." Everyone agreed that it had been a glorious era. (1999, p. 219)

While Ladson-Billings’s story refers more specifically to how the issue of race has changed in the schoolhouse, she points out that teachers’ memories of their own schooling and their earlier teaching positions play an important role in how they currently approach their careers. It would be a logical extension that in some cases the remembrance of how things used to be harkens back to a time when men and women’s places in the schoolhouse were more clearly delineated.

Goodson, Moore and Hargreaves (2006) point out that paying attention to teacher nostalgia is critical to understanding how they experience, and often resist, change:

It is a testimony of teachers’ experience of change over time. It is an act of ongoing construction and reconstruction of the meaning of change for teachers’ professional lives. It acts as a prompt and a guide to action and commitment in the ongoing, everyday life of teaching and schooling. It is
a source of resistance to changes that threaten patterns and purposes that
teachers have cherished for decades. (p. 43)

These authors distinguish between social nostalgia, which is associated with “home,
family and community,” and political nostalgia, which concerns “ideologically charged
memories of lost status, power, and self-determination” (Goodson, Moore, & Hargreaves,
2006, pp. 44-45). In their study of Canadian and American teachers spanning several
generations, the focus on nostalgia is largely on changed student demographics, much
like Ladson-Billings, and how teachers’ perceived feelings of power and control over
their work have changed over time with the movement toward standardization.

Datnow (1997) and Riseborough (1981) also speak of nostalgia as it refers to
teachers’ memories of how things used to be. In each of these two studies, the older
teachers are men reflecting back upon their careers as they struggle to implement new
reforms that they see as challenging their current status in the school.

The nostalgic teachers in all of the aforementioned studies are teachers in the last
years of their career, however. There is research (Veenman, 1984) that indicates that it is
a normal progression of the teaching career to enter the job with high hopes and
expectations based on one’s teacher training, only to encounter teaching contexts that do
not fit these expectations and cause teachers to become more conservative as they
progress through their careers. Still, little if any literature exists on nostalgia as it relates
to teachers in mid-career, a not surprising omission given that teachers in mid-career tend
to be younger and therefore not quite so nostalgic about their earlier careers.
The data in my own interviews, however, do suggest that a form of nostalgia is occurring, and that is particularly affecting the male teachers. In particular, two of the male teachers, Harrison and Jim, address it directly.

Harrison talks about the way teaching used to be in terms of both political and social nostalgia. Politically, Harrison remembers a time when he felt teachers had more professional authority over their own work and were free to make decisions:

They just have, I feel like they have more and more layers of administration now. Whereas before they just didn't have the bodies to closely supervise you to the point that they wanted to, now they do. And now these people have nothing else to do other than sit around and think of things for you to do. And they just give you more than is humanly possible. And I think you still have the budgetary pressures to get people at the low end of the salary scale in place to save money and they are easier to control. They're not permanent teachers, they're provisionals. A lot of them aren't even certified so you give them the scripted curriculum and they do it. It's probably the best thing for them, they don't know how to teach so you may as well. But for somebody who has a professional license, who has a degree and who has been in the business a while, it's insulting, it's just crazy.

Regarding the context in which he works:

They make you work together and you do. But it's changed. There's too much supervision. What's the point in being collegial? You're just being told what to do anyway. Collegiality doesn't really have a purpose.
Professional collegiality, in terms of cordiality, it's just different. Even that's kind of, it becomes affected when everyone has to work through their lunch. It's tough to find windows.

Socially, too, Harrison feels differences at both the racial and gender levels:

And then it depends, the district just doesn’t hire male teachers anymore. All the new teachers are all white women. Not to sound sexist or to stereotype, but it’s tough to say. The typical new teacher does not have children. So whether they stay in the business may depend on family aspirations or whatever. They just don’t ever talk about where they’re going to be in 10 years. That’s not a conversation you have with a provisional teacher.

Jim also talks nostalgically about how his career has changed over time. His memories, too, are both socially and politically nostalgic. Socially, he talks about the demographic shifts in his school community and how they are impacting his career:

Demographically it's probably 25% minority, which is a big change. When I started it was 5 or 10% minority. And so there have been some growing pains regarding that. I think I was lucky because it started happening when I was new and I also came from a very diverse school myself. So while the older teachers, and I'm sure this had something to do with their retirement, were having trouble with this new population. I felt
at home. I don't know if I'm very good at relating to these students. I often think I'm a big failure but I don't feel like I'm being pushed out or anything like that. I just know that I have to work harder.

In more mixed tones, he talks about how the political and social shifts have intersected. He has had to change his teaching not only because of the new testing regime and its attempts to improve the educational outcome of minority students but also because attention to diversity in his subject area of English has become more common:

You can't mark them off for spelling, for run on sentences, nothing like that. It's very formulaic and it's good, I think, for teachers who haven't been trained in English because part of MCAS is that we have to do writing across the curriculums. They have to write essays in math class and in phys ed and in health and a lot of those teachers just don't know how to grade writing. So it makes it much easier for them to grade and gets the writing but for an English teacher to do that and you might as well make me a technician, which I despise. So we tried that. The English department has basically fought it off. It's officially still on the books. Officially we're supposed to be doing it. I don't know anyone who does. We're trying to have much better diverse representation of authors and experiences in our reading, which I think is good. But sometimes we pick an author just because he fits into a slot. Oh, good, we have another African-American gay writer or something like that, without really looking at the quality of the writing. That doesn't happen too often but
we're always afraid of it. We have more extra help classes, which is good. Something we call quiet English, which instead of an elective the student will work with his English teacher. It's not a study period but it's a very focused and MCAS driven class. So I think that's probably a plus, especially for those populations that are underperforming. Because the last maybe 35 years (this town) has tended to be very white and very Irish and the teaching population was the same I think a lot of people just didn't know how to deal with this new population coming in. So MCAS has had that very good effect.

Jim also speaks about how schooling has changed since he was a student himself:

From when I entered, probably not so much because I came when lot of these changes were being put into place. From what I was expecting and from the way I was taught myself in school, very different. The way I was taught there was a lot of drilling on grammar, you write an essay, you get a letter grade back and that was it and you just did it. Not a whole lot of support, sink or swim, which may have just been my experience at Latin School, I don't know. But it's all I knew. There was a lot less emphasis on helping an individual student. You know, I had veteran teachers talking to me about cells and bells, that's what school is. Cells and bells, you just, you do what the teacher tells you and the bell rings and you move on to the next cell and that warden tells you what to do.
Even as a teacher, Jim feels he would have been more comfortable in how he imagines classrooms used to be:

By old school I mean, like, I would’ve been comfortable in a classroom maybe 40 years ago. The level of expectations I have for my students, the level of work I give them, not the old fashioned way of teaching but definitely the expectations for student learning are, I think, very much out of step with the direction education is going these days.

Both Harrison and Jim seem uncomfortable in their current roles as mid-career teachers. They both remember a time when things were different, when they felt they had more control over the choices they made as teachers and when they were valued as professionals. Both Harrison and Jim are exploring options outside their current employment, although neither, at the time of the interview, had secured new positions.

What makes these teachers different from those studied by others who focus on nostalgia, however, is the fact that these teachers have only been in the classroom for fifteen years. The literature on nostalgia previously focused on those teachers in the late stages of teaching, not those with twenty—or likely thirty—years remaining in their careers. Nostalgia seems a topic better suited to older individuals reflecting back over long and productive careers, not those who, while in mid-career, have not even reached mid-life. What also makes the topic noteworthy is the fact that it is only the men who talk at length about how much things have changed. They are, in a way, out of step with
the women with whom I spoke, who felt empowered, in many ways, by the standards to which they were being held.

*Control.*

A second theme in the conversations with male teachers who felt negatively about the reforms focuses on shifting feelings of control over time. As discussed in the previous chapter, the overall trend in the two datasets I surveyed showed that most teachers felt high levels of control over their work, and that the percentage of teachers who felt high levels of control increased over time. As Ingersoll (2003) wrote, however, teachers have long felt that they have little control over their work, and even though there does appear to be more teachers feeling greater control, teaching is still a career with low levels of personal professional control.

The same two teachers who expressed nostalgic sentiments about their careers also voiced clear concern about changed levels of professional control from the beginning of their careers to their current positions. In fact, the same quotes used above to describe feelings of nostalgia also describe these two teachers’ feelings of a diminished sense of control as their career progresses, due largely to the implementation of reforms involving standardization and high-stakes testing. Both men work in subject areas that are tested and have felt the squeeze on their teaching as they become more accountable. Both men also work in schools in the lower half of school performance, although Harrison’s school is much lower-performing than Jim’s.

In an important way, Jim’s and Harrison’s nostalgia and diminished sense of control intersect. They long for a time when they made, or at least they remember feeling
that they made, most of the curricular and pedagogical decisions for their classrooms. Jim is even nostalgic for a time in which not only did he not personally teach but in which he was not even a student!

Lortie (1975) suggests our teaching styles are formed by memories of the teachers by whom we ourselves were taught. Today’s mid-career teachers find themselves in an interesting bind, as today’s classrooms look in fact quite different from the classrooms in which many if not most of them learned as students. When these same teachers began their careers in the 1990s, however, states began to move toward standards-based curriculum (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006). Teachers are now being asked to teach differently than they learned, in classrooms that look very different from the ones in which they sat.

