

Preservice Teacher Expectations of the Principal's Role in Teacher Induction

Shaoan Zhang, Ph.D.

Department of Teaching and Learning, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Matthew Nishimoto, Ph.D.

Coronado High School, Clark County School District, Nevada

Katrina Liu, Ph.D.

Department of Teaching and Learning, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Abstract

This study examines pre-service teacher expectations of the principal's role in teacher induction, using grounded theory methodology to explore the question: What role do secondary pre-service teachers expect of principals in the induction of novice teachers and how do their expectations develop? Findings show that preservice teachers expect the enactment of two main roles of the school principal, school leader and instructional leader, within a continuum from negative beliefs to positive preferences. Findings demonstrate that field experiences influenced preservice teachers' expectations of the principal's role in teacher induction. This study broadens teacher induction research on the transition from pre-service teachers into the teaching profession and how school principals are perceived to be a part of that transition.

Introduction

Induction, the first years of teaching in the classroom, is a critical period in a teaching career, in which novice teachers face entry and acculturation to a new profession. The impetus to establish and implement effective teacher induction programs is mounting as disproportionately large numbers of novice teachers enter teaching while experienced veterans leave (Ingersoll, 2012). Both the number of novice teachers and their participation in induction programs have increased so that formal induction has become a standard practice in most United States K-12 schools (Kang & Berliner, 2012; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Effective induction has shown to have a positive impact on novice teacher professional development and retention as well as student achievement (Ingersoll, 2012; Villar & Strong, 2007).

Principals are crucial in novice teachers' induction (Angelle, 2002, 2006; Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010a, 2010b; Wood, 2005; Wood & Stanulis, 2010). Wood (2005) identified a principal's five leadership roles in induction as (1) culture builder, (2) instructional leader, (3) facilitator of mentors, (4) recruiter of new teachers, and (5) advocate for new teachers. On the other hand, novice teachers consider the principal the go-to person for guidance on how to perform in a new school environment (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). Research demonstrates that when novice teachers receive guidance from the principal during the induction years, they are more likely to be confident in their teaching and complete the induction process successfully. On the contrary, if novice teachers do not receive the principal's support and guidance, they tend to encounter difficulties or even leave the teaching profession (Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Richards, 2004).

With increasing emphasis on accountability, curriculum reform, technology implementation, and parental involvement in teaching, principals are expected to take more responsibilities and they encounter challenges in working with teachers, particularly novice teachers in urban schools

(Duke, Tucker, Samonowicz, & Levy, 2007). It is crucial that novice teachers have a clear understanding of the principal's roles in induction. It is equally important for principals to understand novice teachers' expectations of their roles. However, research shows there is an apparent misalignment among stakeholder groups in the induction process (beginning teachers, veteran teachers, mentors, and school leaders) regarding the importance of certain induction components, most prevalently regarding orientation and mentoring (Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, & Cowan-Hathcock, 2007; Andrews, Gilbert, Martin, 2007; Fry, 2007; Fry, 2010; Womack-Wynne, Dees, Leech, LaPlant, Brockmeier, & Gibson, 2011).

Since misalignments already exist between novice teachers and their principals, then an assumption would be that misalignments may exist in preservice teachers who will soon enter the induction process. Unfortunately, teacher preparation programs and leadership preparation programs are often separated so that preservice teachers have few opportunities to learn about the principals' roles. While preservice teachers' misaligned expectations of teaching and learning have been examined (Weinstein, 1988; 1989), there is little research on preservice teachers' expectations of the principal's role in novice teacher induction. We argue that teacher induction begins in teacher preparation and the transition from preservice to inservice teaching. Therefore, it is important for principals and other novice teacher induction stakeholders to understand the expectations of preservice teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine preservice teachers' expectations of the principal's role in the induction process, guided by the question: What roles do secondary preservice teachers expect of principals in novice teacher induction and how do their expectations develop?

Literature Review

School climate has been identified as contributing to both the professional and personal needs of beginning teachers (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010a, 2010b); principals are viewed as most influential in the establishment and maintenance of a healthy school culture attending to those needs (Angelle, 2006; Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010a, 2010b; Cherian & Daniel, 2008). Principals are further seen as responsible for the acculturation of new teachers into the school culture (Angelle, 2006; Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010b; Wood, 2005). Recent research on teacher induction has investigated school culture and collaboration as well as the integral role of the principal within the induction process (Angelle, 2002, 2006; Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010b; Brown & Wynn, 2009; Wood, 2005; Wood & Stanulis, 2010).