Visions of teaching.

One of the most salient themes of the earlier literature on gender and reform is the idea that male teachers resist educational change that is generated by female teachers or that feels “motherly” (Acker, 1995-1996; Datnow, 1997; Datnow and Hubbard, 2000; Loder, 2005). The contested reforms, according to these researchers, are seen as giving too much help to struggling students. As many teachers feel a moral calling to teaching (Fullan, 1993), however, it should not come as a surprise that teachers and female teachers in particular support reforms aimed at helping those who need help most.

Hammerness (2001) describes vision as “images of what teachers hope could be or might be in their classrooms, their schools, their community and, in some cases, even society (p. 145). Hammerness writes that vision varies across three dimensions: focus,
which refers to what is central to the vision and how clear the vision is; range, which refers to the scope of the vision; and distance, which refers to the distance of the vision from where the teachers’ practice currently is. If the focus is unclear, the range too wide and the distance too far, a teacher may feel disheartened, disengaging from practice or, if new to teaching, even leaving early. In contrast, if the focus is clear, the range reasonable and the distance close or within reach, a teacher is more likely to report feelings of confidence and capability.

It is useful, then, to explore teachers’ reasons for becoming teachers to better understand how they view teaching and the purposes of reform. To understand the participants’ visions of teaching, one first needs to look at the reasons each teacher stated for entering the profession. The answers fell into several categories: those who chose teaching because of a love of their subject area; those who were impacted by special teachers in their own schooling; those who enjoy helping people; and those who felt a calling to the profession.

Five of the seven male teachers felt teaching was a calling, and many of them knew from high school that they wanted to become teachers.

And then I had, I had a teacher. . . who really, he had two courses which became the really two courses that actually mattered for me at all, really, in high school. All the other courses were pretty, they were academic and I saw some, some usefulness but these were the only two classes that really mattered to me personally and they were ethics and (inaudible) courses and so I started to question some of the assumptions I had about
what I wanted to do with myself and literally what it came down to is I
said, I don’t really need to spend the rest of my life selling people, you
know, junk that they don’t necessarily need and making them feel bad
about it if they don’t have it. (Bill)

To whatever extent a little kid can know I knew. But I know that people
don’t necessarily always buy that. I would say I really started appreciating
the process of teaching when I was in middle and high school. (Doug)

I think the kind of teacher I became is defined by that but I’ve wanted to
be a teacher for as long as I can remember. You know, I wanted to be a
fireman up until I was 12, but even when I wanted to be a fireman at 12 I
was afraid of heights and fire so I’d probably... (Jim)

I first knew in high school and then I ignored that for a long time and then
came back to it about two or three years after I finished college and I’d
been working, I worked in test prep teaching for a long time and that’s
where I sort of, sort of hit my end of test prep teaching and said, but, wait,
I like teaching. So I went into teaching. So I kind of have known for a
long time. I feel like maybe it was in my blood a little bit but it wasn’t a
straight path. (Max)
I’ve known that I should be a teacher from high school, that I was someone whom my teachers would ask to help explain stuff to other classmates. I was patient. I was good at communicating, especially the math stuff and I spent college trying to figure out what I could do with those skills that wasn’t teaching. And even graduating college I felt like I liked the skills involved in teaching but didn’t want to be a teacher. And then I had this opportunity to teach in Japan, which to me was more about going to Japan than about teaching but when I got over there I realized that the teaching part of it was what really held me captive. I feel like there’s nothing else that I could do, again, going back to that generational obligation of feeling like I need to be doing something that I’m passionate about, what I’m passionate about. (Mike)

In comparison, of the five female teachers, only one knew from early on that she wanted to be a teacher, although it was wrapped up in her love of English.

When I was a sophomore in high school. I’ve always loved English and, thanks, I was giving a presentation in English and my teacher fell asleep and I was like, I could do way better than that. And then my junior year I had an awesome English teacher, my senior year I had an awesome English teacher that I just decided it would be great. Definitely started with a love for English. (Sarah)
Alice, too, became a teacher in part for her love of subject and in part because of her desire to help children.

In my junior year I met my husband. His mother taught. His family very highly valued education. His grandmother or great grandmother was instrumental in creating the New York Teachers Union. And they put a lot of pressure on me to perform in college much better than I was doing, to be more committed to my studies and to a long term career. They suggested that I start volunteering in my spare time in college. Which I thought was a fabulous idea. So I volunteered through Head Start. And I loved working with the inner city children in Bridgeport, Connecticut. It fulfilled me in a way I didn’t realize I’d been lacking. People talk about it being a calling, and that’s sort of when I had this moment. I realized as much as I enjoyed working with the very small children, I was an English major and I wanted to use my English major. (Alice)

The other teachers all either fell into teaching after becoming disillusioned with other jobs, or became teachers after people in college convinced them they might be good at it. For most of the teachers, their desire to become educators had less to do with a particular commitment to children and more to do with certain aspects of their personality, such as being a good leader or being compassionate, that drew them into the field.

All of the teachers with whom I spoke are secondary teachers. As such, they focus their teaching largely on one (or sometimes two) subject, most likely a subject they
studied in college and graduate school. That they love their subject is no surprise, and that they do not necessarily express a love of children as their reason for entering the profession also does not seem shocking. Given the aforementioned literature on gender and teaching I would have expected more female teachers to talk about their desire to help people as a motivating factor in career choice, but I do not think the teachers’ responses stray far from the norm given their secondary teaching focus.

The interplay of gender and reform stands out in most stark contrast when looking at why the teachers do or do not support the standardization/reform. Datnow and Hubbard’s work (2000) suggests that women teachers tend to support reforms that have a mothering tone to them, reforms that they perceive to help children most in need, whereas male teachers tend to fight the same reforms because (emphasis mine) they have such a tone. In many ways, the teachers I interviewed divided in this same manner. Most of the female teachers felt that the MCAS was an adequate and appropriate assessment of basic skills, and that being held, as teachers, to clear standards improved their teaching and benefited the students most in need.

The male teachers, in contrast, felt that the MCAS took time away from important teaching and innovative learning. Instead of viewing the test as benefiting students who needed aid, several of the male teachers felt that changing an entire course to meet the MCAS standards brought every student down to the lowest level.

The gendered patterns of response to the reform, in this one way, conformed to previous patterns seen by researchers exploring the relationship between gender and teaching. The same previous research, however, also focused on the ways that teachers within schools interact around the implementation of new reforms and the gendered
differences that arise, namely that male teachers do not support reforms that are initiated by women or that take on mothering tones. In the instance of my study, however, the reforms are externally generated, and on their face do not seem to be mothering in tone; in fact, the punitive nature of the high-stakes testing could be viewed as hurting those who are supposedly not to be left behind. Given the punitive nature of the reform, I would have expected a flip in terms of support (which is not to say that male teachers support reforms that hurt children). Instead, the female teachers largely felt the reforms had a positive impact (improving and focusing teaching, providing clear standards for students and teachers), and the male teachers felt the reforms took time away from valuable and more creative teaching time.

It would be much too simplistic to say that teachers’ visions of teaching divide solely on gender lines: that women go into teaching for the love of children and to improve the lives of students who have previously not succeeded and that men go into teaching because they feel passionate about their subject area, although some of the data do support such a limiting statement. It would also be limiting to say that female teachers only support reforms on the basis that they help struggling students and that male teachers never support such reforms; given the teachers in my study, it appears more accurate to say that male teachers are not opposed to helping struggling students but more that they feel paying attention to the smaller subset of students does a disservice to the general student population.
Leadership.

The overarching question of my study, however, focuses not just on the types of reforms implemented but the impact these reforms have on the careers of teachers, specifically teachers in mid-career, and here there are clear gendered differences. When asked about their future plans, teachers responded in clearly gendered patterns. In particular, the main gendered difference was in opinions about leadership roles.

Teachers’ prior experiences with and future desire for leadership roles varied. Four of the teachers said they had never held leadership roles. Several teachers had held low-level leadership roles in their schools: peer coaches, MCAS coordinator, club leader, for example. None had been department head, although Jim was preparing to become one, albeit not in the school in which he currently worked. Earlier in his career, Harrison had been Dean of Students, but was presently not in a leadership position. Alice, Doug and Mike had all held coordinator roles.

At the time of the study, two of the female teachers were out of the classroom, opting to stay at home temporarily with their young children. Two of the female teachers were working reduced schedules with no clear timeline for returning to full-time work. The fifth teacher planned to leave both her job and the teaching career at the end of the school year. Both teachers who were out of work planned to return as teachers when their children were older, and still identified themselves as teachers even though they were not currently working. One of the teachers who was working part-time was considering a move to counseling. Four of the five said they planned on remaining in education, although not necessarily in their same job or in teaching. None was considering a move to educational leadership.
Two of the female teachers expressed a move to leadership as a loss of time with students.

I'm not cut out to be an administrator. I'm not interested in organizing within schools. I'm interested in being part of the organization and part of making change but not administering it or working really primarily with adults in the building. My focus is really on kids. (Julie)

Every administrator I know is unhappy. Because unlike I think a lot of people, my interests didn't change. My interests still remains first and foremost English and second children. And you don't get to do that as an administrator and I've had people ask me why don't you and why won't you. I don't want the stress. I don't want to end up hating the kids. I don't want to end up hating, I don't want to have the teachers hate me. (Sarah)

The male teachers’ paths looked quite different. Five of the seven male teachers were planning career moves, either in the immediate future or within the next five years. Four of those five planned on moving into leadership positions, some immediately and some in the future. All planned to remain in education in some capacity. Three were actively looking for work at the time of the interviews.