The literature demonstrates the importance of direct personal interaction between the principal and novice teachers (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010b; Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Quinn & Andrews, 2004; Wood, 2005). Principals are expected to actively monitor new teachers, engage discussion with them, and provide meaningful, systematic, and ongoing feedback (Angelle, 2006; Wood, 2005). In addition, principals promote new teacher growth both through direct facilitation and mentor coordination (Wood, 2005). Novice teachers expect principals to be visible in their classrooms and in their development (Cherian & Daniel, 2008); effective mentoring support in induction is achieved through the principal's leadership in assigning appropriate mentors, facilitating the development mentor-mentee relationship, providing time for these interactions to happen (Fry, 2007; Scherff, 2008; Wood, 2005).

With the rapid transformation in the school curriculum (e.g. Common Core State Standards) and education policy in most states, principals' traditional roles have been changing in building school culture and mentoring novice teachers. Principals are expected to play key roles in teacher professional development and curriculum reform (Eilers & D'Amico, 2012; Kober, McIntosh, &

Rentner, 2013), and technology implementation (Machado & Chung, 2015). In addition, as parental involvement is enforced, they struggle to work with parents and communities around those schools to create socially just learning environments (Ishimaru, 2013).

With these changing roles, new teachers will have more challenges in working with principals in the induction and professional development. We argue that preservice teachers' appropriate understanding of principals' role in novice teacher induction could help them how to transition from preservice teachers to novice teachers during the induction stage. Furthermore, if principals have a better understanding of preservice teachers' expectations of their roles, they may be able to adjust their roles in order to better serve their needs when they enter the teaching profession. Unfortunately, little research has investigated preservice teachers' expectations of the principal's role. In this study, we explore how secondary preservice teachers in their field experience perceive the principal's role in teacher induction.

Theoretical Framework

In the field of education, role theories are used to describe the causes and effects of roles and their effect on behaviors (Biddle, 1979). One tenet of the role theory is that sharing expectations for a role is a major cause for the behavior and identity of that role. Succinctly, individuals in a role learn what behaviors are expected of them and other individuals impose their expectations on them. Role theory applies to the learned and induced roles of students, teachers, and school leaders. In this study, preservice teachers' perceptions of a principal's role in novice teacher induction do not necessarily have an immediate impact on the behaviors of the principals' behaviors; however, we anticipate that by exploring preservice teachers' expectations and distributing them to principals might lead to future changes in the roles of the principals.

The lens of cognitive role theory (Biddle, 1986) guided the investigation of preservice teachers' expectations in this study as norms, beliefs, or preferences. *Norms* are conceptions that prescriptively approve or request a characteristic based on shared expectations about a social identity or role. *Beliefs* are expectations that are descriptive, objective, and may be anticipatory; these are expected to occur. *Preferences* are expectations that are subjective, and possibly cathetic and emotion-laden; they are usually privately held responses to previously experienced characteristics of a role or rooted in bias rather than accepted norms. Each modal manifestation has different implications for the interpretation of participant statements.

This cognitive role theory lens was used because of the unknown nature of expectations that preservice teachers hold regarding the principals' roles in induction as well as a means to analyze the data at a deeper level. Treating expectations as modalities further dissects the internal meaning behind what an individual may expect. In this study, treating participants' words helped identify the statements that were based on a feeling, a hope, or transferred vicariously through mentor teachers who were sharing their feelings and experiences with the preservice teachers, among many other modalities of how preservice teachers *expect*. For example, the expected role of the principal as a "teacher critic" (see the Findings and Discussion) would have simply been an expectation if not for the cognitive role theory lens revealing it as a negative-preference with roots in vicarious experience as opposed to authentic experience; the preservice teachers observed this role through their mentor teachers' experiences, not their own.