There are, then, both clear differences in the way teachers of different genders respond to reform and in teachers’ career paths based on gender. The question is whether there is an intersection of these two phenomena. As previously discussed, four of the seven men in this study expressed distinctly negative feelings about the reform (MCAS)
and its impact. Three of those four planned to leave their jobs at some point; at the time of the interviews, two were actively pursuing new jobs and one was in a doctoral program and had future plans to leave. Two of the four men expressed diminished capacity for change (educational change, not personal change) as a result of the implementation of mandated reform.

Given these data, it would seem that mandated reform has a marked impact on male teachers in mid-career. This distinction is both interesting and important. First, the previous discussion of the findings of this dissertation have largely leaned toward the sentiment that overall mandated reform has had a neutral to positive impact on the work of teachers in mid-career, specifically supported by the qualitative interviews, and of teachers in general as supported by the quantitative data. Yet, the men in particular in this study seem especially influenced by the work they are being asked to do and the negative impact they view it having on their careers. This sentiment can be juxtaposed with the demographic data, stated earlier, that shows the overall teaching force to be about 80% female, with the secondary teaching force being closer to 56% for upper secondary and 68% for lower secondary (OECD, 2009). So, it could be possible that most teachers perceive the reforms to have a neutral to positive impact simply because there are more female teachers and female teachers are more likely to have more positive feelings about the reform.

The second point is that none of the women expressed a desire to move into positions of leadership, while most of the men did, both those men who felt positively about the reform and those who felt more negatively. If the reasons the men felt negatively about the reform focused on feelings of diminished capacity in their
professional roles as teachers, it would logically follow that these teachers would want to
move into more powerful roles where they might feel enhanced capacity.

Furthermore, it is important to discuss here teachers’ capacity not only in terms of
professionalism but in terms of change. The male teachers’ desires to move into
leadership positions could indicate a desire for heightened capacity for change. In their
current roles, while they might be dedicated to enacting change within their classrooms,
they feel constrained in their ability to do so as they perceive the changes to hold students
to lower standards and the standardization to lessen students’ and teachers’ opportunities
for creative or innovative work. The move to leadership, then, would provide an
opportunity to both direct the reform work and increase feelings of professional capacity.

Generation.

Much has been written about teachers and reform. Less has been written
specifically about teachers in mid-career and reform, although there has recently been
activity in this area (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005; Johnson et
al., 2004). One other factor that is under-explored (although again, also being looked at
more now) is generation.

The teachers in this study, when asked, had great difficulty not only identifying
but also labeling the generation of which they are a part—Generation X. This
demographic is unique, sandwiched between the Boomer generation, known for its
idealism, and Generation Y (also called Millennial), still working out its adult identity but
currently seen as more engaged and defined as more productive than Generation X. Even
demographically speaking it is smaller: 46 million compared to 80 million (Boomer) and 78 million (Millennial) (Stephey, 2008).

Most associations with Generation X are fairly negative. As a group, they are viewed as cynical and as slackers (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000) and as unable to commit to careers, marriage or family life (Watters, 2004). In fact, they have married much later than previous generations and are having children later as well. Their inability to commit is seen as a by-product, in some ways, of being latch-key children of the 80s, left to fend for themselves while their mothers entered the workforce unlike generations of women before them (Lovely & Buffum, 2007; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Their economic prospects are bleak—they may even be the first generation to not be as financially successful as the previous generation (Ellis, 2007).

And yet, in speaking to Generation Xers, specifically Generation X teachers, I found something quite different from these standard stereotypes, something more promising and optimistic. What others see as slack, they see as flexible. What others see as entitled, they see as balanced. They want to work on their own terms, and they are willing to walk away from jobs that do not meet their needs (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). These differences play out not only in terms of family and work life generally, but specifically in terms of the careers of many of today’s teachers. No matter how one looks at it, this is not their parents’ teaching career, nor is it the career described by the Boomer generation writers who still dominate this literature and the portraits of that generation largely centered within it.

Recent research about the “new generation” of teachers tends to focus on how today’s new teachers, those entering the field, are different from those currently in and
about to leave the field (Johnson et al., 2004). These differences center on previous
career experience (many new teachers are entering teaching having held previous jobs),
age (many new teachers are older), gender (more new teachers are male) and race (more
new teachers come from more diverse backgrounds than in years past). In this sense, the
term “generation” is being used to describe a wave of teachers, much as the term
generation speaks of broad waves of people within the population within given age brackets.

What I focus on in this study, however, is more along the lines of generation as it
refers to specific ages. To gain a better understanding of generations, sociologically and
historically speaking, I relied heavily on the work of historians William Howe and Neil
only the descriptions of generations across history but also the cyclical nature of
generations. They draw on these cyclical patterns to predict both the behavior of current
generations as they age as well as the behavior of future generations. In the introduction,
I also described Strauss and Howe’s metaphor of generations as trains. Previous
historical and sociological work (according to them) focused on “stations” through which
every generation train traveled; each train was viewed as similar. Strauss and Howe urged
instead that generations need to be framed as not as stations but as the trains themselves,
and that each train should be viewed uniquely although they pass through the same
stations.

More recent work by noted educational change researcher Seymour Sarason in
conjunction with physicist Stanistaw Gtazek (2007) urges educators to take this train
metaphor even farther. They argue that as humans, we tend to view the ground as static
while we see the train as moving. We must realize, though, that not only are the trains moving (through stations), but the stations themselves are moving (as the earth rotates), and the passengers on the train are moving (both through time and space). This is a very simplistic synopsis of a beautifully intricate application of physics to educational reform, but the important piece of this work here is to understand that what used to be viewed as static—the stages of the teaching career—can no longer.

In designing my interview questions, I began with the idea that perhaps a teacher’s generation, more than the conditions or contexts in which she works, might heavily influence her career path. I based this hypothesis on my own abbreviated experience as a classroom teacher in a struggling urban school and on my friends’ and colleagues’ similar experiences. We felt that teaching was something we wanted to try, but when we felt either not good enough at it, or too overwhelmed by the micropolitics (Blase & Anderson, 1995; Schempp, Sparkes & Templin, 1993), of the school in which we worked, or we wanted to stay home with our children, we re-shaped our careers to fit our desires. While others (older generations) felt we gave up or gave in too early, or that we could not handle being adults with professional responsibilities, we saw it as within our right to make the choices that best suited ourselves and our families. If this was true of my peers, could it be generalized to speak of Generation X as teachers writ large?

The teachers with whom I spoke do not plan to leave education, although some are looking to teach in different schools or jobs or move into leadership positions. They are dedicated to their students, their jobs, their colleagues and their schools, and their level of commitment, in their own words, is “tremendous.” In comparison to the research on retention, what I found is that while these teachers are staying in their careers, their
career trajectories are speeded up in comparison to earlier generations. These teachers are experimenting less in their own classrooms, burning out earlier, and generally resigning themselves to viewing teaching as something done during school hours instead of as an around-the-clock job at a younger age and at an earlier stage than teachers before them. The reasons for this acceleration are numerous and include the standardization of teaching due to *No Child Left Behind* and its focus on high-stakes testing and the desire for flexible work that allows a greater work/family balance. Whatever the reasons, though, careful consideration of the ways in which Generation X teachers view their work and their careers is necessary to keep them sustained in their work. While they might not be planning to leave, they are disengaging from their work much earlier than their predecessors.

In order to understand how the teaching career is changing it is important to look at previous research on the teaching career. The starting point is Huberman’s influential writing on teachers’ careers (1989). Huberman identifies trends in the empirical literature on the phases of teachers’ careers: *survival and discovery*, in which new teachers adjust to the shock of a new career and stumble to find their footing as novices; *stabilization*, in which teachers make a commitment to teaching as a career and gain more professional freedoms as they increase their experience; *experimentation/activism*, in which teachers attempt to increase their impact through experimenting with a variety of teaching techniques and taking on new roles, all the while bumping up against institutional barriers that seek to limit that impact; *taking stock*, in which teachers face a “mid-career crisis” and struggle to stay or leave the profession; *serenity*, in which teachers begin to distances themselves from their students and experience a slow
deceleration; *conservatism*, in which teachers, finding themselves so much older than their students, begin to resist innovation and feel nostalgic for the way things were; and finally *disengagement*, in which teachers transfer their energies to pursuits other than work.

Each of these stages roughly corresponds with years teaching in the field. Figure 5.2, taken from Huberman’s article, lays out a schematic model of these predictable stages.
Figure 5.2  Successive Themes of the Teacher Career Cycle: Schematic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years 1-3</th>
<th>Career entry: “Survival” and “Discovery”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years 4-6</td>
<td>Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 7-18</td>
<td>Experimentation/”Activism” — Reassessment/”Self-doubts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 19-30</td>
<td>Serenity/Relational distance — Conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 31-40</td>
<td>Disengagement: “Serene” or “Bitter”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Huberman, 1989
Using this model as a starting point, I observed the following trends regarding the form and shape of the career trajectories of the teachers in my study.

- The experimentation/activism phase is interrupted and/or stunted.
- Serenity and conservatism begin much earlier.
- Teachers begin the process of disengagement at an earlier point in time.
- The nature of teachers’ career trajectories is no longer linear.

**Experimentation/Activism.**

In Huberman’s model, teachers, after passing through the early years of their new teaching careers, begin to settle in and gain confidence in their teaching abilities; this occurs between 7 and 18 years after entering the classroom. At this point, teachers enter a phase he calls *experimentation/activism*. Because of the increased levels of competence, teachers begin to experiment with new techniques in their classrooms. They may also begin to take on small leadership roles.

This pattern of career development was typical for teachers in the Boomer generation. For Generation X teachers, however, the story has unfolded a little differently; two factors have influenced this difference. First, the context in which today’s middle career teachers work has dramatically changed. Particularly in the United States, teaching has become increasingly standardized (Hargreaves, 1994, 2003). While advocates of standardization argue that standards define what is to be taught and what kind of performance is expected, that they are necessary for equality of opportunity, and that they supply accurate information to all stakeholders (Ravitch, 1995), others argue that standardization deskills teachers (McNeil, 2000) by limiting curricular content and the teacher’s control over what is taught, as well as intensifying teachers’ work so that in
practice they have less rather than more time to access the expertise and support of their colleagues (Hargreaves, 2003). Teachers cannot take professional risks that may help them grow but instead must work to maintain their status quo. Thus, the necessary step in a novice teacher’s career growth—experimentation—is complicated by simultaneously feeling more skilled while having fewer opportunities to demonstrate such development. In Massachusetts, the implementation of MCAS and the resulting pressures of achieving Adequate Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind, are impacting many teachers.

I feel like they have more and more layers of administration now. Whereas before they just didn’t have the bodies to closely supervise you to the point that they wanted to, now they do. And now these people have nothing else to do other than sit around and think of things for you to do. And they just give you more than is humanly possible. (Harrison)

I work at a Boston Public School and within the Boston System group of schools called Pilot Schools which have some autonomies, that are separate from the rest of Boston System. Autonomies around budget, hiring, curriculum, calendar, there's another autonomy somewhere but the big one for me is about curriculum and as a teacher I think that's the big difference in teaching in a pilot school versus teaching in another school. So at my school, other schools in Boston there's a set teaching guide, there's a set textbook, set curriculum for a math teacher and at my school
because of the pilot school autonomy and also because of how the leadership of my school delegates that responsibility to the teachers I have a lot of control over what I teach, how I teach it, when I teach it. So when I originally started I kind of could do whatever I want in whatever order I wanted. That was a really exciting but sometimes frustrating thing about being a teacher. MCAS in my department has meant that we are much more obligated to follow a certain path, a certain sequence of events. While we still have that autonomy, while we still have that level of, our headmaster still delegates that level of, our headmaster still delegates that level of responsibility to the teachers I feel like we're much more in line with what you would see in another school in Boston or another school in the state. (Mike)

The second factor is a generational difference regarding the desire to become leaders. While many teachers in previous generations moved from the classroom into administration at a later stage in their teaching career, many Generation X teachers express a clear disdain for leadership roles, specifically high-level roles such as principal but also roles such as department chair or curriculum or testing coordinator that take them out of their classrooms and away from their students (Donaldson, 2007). Of the teachers with whom I spoke, 8 out of 12 said they did not want a leadership role at this point in their careers. Of those, a handful said they would take leadership roles that allowed them to stay in the classroom, or that they would take leadership roles in the future but not now. These teachers viewed administrative roles as taking them away from the students.
I'm not cut out to be an administrator. I'm not interested in organizing within schools. I'm interested in being part of the organization and part of making change but not administering it or working really primarily with adults in the building. My focus is really on kids. (Julie)

Every administrator I know is unhappy. Because unlike I think a lot of people, my interests didn't change. My interests still remains first and foremost English and second children. And you don't get to do that as an administrator and I've had people ask me why don't you and why won't you. I don't want the stress. I don't want to end up hating the kids. I don't want to end up hating, I don't want to have the teachers hate me. (Sarah)

The result of these two factors is that teachers are not experimenting and not taking on entry-level leadership roles in the way teachers in previous generations did.

**Serenity and conservatism.**

One typically views a move toward conservatism as a natural part of the aging process (Evans, 1996; Hargreaves, 2005a; Riseborough, 1981). As teachers age, their focus often shifts from concerns at work to concerns at home. Instead of spending energy planning for the workday, older teachers begin to think about the future, about retirement and life after work. As such, they are less able to invest in changes or reforms occurring
in their schools. This phase in Huberman’s model begins after a long career in teaching, typically between 19 and 30 years.

Huberman suggests that in this phase of serenity moving toward conservatism, teachers experience a gradual decrease in energy that is made up for with a great sense of pride in themselves and their work over their careers. Thus, because they feel good about the work they have done and continue to do, they can begin to relax a bit and turn their energies elsewhere. This phenomenon is certainly true for the teachers in my study—but they have been teaching only between seven and fifteen years!

For those participants with families, teachers reported that their energies have turned away from school and toward home life. They no longer view their students as “their kids” as they have children of their own. Where they used to coach sports, direct plays and stay up nights working on curriculum and lesson plans, these teachers now do the minimum necessary to do their jobs well.

It's changed it an awful lot. Before I got married I was at school all the time. I was going to the dances, I was going to games, I had kids hanging out in my classroom just talking until 5:00 in the afternoon and none of that mattered. I just gave my whole life to the school. When I started dating my wife I was (head) of the drama club and so I was in the middle of the Crucible will henceforth be known as that damn play. And because it was taking time away from my girlfriend. So after that year, dumped the play, we got married and my time at school dropped. I don't go to dances anymore unless I have to. I do very little extra-curricular stuff that
keeps me out at night. When my son was born four years ago I dropped even more. On the other hand it also made me very isolated at school because every free minute I had at school was dedicated to grading and prep work. I wanted to do as little as possible at home. So that meant no more socializing at lunch, leaving the teachers' room, hiding in my room for the grading. So that was difficult. (Jim)

A lot of it is about when and how I do the work so that used to be my motto was stay in the building until 5:00, 5:30, 6:00, be as available as possible to students at every hour and go in early and stay late and now it's just not really a possibility to do it that way. You know, and then also the part that I bring home is much smaller. I used to come home and after dinner work for another two or three hours making beautiful worksheets, making beautiful curriculum. I don't know. And now I'm much more satisfied to do the best I can in a given amount of time which isn't always great but I feel like I have enough experience and enough other skills that kind of balance that out. (Mike)

The first day of school I put my phone number on the board and say, you never have any excuse, call me, if I don't answer the phone leave me a message, you know, like, not doing your homework isn't an option because you can call me and tell me why you can't do it, you can call me and ask me for help. Spent hundreds of dollars on books. You know, my
kids like supplies, you know, pencils, putting white boards up in my room. It's just, you know, worrying, worrying about these students who they're not, now I know, they're not mine. But it, over committed. It stressed me out…and I got to a place where I could disconnect but only after four, five years maybe and still, my husband would get so frustrated because the phone would ring, you know, eight times a night and these kids don't have phone manners. And, you know, it was just, I need help or I just called to, I mean, I had surgery and I remember when I had surgery, like, three hours afterwards the phone was ringing and my husband said, she can't talk right now. Just calling to say hi. (Sarah)

I started as an enthusiastic, dedicated teacher. Dedicated to figuring it out. And I was pretty successful early on. I could not recognize that at the time. Which I think many early teachers can't. And then I started taking on leadership roles in the school, to some extent, nothing administrative. But some leadership roles. And then I had a baby and...and I'm definitely figuring out still how to balance it and I'm kind of accepting that right now it's, while I'm there I do the best job I can do for the most part but it turns often into a totally different energy than it used to. But sometimes that scares me a little bit, and I think oh God, I'm slacking, I'm turning into this teacher I really don't want to be. But in some ways I think there are parts of it that are healthy. The healthiest part being that I used to call my students my kids. And they were to an extent. But now they're really not.
And I still love them and develop good relationships with them etc. but they are someone else's kids. Which is a good thing. (Julie)

This does not mean that they have checked out of their jobs; indeed, they still say they are highly committed. However, the hours and mental energies directed toward their work have markedly decreased.

As before, there are two components to this expedited process of serenity moving into conservatism. The first is a change in the scope of teachers’ work. Teachers are encouraged to take on more roles, and to take them earlier, than their predecessors (Bartlett, 2004). Teachers are urged to become more collaborative (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001) and to take on leadership roles not just in their classrooms but also in their schools (Lieberman & Miller, 1999). This expanded view of the teaching role is more likely to include responsibilities outside the classroom, such as teacher involvement in directing the school’s curricular, pedagogical, and assessment programs.

The teachers with whom I spoke have begun to move away from taking these once prized roles. While they used to direct plays and run student government, they now leave at the closing bell. They also took on these roles earlier in their careers, and have come to appreciate their roles as simply classroom teachers and not teacher leaders.