Methodology

This study uses qualitative methods to investigate the research question. Since the main phenomena explored are preservice teachers' expectations and the process of their development,

quantitative methods fall short of the rich description required to generate a clear picture. Of particular relevance to the study at hand is the exploratory nature of the qualitative method in uncovering new areas of investigation to gain novel understandings (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This study employs the key characteristics of a “prescriptive” approach (Creswell, 2008) due to the preconceived categorical coding procedures (open, axial, and selective coding levels), as well as elements of grounded theory research: a process approach, use of theoretical sampling, constant comparative data analysis, memo writing, a core category, and theory generation (Creswell, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Of particular importance to this study and the use of grounded theory is the question of the use of preliminary theory and a literature review. Traditionally, the classic grounded theory does not set the stage of study with related literature or a theoretical framework. However, Creswell (2009) suggests that popular use of literature in grounded theory is for comparison with results that emerged from the data of the study. Therefore, we use role theory to frame the type of expectations as a sociological and cognitive construct, but not to dictate the content of those expectations.

Participants and Context of the Study

This study is situated in a traditional, 4-year, teacher education program in a state university in the Southwest United States. The first two authors are both in secondary teacher education; thus we recruited participants from the secondary teacher education program using convenience sampling (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012). At the completion of their program, preservice teachers receive a Bachelor's degree as well as statewide licensure in grades 7–12. Every participant in this traditional Secondary Education program is required to meet course requirements for a First Teaching Field (e.g. Mathematics), a core subject in which they enroll in content-based courses. Secondary Education preservice teachers are also required to complete field experiences (*practica*) near the end of their program, which is aligned with concurrent coursework in pedagogy and methods as well as other foundational courses, but focused on instruction and lesson planning.

Practicum I is the first phase of field experience and involves applying the knowledge acquired in methods courses to instructing three formal lessons in a classroom setting. Practicum I develops prospective teachers' understanding of and abilities in effective instructional planning and techniques. This course supports the initial field experiences through developing teacher candidates that are aware of instructional and classroom dynamics in multiple modes. The microteaching element of this course also prepares teachers in a “third space” (Zeichner, 2010); a relatively consequence-free environment. Beyond this, Practicum I students are assigned to weekly classroom observations in secondary schools. Practicum II, is the second phase of field experience and extends the application of methods to an actual classroom situation; deepening the experience and reflection of practice. Supervised student teaching is the culminating field experience for teacher candidates and involves the student teacher eventually assuming nearly all instructions of a classroom under the supervision of a mentor teacher.

With regard to the study at hand, the only intervention in the program regarding the perspective of school leadership is a single chapter in the course textbook for the general methods co-requisite course during Practicum I. Though the chapter is included in the text, the incorporation is at the instructor's discretion.

A total of 21 preservice teachers participated in the study at different stages of their program: Practicum I (n=10), Practicum II (n=4), Student Teaching (n=3), transitioning from Practicum II to Student Teaching (n=4). There were 13 females and eight males. The participants' content areas

ranged from English, Science, Social Studies, Special Education, to other areas (no Math). The secondary level was also varied with seven participants exclusively middle school or junior high (both field experiences and anticipated career level were middle school level), six participants exclusively high school level, and the remainder mixed.

Data Sources

Three data sources were used in this study for data triangulation: Questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and re-interviews, and focused interviews for verification. First, the questionnaire (see Appendix A) was divided into two parts, an open response section, and a closed-ended ordinal polytomous section. The ordinal polytomous (ranking) section was used to better create participant profiles and conceptually order the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Second, the semi-structured interviews (see Appendix B) were intended to address the research question in-depth and were the primary data source corroborated by materials and documentary data. The primary focus of the interviews was preservice teachers' expectations of the principal's role in novice teacher induction. Third, the focused verification interviews served as a form of theory-verification and member checks to confirm the participants' words after analysis and avoid "shoehorning" ideas into existing categories (Creswell, 2008).

Data collection occurred in three phases and was concurrent with data analysis based on grounded theory methods. Phase I involved recruitment, questionnaires, and conceptual ordering (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In Phase I, 21 participants completed the questionnaire, which was subsequently used to create a profiling matrix. Phase II commenced after the completion of the three steps of Phase I. Interviews were transcribed verbatim for line-by-line microanalysis and in-vivo coding. As the data collection and data analysis were concurrent and recursive, the semi-structured interview protocol evolved with questions being refined, added, or omitted. Fifteen initial interviews and eight re-interviews were conducted (not including the focused verification interviews conducted in Phase III).