The second component is the trend in Generation X teachers toward later marriage and family life as well as more jobs shifts than generations prior. Teachers used to enter the field after graduating college and begin their families earlier. A teacher with nineteen years of experience might have been close to the age of 40. Today’s middle career teachers, however, have often come to teaching from other lines of work and are
thus older “earlier” in their career trajectories. A teacher who is 40 may have only been teaching ten or twelve years, or even fewer. If the trend toward conservatism if a function of one’s age, then it makes sense that today’s mid-career teachers’ trajectories more closely resemble later stage teachers’ career trajectories from the prior generations.

Conclusion

In designing the qualitative component of this study, I hoped to learn about the impact of mandated high-stakes reform on teachers in mid-career. As I described above, I expected to find an overall negative feeling, and I expected to find teachers that were burnt out, stressed out, and generally on their way out of their careers. The responses that I received, however, suggested something entirely different. Teachers in mid-career are confident in their abilities (this is not new; other research by Hargreaves (2005) and Drake (2002) suggest something similar), but are disengaging earlier than their earlier generation counterparts. Thus, they are staying in their careers and most plan to continue to do so, but their energies are turned elsewhere—to their homes, their hobbies, their families. While it might be a bold and unpopular opinion to express, my research that suggests that by and large teachers in mid-career are not impacted by high-stakes mandated reform, and what impact that does exist is neutral to positive, as many teachers said the move toward MCAS actually strengthened their abilities as teachers.

In the final portion of this study, I will describe how this generation of teachers is both experiencing the teaching career differently and is changing how the teaching career is understood. I draw upon the evidence from both the qualitative and quantitative analyses to make policy as well as practical suggestions.
As described in the introductory chapter, this dissertation is entitled *Enduring Reform: The Impact of Mandated Change Middle Career Teachers*. I described enduring as having dual meanings: both living *through* the experience of reform and living *on* in terms of remaining in the career in spite of or even because of the implementation of reform. At every step of data analysis, I turned my thoughts to what it means to endure and whether the teachers with whom I spoke in person or the teachers whose words I read in the Schools and Staffing Survey felt their careers were merely being endured or truly enjoyed. Furthermore, I wondered whether these teachers felt that the work in which they were currently engaged would live on and whether they felt that the energy spent working toward reform and toward improved and sustained student achievement was worth it.

Throughout the analysis, I struggled with whether or not the original title still held. After all, the teachers were not only talking about how much better off they were than in the past but about how they felt better equipped, as teachers in mid-career, to handle the types of reforms that were being asked of them. In many ways, it did not seem to me like the teachers were struggling to endure. Even further, recent international work focuses on the ways in which standardization as we have come to understand it in this country is being phased out in many countries, resulting in improved student achievement and raised teacher morale (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2007, 2008), perhaps rendering a focus on standardization and its future implications for mid-career teachers obsolete.
Additionally, the United States itself is changing, and the government that brought *No Child Left Behind* into existence did not endure, perhaps changing the contexts in which teachers work and giving them new opportunities for sustainable educational reform. I was, and indeed still remain on some level, uncertain as to whether the focus should be on endurance.

As I conclude the research and the writing on it, however, I think the topic of endurance is still important, indeed crucial, for several reasons. First, the sentiments expressed by the teachers in the study reflect what was happening at a particular given moment, even across moments, and the implications of a legacy of standardization, ushered in with *A Nation at Risk* and enhanced by *No Child Left Behind*, will not disappear immediately. Second, my findings conflict with much of the other literature on both the lives of teachers and on the effects of reform, particularly mandated reform, on teachers generally and on teachers in mid-career specifically. I believe it is important to explore why the difference exists and probe whether or not it will endure, or whether it is simply an anomaly of my own data collection and the particular educators who joined my endeavor. Finally, drawing upon the aforementioned difference in my own research and previous research in the same area, the fact that a difference does exist suggests something else that will undoubtedly endure: the generational differences between teachers, between teachers and leaders, between teachers and policymakers, and even between educational researchers. Opening a conversation about how today’s teachers view their work and contrasting it with previous generations of teachers as well as future generations is critical to understanding how and why teachers enter into, stay in, and indeed endure their careers over their lives.
I began this study with several suspicions about teachers and the teaching career. My theories were strongly based on the literature and my own teaching experience, which I described in the introductory chapter. I designed the study to explore these suspicions, but I was certain that I knew what I would find and that it would be a simple, cut-and-dry study that would virtually write itself.

I started to suspect that I was pretty far off the mark when I began analyzing the quantitative data from the Schools and Staffing Survey. As I ran the z tests, each result came back as the opposite of what I expected. More teachers felt great influence over setting policy in the area of establishing curriculum and over setting performance standards in their school. More teachers felt great control over selecting textbooks and instructional materials, topics and skills to be taught, and teaching techniques. Teachers did not seem to feel that routine duties interfered with their work any more so than they had in the past. When I designed my question to reflect teachers’ changed perceptions of capacity, they were supposed to say they felt less capable!

Even more shocking, teachers seemed to be happier about their work and careers and more likely to want to stay in teaching; in essence, they seemed more committed than ever. Most teachers did not feel it was a waste of time to try their best, and even more teachers felt strongly so in the second survey. Most teachers strongly agreed that they were satisfied as teachers in their schools, and the numbers again went up between the surveys. Most teachers said they would certainly become teachers knowing what they know now, and more teachers strongly agreed with this statement in the second survey. Finally, most teachers said they would remain in teaching as long as they were able, and again more agreed with this statement in the second survey.
Well, I thought, fine, teachers feel better. But surely schools are suffering, right? The tightened controls around standardization must be taking a toll somewhere, and if teachers are feeling better then schools must be doing worse. Here I found some of what I was looking for: in 1999, most teachers strongly agreed that their colleagues share their beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be. By 2003, most teachers only somewhat agreed. Not exactly bad news, but it was the decrease I needed! I can still say standardization is bad and confirm what everyone already knows. But of course, it cannot be that simple. In 1999, when asked about cooperative effort among staff members in the school, most teachers somewhat agreed that there was a great deal. By 2003, though, most teachers strongly agreed there was a great deal of cooperative effort. So, while teachers might not see eye-to-eye on the mission of the school as much as they did in the past, they are working together better than ever.

The quantitative data suggest that over all, most teachers who were interviewed shortly after No Child Left Behind was implemented felt high levels of capacity and commitment in their careers. However, due to the limited use of the data, I could not separate out demographic details such as gender, age, or time in career. Thus, while I can say that as an entire teaching force there are positive trends in teachers’ feelings about their careers, I cannot specifically talk about teachers in mid-career, nor can I focus on teachers in secondary schools.

The data for these surveys reflect the voices of thousands of teachers—more than 80,000 in fact. But numbers can only tell part of the story. While the trend in teachers’ opinions about their careers and their workplaces seems to be moving in a more positive direction, in the face of what a great deal of education researchers suggest is one of the
most negative reforms in recent educational history, the numbers alone cannot explain why the positive movement is happening. Thus, the qualitative questions provide a fuller, clearer picture of the trend. Even though the questions were designed before the analysis of the surveys—and perhaps interestingly because they were designed before—they enhance the story of how teachers are, or are not, being impacted by mandated reform.

The results of the qualitative interviews suggest a similar trend in teaching, at least in teaching at mid-career, and at least in Massachusetts, as the SASS. Conversations with twelve teachers in a variety of teaching contexts indicate that today’s mid-career teaching force is confident in its teaching capacity. Indeed, the implementation of mandated reform through standardized testing has acted as a positive spur in many teachers’ repertoires, helping them to hone their curriculum and target the students about whom they are most concerned. Even those teachers who reported negative feelings about the implementation of mandated reform or the reform itself felt committed to their careers, although some with a diminished sense of capacity. Nearly all planned to remain in education, not necessarily in their current jobs or even as teachers, but still in schools and still working with students.

The mixed methodology utilized in this study shows a complex portrait of teaching both in the moment and over the last decade. The two datasets play off one another, showing a broad swath of teachers at two different times and a narrow band of teachers experiencing change very much in the present but over their career spans as well. Much current literature suggests that standardization has a negative impact on teachers’ morale and capacity, limiting their professionalism and discouraging creativity.
Certainly some teachers in this study, in both the surveys and the interviews, felt this impact at some level, and some felt it more than others. Even so, though, the teachers who felt frustrated about the changes did not plan to leave education; they remain committed and capable, dedicated to their students and generally positive about their colleagues and the contexts in which they work. While it is not possible to say that standardization and the imposition of high-stakes mandated change are truly positive, the data from my study indicate that the impact has not been all bad.

The original question I posed at the beginning of the study was this: What are the effects of contemporary high-stakes mandated reform on the change commitments and capacities of mid-career teachers? The qualitative and quantitative data indicate that the simple answer, if one can be given, is that the effects are positive: teachers report high levels professional capacity, both in terms of their work and their ability to reform, and high levels of commitment. Quantitatively, most teachers feel moderate to great control and influence over their work, and more teachers are saying they feel great control than in prior surveys. Most teachers are satisfied in their careers and would make the same choice to be a teacher again given what they now know. Even with the implementation of NCLB, teachers’ change capacity and commitment remain high. Qualitatively, the positive effects include teachers feeling a stronger sense of direction about their teaching and their planning; an enhanced dedication to students, particularly those who are struggling; and a reassurance that there is a system of checks and balances in place to affirm that students are indeed learning and that their own work (the work of teachers) is successful.
After analysis, though, it seems that the question I asked could be more interesting if the focus were shifted from the impact of high-stakes mandated reform to the impact of being in mid-career or the effects of being a Generation X teacher. While I did not focus on these aspects directly in the questions, the data that emerged, particularly from the qualitative analysis, suggest that teachers are more greatly impacted not by what is being asked of them, at least in terms of the mandated high-stakes reform about which I asked, but by who they are and indeed where they are in their lives and careers.

The data, both qualitative and quantitative, point to teachers being fairly able to adapt to whatever is asked of them. Thus, even if they do not like the reform (or the schedule change, or the new leadership team), they adapt. Most teachers are remarkably resilient (Day, 2008), and early to mid-career teachers particularly so. In fact, Day’s (2008) research on teachers across the career span indicates that through the first twenty-three years of the career teachers are at their most resilient; it is only as the career progresses beyond that point that resilience declines, quite sharply. Perhaps teachers are different from people in other careers. Maybe they became teachers because of this particular characteristic of resiliency; they may be better suited to career contexts that are not stable but that are fluid and changing over time. Reform has been present in school for a very long time, if not forever, and while the “grammar” of schooling (Tyack & Tobin, 1994) persists, there is inevitably some form of change being asked of those who work in schools.

In summary, we as educational researchers know a few key things. We know teachers are resilient (Day, 2008). We know that while they might not like change, they do it anyway (happily or otherwise); they might resist or they might not, they might take
it on enthusiastically or not (Little, 1996), but schools keep changing and people keep becoming teachers. Not only do they keep becoming teachers, they continue to stay teaching. Even though many people leave the career, and more and more people are leaving in early career (Ingersoll, 2001), many people remain. Research in schools across generations shows these characteristics to be true (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006).

We know a little about why people become teachers; that research is not covered here, although the teachers in the qualitative component of the study did talk about it. We have some idea about why they leave (Ingersoll, 2001), although again the research is not clear about whether it is more personal or organizational factors that drive teachers out. We are left, then, with the question of why the remaining teachers stay. Day (2008) describes resilience as “enduring commitment” (p. 255); in the broadest sense, my study does explore teacher resilience. From the very beginning of this study, I was interested in learning what it was—either about the career, the teachers themselves or the contexts in which they work—that kept teachers sustained in their work.

What I believe I found suggests an idea that has not been fully explored by other educational research, which helps to explain why the results I found differ so greatly from other research on the same topic. The most important aspect of what I found is that it is impossible to talk about teachers and the teaching career as either static entities or as singular entities. Both the people who enter the field and the context in which they work continually change; what may be true for certain groups of people at one point may not hold at another point, or what the teaching context looks like at a given moment may not be how it looks in another. This finding echoes what Strauss and Howe (1991) argued in their work on generations, namely that it is no longer useful to assume that every group
of people (in particular, every generation) goes through each phase of life (and here I will extend it to career) in the same way. This finding even more closely echoes work by Sarason and Gtazek (2007), which points directly to the ways in which our understanding of teaching and reform work within it need to be understood. Teachers, like trains, are constantly in motion, but the ground they stand on—their classroom, much like the stations in Sarason and Gtazek’s explanation, is always in motion as well. So, too, are the students, literally and metaphorically. By extension, it should also be true that it is not only teachers and the teaching career that are changing; educational researchers who have explored this topic bring their own understanding of the career to their perspective as well, and that new work by the “next generation” of researchers might also look different from work done previously.

Because of this view, it is useful to revisit Huberman’s teaching career schematic and to talk about it in terms of what both the quantitative data and qualitative data from my study point to. Briefly, the quantitative data suggest that overall, teachers seem fairly capable and committed, and that trends in the data, at least statistically, point to significant improvements over time. Again, these data include the entire teaching force: new, mid-career, and veteran teachers. The qualitative data suggest that many if not most teachers in mid-career indeed feel control over their work, that the changes being asked of them at worst do not negatively impact them and at best focus and hone their teaching work. The qualitative data also point, though, to something that conflicts with the statement I just made. While they do feel control over their work and feel both committed and capable, teachers in mid-career are also expressing reasonably high levels of discontent and the showing the beginnings of career disengagement; these patterns
look more like those of the previous generations’ later career stages. In particular, too, male teachers in mid-career seem to be expressing higher levels of discontent. While all but one of the teachers said they plan on remaining in education, and most plan on staying in teaching, nearly everyone with whom I spoke had either temporarily left the classroom or was making plans to move jobs. It is this tension—between capable and committed teachers and early expressions of professional discontent—that sets up the conclusion for this study.

**Implications**

Given the surprising data from this study, I believe there to be several important implications for educators and for those who work with educators—principals, teacher educators, and policymakers, to name a few. The first implication is that generational differences, which have been heretofore either not understood or ignored, need greater attention. The differences in the phases of teachers’ careers as described above have both generational as well as environmental components; these can be both be viewed as constantly in motion, as in Sarason’s and Gtazek’s explanations of moving trains and stations. The context in which teachers work today is different than in past generations, largely due to the current focus on standardization and high-stakes testing. These differences are not necessarily permanent, though; educational change is a continuous process and the experiences that teachers have in their classrooms over time undoubtedly change with the times. What is permanently different and constantly in flux is the generational makeup of teachers as time progresses. No matter what happens, new generations of teachers will enter into, work in, and leave teaching. These teachers will
have different worldviews and understandings about life and careers than the generation before them, and understanding these varying viewpoints is a necessary step in understanding how teachers approach their work. A beginning step would be for those who work in schools to recognize that generational conflict, as Mannheim (1970) wrote, is an inherent part of society. Knowing that at any given time there may be as many as four or five different generations in a school means preparing for tension. Recognizing that different generations approach work and family differently and respecting these differences is critical to progress in schools.

The second implication is that schools and the universities that prepare teachers and school leaders must recognize that the teacher career may not look like it did in the past. First, the path is not necessarily as linear. Generation Xers do not view careers in a linear fashion; many of the teachers began their careers in other fields, many plan to leave the classroom for other jobs in education, and several were out of the workplace or only working part-time so that they could raise their families. Max raises this point in his conversation with me:

I think that we think of our work differently but not necessarily in terms of privilege. I think we think of it differently because of the way that things work. I think it used to be the case that it was sort of expected and companies or organizations would sort of want you to come and stay and help build an organization or help build a company and now the incentive is not necessarily to stay. There’s more incentive I think to jump around quite often because there’s nothing really built in to help people build
ownership and build, build up more value as they build time in a certain job.

Second, as I touched on above, the path is speeded up. This change is partly generational but also partly societal. Generation X had to grow up early, with their parents off at work and being left home after school to fend for themselves, and it appears that they are aging early as well. When asked about their generational identity, teachers even said that they felt older than their peers.

I feel like I'm right on the cusp to some extent, there's some Gen-X stuff but I also feel like I'm a little bit older. So there's a certain traditionalism. I don't know what you call the generation before Generation X but I feel like it's a mix...I feel like a lot of my political opinions and a lot of how I make my own decisions are based on older issues. So, for example, a point of comparison for me is Viet Nam. Even though I'm not old enough to remember Viet Nam, because my parents were so impacted by it I feel like that's sort of my foundational point of comparison. (Doug)

I think I'm too old to be Generation X. (Max)

I would've been comfortable in a classroom maybe 40 years ago. The level of expectations I have for my students, the level of work I give them, not the old fashioned way of teaching but definitely the expectations for
student learning are, I think, very much out of step with the direction education is going these days. (Jim)

Gleick (2000) writes that our society’s understanding of time, as a concept, has shifted, and that because of our increased education levels and wealth, we have a sense that we do not have enough time and this feeling causes tension. Time, as Gleick points out, is seen as a “negative status symbol”: the more a person has, the less important he or she must be (p. 155). Gleick writes that the very way we exist has speeded up; we buy pre-washed blue jeans because we do not have the patience to let them fade on their own. The door close button on the elevator is the most worn out, as we do not even have ten extra seconds to spare to wait for the doors to close by themselves. This phenomenon of accelerated time is clearly present in the changed view of the teaching career as well. The teachers with whom I spoke are throwing themselves full-speed into their careers at an early stage, but they are burning out faster as well.

Particularly in an era of mandated reform and standardization, where expectations are raised for teachers in terms of performance and accountability, stress on teachers can lead to burnout (Smylie, 1999). In the review of the literature, I summarized the phenomenon of teacher burnout. Teachers may burn out from taking on too many new roles, from trying against the odds to help struggling students, from working too many hours for not enough pay. Several of the teachers talked about feeling burned out.

Yes. I mean, if I wouldn’t have had her (daughter), well, I would’ve taught I just couldn’t stay where I was. It was just too dysfunctional. Too, I mean, it was like I was walking in to school every day and my analogy
was like, I was just walking in, just trying to get in my classroom so I
could help the kids and it was, like, different people were just, like,
throwing things at me trying to stop me from getting there. It was just so
hard. I was fighting so many things that I, weren’t my job. You know, it
didn’t seem worth it anymore. So I would’ve gone to a different school
but I would’ve bagged groceries before I would’ve gone back there. And I
loved the kids, loved the kids. (Sarah)

I always felt like education is such a demanding field that I could burn out
really, really quickly and I've always left myself open to that possibility so
I think that I could but I don't like to look too far ahead. I think my level
of energy for the work has changed. The pace of how I do it has changed
but I still feel energized by the teaching part. (Mike)

Third, fewer teachers are talking about becoming leaders. This situation creates a
two-fold problem. One, there is a certain level of disdain for administrators, who are
viewed as out of touch with the students. Two, there will be a significant leadership gap
when the Boomer generation leaders leave and no one with experience in classrooms is
there to fill their positions. This problem is one of both leadership and preparation, and it
must be addressed to ensure that today’s mid-career teachers can stay happy in their
present roles but also progress in a productive way to leadership. Given what I have
learned in speaking with teachers, I make the following suggestions.
First, generational research suggests that Generation X teachers are driven to leadership roles by altruistic reasons, not the desire for power (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Lovely & Buffum, 2007; Raines, 2003; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Distributed leadership that empowers teachers to lead and allows them to feel they are directly helping their students while not necessarily taking them out of their classrooms would both put teachers in positions of power and give them a sense that they are not losing time with their students (Harris & Muijs, 2004; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001). The type of leadership that teachers seem to disdain is the top-down kind, the kind that has one person at the top making every decision, a more power-based position than an altruistic one. Teachers also said they did not want to get bogged down in the politics of the school but instead wanted to be closely involved in the learning. While these two (politics and learning) are not by nature mutually exclusive, any moves to bring them closer together in ways that teachers view as helpful would bring experienced teachers into leadership roles.

Second, recent research on teacher leadership suggests that the teachers who remain the most engaged are those who are paid well for the work they do which they consider above and beyond their job descriptions (Bartlett, 2004). Extra pay for extra work is one avenue, as is giving teachers fewer classes to teach as they take on additional roles, although other work (Drake, 2002) suggests that for older teachers, whose interests have begun to be outside the classroom, more money will not make them want to do extra work if it involves extra time. Several of the teachers I talked to said they would consider leadership roles that allowed them to spend most of their time in the classroom and not in the front office. One perception of Generation X is that they want to have their cake and
eat it, too. By giving them the opportunity to experience leadership while continuing to teach, school leaders might be able bring a greater number of these teachers into leadership roles.

Of course, the general reluctance of teachers to move to administration is still a concern. Even with distributed leadership, the fact remains that many Generation X teachers simply do not want to be principals. They will assume leadership roles but not the general leadership of a school, or for that matter, a school district. For these teachers, a fundamental shift in how administration is viewed may be the only way to move experienced teachers into principalships. Distributed leadership can both allow teachers to share in the administration of school while remaining in their classrooms and allow them, if they become leaders, to keep a foothold in the more routine aspects of leadership instead of wholly immersing them in the more political aspects of the school.

The third implication is one of sustainability. Generation X teachers will remain in their careers, but what can be done, both by the teachers themselves and by the leaders who work with them, to ensure that they remain engaged in their careers, especially if they do not plan to move into leadership positions? And for those who are expressing the desire to move into leadership—in particular, male teachers—how can we support their move from the classroom into leadership, and how can we prevent them from becoming too burned out before they make the move? Generation X teachers appear to be burning out years before the generations of teachers before them, but they are not necessarily leaving teaching. In order to keep teachers sustained in their work, school leaders need to consider several factors. First, do these teachers need new types of work to stimulate their careers? Can they be given new courses to teach, or new groups of students?
Teachers in mid-career are finally feeling good about the work they can do after years of learning the ropes. There is a fine balance to be achieved between asking teachers to take on new work that stimulates them, asking them to give up what they feel effective doing, and being mindful not to overload them. For teachers who are already beginning to experience burnout, taking on new work might seem not to be a stimulus but instead to be a drain. Asking teachers directly where their interests lie and working with them to create change in their work would be an ideal first step in this process.

Equally important, especially to Generation X teachers, is flexibility. This generation of teachers is highly dedicated to their students but also strongly family-oriented. They want the ability to keep their jobs while making time to spend with their own children. Several of the teachers I talked to were either currently out of the classroom to raise their children, working reduced schedules to accommodate family concerns, or consciously holding off on making moves either to different schools or to leadership roles while raising their families. This was true of both men and women. School leaders must be mindful that this generation, having been raised as latch-key children, is conscious of wanting to spend more time with their children, and their career trajectories may not be linear as in previous generations. Allowing teachers the flexibility to shift their careers in ways that best suit their needs is a critical component of keeping these teachers in the classroom. Generation X teachers, already prepared to leave any job that does not conform to their desires, may be better able to commit to staying in their jobs if they are reassured that their job will be there if they take time off for family. Departments may look different as teachers cycle in and out of positions, and
strong leadership involves building strong teams with multiple strengths to accommodate these shifts.

**Conclusion**

It is clear to me in speaking with these teachers that something very different is happening in their careers, something that is on the one hand burning them out early yet at the same time keeping them most of them in the classrooms, or at least keeping most of them as self-identified teachers. These teachers are going through the same stations, as Howe and Strauss (1991) suggest, that other teachers in the past have gone through, only they are on bullet trains, not steam locomotives. At the same time that their trains are speeding through, though, the stations themselves are also changing, moving, shifting.

Generational theory, in many ways, has been able to explain not necessarily why different groups of people act the way they do, but that they do act differently and that these differences need to be viewed as expected instead of surprising. Educational theory, however, has not made the same leap. We still expect teachers to act as teachers before them have, even though the both the contexts of and the people in education are shifting and changing.

To return to the original question of this study, what is the impact of mandated high-stakes reform on the change capacities and commitments of teachers in mid-career, we must apply the same kind of thinking. We must be attentive to all of the moving parts: the teachers as they go through the career cycle, the different generations of teachers in a school at any given moment, the changing expectations of teachers, the
changes in the form of reform that teachers are asked to make each and every day, year in and year out.

The data in this study demonstrate that in many ways, the impact of mandated high-stakes reform is positive. However, this may be true only at the very moment at which the data were gathered. Understanding this helps to explain why the results appear so different from what other literature about educational change suggests. Sarason and Gtazek (2007) give a different example from trains that helps to explain this phenomenon. They ask readers to imagine people watching cars. If you were to only ever see the front of cars in oncoming traffic, you would believe that cars only have white lights; this would be your reality. If you only ever saw the back, you would know that cars only have red lights; this would be your reality. As Sarason and Gtazek point out, in order to understand that cars have both red and white lights we have to understand the relationship between the two observers:

Namely, the axes of their sight are pointed in opposite directions when they look at the same objects. When we understand the relationship between the axes of their frames of reference, we begin to see the possibility that both can be right even though they see different images. (p. 138)

It is possible that the impact of mandated, high-stakes reform on teachers in mid-career is both positive and negative; it just might depend on how you look at it. In saying this, I am not trying to soften or lessen the impact of the data from my study. Quite the opposite; because it is the reality for today’s mid-career, Gen X teachers, it is true, just as if they only saw car lights as white they would be right. The ways in which school
leaders and teacher education programs attend to this changed understanding is critical to finding ways to keep these teachers satisfied as they remain in the workplace. By taking a generational approach to viewing teachers’ career trajectories, this chapter opens up a new avenue of understanding the teaching career. While further research is necessary, it is an initial step in regenerating our knowledge about who is teaching and why they do or do not remain in the classroom and for what reasons. As the next generation of teachers, the Millennials/Generation Y, enters the teaching force, it will certainly be interesting to see how they view their careers and work as well.
Appendix A

QUESTIONS

Generational identity
What generation do you consider yourself to be a part of?
What do you believe are the key characteristics of this generation? What do you believe others see as the key characteristics?
How do you see "your" generation in comparison to generations before it? (If applicable, after it).
Probes: (Mission/destiny, Belief system, Work life, Relationships, Technology, Gender)

Career path
How long have you been a teacher?
How much of this time has been in the school you are in now?
If you have worked in another school, how long was your position there?
When did you know you wanted to become a teacher?
What events in your life led you to this decision (describe your own schooling/work experience/life experience/family)?
How long do you think you will remain in this particular job? In teaching? In education?
How do you think your career path compares to other teachers in your own generation? In previous/future generations?
If you were to do everything all over, would you still become a teacher?
Describe how you see your career path evolving.
Where do you see yourself in 5 years? 10? 20?
Where do you see family and other outside factors fitting in to this career path? (For next interview, please bring a map of your career path as you see it.)

Engagement with reform
Is your school undergoing major reforms at this point? If so, what types of reforms are these?
Were they generated by people in your school or from people/agencies outside of your school?
What is your opinion of the reform and the way it is being handled?
Please describe the reform process in your school.
What is your role in these reforms?
To what extent are you engaging in the reform?
How does engagement with the reform impact your teaching?
How does your engagement compare with your colleagues' engagement? To older colleagues' engagement? Younger colleagues' engagement?
To what extent do you believe in the reform your school is undertaking?
How important do you believe your role is in the implementation of the reform?

Commitment
How committed do you feel to your job? Your students? Your colleagues?
How do your feelings of commitment impact your response to/engagement with reform?

Efficacy
How do you view your role as a teacher in your school?
To what extent do you believe you are succeeding with your students?
To what extent do you believe that in your role as a teacher you are making a difference in your students' lives?
To what extent do you believe that the reforms your school is undertaking will impact your students (either positively or negatively)?
Appendix B

**Text of Recruitment email**

Dear ____,

I am about to begin the data collection phase of my dissertation, and I’m hoping you may be able to help me out. I am looking for teachers to participate as subjects in my study. If you fit the bill and are interested, please let me know. There will be most likely 3 interviews per teacher, after school hours. Ideally, we’d meet at a café or something of that sort where we could chat about your career. I’m looking for teachers:

1. With 7-20 years teaching experience (does not have to be in same school or subject)
2. In secondary school
3. In public school
4. In Math, Science, History, or English (or any combo of those)

If you, your partner, or anyone you know might be interested, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Corrie Stone-Johnson
Doctoral Candidate, Boston College
617-869-2023
stonece@bc.edu
### Appendix C

#### DECISION MAKING: Items 57-61
This section asks about your influence on staffing, budgeting, and instructional policies, and your perception of various issues about teaching.

### Item 57
Using the scale of 1-5, where 1 means "No influence" and 5 means "A great deal of influence," how much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>A great deal of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Setting performance standards for students of this school</td>
<td>0286</td>
<td>0286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establishing curriculum</td>
<td>0287</td>
<td>0287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Determining the content of in-service professional development programs</td>
<td>0288</td>
<td>0288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating teachers</td>
<td>0289</td>
<td>0289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Hiring new full-time teachers</td>
<td>0290</td>
<td>0290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Setting discipline policy</td>
<td>0291</td>
<td>0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Deciding how the school budget will be spent</td>
<td>0292</td>
<td>0292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 58
Using the scale of 1-5, where 1 means "No control" and 5 means "Complete control," how much control do you think you have IN YOUR CLASSROOM at this school over each of the following areas of your planning and teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No control</th>
<th>Complete control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials</td>
<td>0293</td>
<td>0293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught</td>
<td>0294</td>
<td>0294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Selecting teaching techniques</td>
<td>0295</td>
<td>0295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating and grading students</td>
<td>0296</td>
<td>0296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disciplining students</td>
<td>0297</td>
<td>0297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Determining the amount of homework to be assigned</td>
<td>0298</td>
<td>0298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- **Mark (X) one box on each line.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The principal lets staff members know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>0206</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The school administration's behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.</td>
<td>0300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am satisfied with my teaching salary.</td>
<td>0301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The level of student misbehavior in this school (such as noise, horseplay or fighting in the halls, cafeteria or student lounge) interferes with my teaching.</td>
<td>0302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.</td>
<td>0303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Necessary materials such as textbooks, supplies, and copy machines are available as needed by the staff.</td>
<td>0304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my job of teaching.</td>
<td>0305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My principal enforces school rules for student conduct and backs me up when I need it.</td>
<td>0306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The principal talks with me frequently about my instructional practices.</td>
<td>0307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced by teachers in this school, even for students who are not in their classes.</td>
<td>0308</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
<td>0309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59. Continued -

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- Mark (X) one box on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>l.</strong> The principal knows what kind of school he/she wants and has communicated it to the staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>m.</strong> There is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n.</strong> In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>o.</strong> I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state or local tests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p.</strong> I am given the support I need to teach students with special needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q.</strong> I am satisfied with my class size(s).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>r.</strong> I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s.</strong> The amount of student tardiness and class cutting in this school interferes with my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t.</strong> I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>u.</strong> I plan with the library media specialist/librarian for the integration of library media services into my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v.</strong> I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60. To what extent is each of the following a problem in this school? Indicate whether it is a serious problem, a moderate problem, a minor problem, or not a problem in this school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Serious problem</th>
<th>Moderate problem</th>
<th>Minor problem</th>
<th>Not a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Student tardiness 0321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Student absenteeism 0322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Teacher absenteeism 0323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Students cutting class 0324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Physical conflicts among students 0325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Robbery or theft 0326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Vandalism of school property 0327</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Student pregnancy 0328</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Student use of alcohol 0329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Student drug abuse 0330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Student possession of weapons 0331</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Student disrespect for teachers 0332</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Students dropping out 0333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Student apathy 0334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>Lack of parent involvement 0335</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>Poverty 0336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>Students come to school unprepared to learn 0337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>Poor student health 0338</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61a. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?
- Mark (X) only one box.

   1. Certainly would become a teacher
   2. Probably would become a teacher
   3. Chances about even for and against
   4. Probably would not become a teacher
   5. Certainly would not become a teacher

b. How long do you plan to remain in teaching?
- Mark (X) only one box.

   1. As long as I am able
   2. Until I am eligible for retirement
   3. Will probably continue unless something better comes along
   4. Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can
   5. Undecided at this time

YOUR COMMENTS
## Appendix D

### VIII DECISION MAKING

61. How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mark (X) ONE box on each line.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Setting performance standards for students at this school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establishing curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Determining the content of in-service professional development programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Hiring new full-time teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Setting discipline policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Deciding how the school budget will be spent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. How much actual control do you have IN YOUR CLASSROOM at this school over the following areas of your planning and teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mark (X) ONE box on each line.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Selecting teaching techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating and grading students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disciplining students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Determining the amount of homework to be assigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
63. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. The principal lets staff members know what is expected of them.</th>
<th>4400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. The school administration's behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.</td>
<td>4401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am satisfied with my teaching salary.</td>
<td>4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The level of student misbehavior in this school (such as noise, horseplay or fighting in the halls, cafeteria or student lounge) interferes with my teaching.</td>
<td>4403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.</td>
<td>4404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Necessary materials such as textbooks, supplies, and copy machines are available as needed by the staff.</td>
<td>4405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my job of teaching.</td>
<td>4406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My principal enforces school rules for student conduct and backs me up when I need it.</td>
<td>4407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced by teachers in this school, even for students who are not in their classes.</td>
<td>4408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
<td>4409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. The principal knows what kind of school he/she wants and has communicated it to the staff.</td>
<td>4410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members.</td>
<td>4411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.</td>
<td>4412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.</td>
<td>4413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.</td>
<td>4414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. I am satisfied with my class size.</td>
<td>4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. I am given the support I need to teach students with special needs.</td>
<td>4416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
63. Continued -

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. To the best of your knowledge how often do the following two types of problems occur with students at this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Happens daily</th>
<th>Happens at least once a week</th>
<th>Happens at least once a month</th>
<th>Happens on occasion</th>
<th>Never happens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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65. To what extent is each of the following a problem in this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Serious problem</th>
<th>Moderate problem</th>
<th>Minor problem</th>
<th>Not a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student tardiness</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Student absenteeism</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Student class cutting</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teacher absenteeism</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Student pregnancy</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students dropping out</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Student apathy</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Lack of parental involvement</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Poverty</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Students come to school unprepared to learn</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Poor student health</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe us as a satisfied group.</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I like the way things are run at this school.</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. If I could get a higher paying job I'd leave teaching as soon as possible.</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I think about transferring to another school.</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go.</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
67a. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?
   - Mark (X) only one box.
   1. Certainly would become a teacher
   2. Probably would become a teacher
   3. Chances about even for and against
   4. Probably would not become a teacher
   5. Certainly would not become a teacher

b. How long do you plan to remain in teaching?
   - Mark (X) only one box.
   1. As long as I am able
   2. Until I am eligible for retirement
   3. Will probably continue unless something better comes along
   4. Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can
   5. Undecided at this time

69a. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL ever threatened to injure you?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO 26a (ень Indicates)

b. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL threatened to injure you IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO 26b (ень Indicates)

c. In the past 12 months, how many times has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL threatened to injure you?

69a. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL ever physically attacked you?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO 26a (ень Indicates)

b. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL physically attacked you IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO 26b (ень Indicates)

c. In the past 12 months, how many times has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL physically attacked you?

Times
Appendix E
Z test results

1. How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL in establishing curriculum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.36413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>4.288317</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>19.76457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>14.72908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL in setting performance standards for students of this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.078597</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>11.5487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>11.15142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>18.13877</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How much control do you think you have IN YOUR CLASSROOM over selecting textbooks and other instructional materials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.05128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>9.519871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>39.74004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>14.82441</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How much control do you think you have IN YOUR CLASSROOM over selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.58211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>5.811072</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>40.81301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>24.20815</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How much control do you think you have IN YOUR CLASSROOM over selecting teaching techniques?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.13335</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>10.40187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>41.32873</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>42.87635</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my job of teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.657885</td>
<td>.510612</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>.551814</td>
<td>.551814</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>1.831872</td>
<td>0.06697</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>.508063</td>
<td>.611409</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13.4055</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>15.52165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>8.304826</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>23.92436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22.66186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>43.1582</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>12.30114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>30.35389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I am generally satisfied with being a teacher in this school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22.21971</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>18.87003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>11.56224</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>.855887</td>
<td>.3926</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29.75001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>8.897986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>18.26493</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>15.67745</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certainly would become a teacher</td>
<td>13.21275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably would become a teacher</td>
<td>2.997139</td>
<td>0.002725</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances about even for and against</td>
<td>3.491898</td>
<td>.00048</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably would not become a teacher</td>
<td>8.727517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
<td>5.879193</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How long do you plan to remain in teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>90%CL</th>
<th>95%CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As long as I am able</td>
<td>20.70427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until I am eligible for retirement</td>
<td>6.819203</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will probably continue unless something better comes along</td>
<td>13.07757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can</td>
<td>11.34669</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided at this time</td>
<td>3.070233</td>
<td>.002139</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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