Phase III commenced upon near completion of the data collection, interviews, and data analysis; specifically, when the researchers noted the redundancy of data reflective of theoretical saturation. This phase marked the end of data collection, and as a theory-verification instrument, a closure to the study itself. Overall, six focused verification interviews were conducted with archetype profile participants. Another six of the semi-structured re-interviews from Phase II concluded with a member-checking and verification of the emerging concepts.

Data Analysis

The data analysis procedure started the inductive process with the first step in the grounded theory approach, microanalysis, or the line-by-line analysis of data for open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Each block of participant response was divided into individual unit clauses or micro-ideas with open or in-vivo codes summarizing several units containing the same concept (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Example of Micro-Analysis During Open Coding Level*

<p>“Principal – whole school situation”</p> <p>“Teachers – individual classrooms, students”</p> <p>Modality: Preference</p> <p>“Principal as overarching idea”</p> <p>“guide to more specific sources such as mentors”</p>	<p>P: Yeah, I suppose I see that a little bit more. Um, ‘cause the principal would probably have a good idea to the whole school situation, but per individual classrooms, by subject, I think the teachers would be a little bit more down to the student level since they’re interacting with them on a significantly greater basis, just even by quantity and time. So I’d like the principal to be more of an overarching idea as well as a guide to more specific sources, such as teacher mentors. But the teachers being the primary aid.</p>
--	--

The overall analysis followed the general stages of the systematic grounded theory approach, open, axial, and selective coding. During the initial microanalysis and open coding, the emic perspective of the participants was emphasized, especially the participants’ interpretation of the process of their own belief-expectation development and its sources. The initial concepts, range of potential meanings (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), categories, and subcategories were generated. During open coding, margin-labeling was used in tandem with line-by-line microanalysis. Open codes and their potential ranges as well as dimensions were discussed in memos.

The discovery stage of axial coding sought to assemble these categories in new ways that logically and naturally accounted for the causal conditions of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2008). Strauss and Corbin (1998) noted that “axial coding is the act of relating categories along the lines of their properties and dimensions” (p. 125) to give the analysis more explanatory power. Further, they noted that this stage does not necessarily have explicit sequential steps, despite the systematic approach. As data began to form into categories and conceptualizations, the analytic mode shifted from mainly inductive treatment to comparative and deductive, in accordance with the methods.

Finally, the selective coding process transformed data to theory and sought the explanatory central phenomenon of the expectation development process. Following Strauss and Corbin, a central category was chosen that related logically and consistently to all other categories in the analysis, appeared frequently in the data, and was abstract enough to be integrated into other theories as well as flexible enough to still apply when conditions varied.

Analysis procedures. During the analysis process, analytic procedures specific to grounded theory were utilized. Strauss and Corbin (1998) stress the gravity of interpretations of language as indicators of assumptions or significance. Another technique utilized was the “flip-flop technique” wherein the researchers looked at the extremes of an example to elicit significant properties. As the analysis showed that expectations fell into continua, this analytic method was paramount in the open and axial stages of coding. Also present during the analysis was a sensitivity to the indicators of bias that may be intruding into the analysis, such as “the face value acceptance of the words or explanations given by the respondents or the complete rejection of these without questioning what is being said” (p. 97).

Findings

Expectations of the Principal’s Roles

School Leader roles. The findings of this study indicate that preservice teachers expect principals to enact two broad roles, school leader and instructional leader. These two broad roles manifest as a spectrum of sub-roles from negative to positive expectations. School Leader (Table

2) encompasses five roles ranging from negative (Absent Principal and Micromanager), neutral (Administrative Leader), to positive (Visionary Leader and Culture Leader). Participants reported the expectation that the principal may be absent due to time constraints on the principal’s schedule and the prioritization of the school as a whole over individual teachers. For example, one of the participants stated, “They [principals] probably have more important things to do. They got a school to run.” Similarly, another participant commented,

Um, because the principal would probably have a good idea to the whole school situation, but per individual classrooms, by subject, I think the teachers would be a little bit more down to the student level since they’re interacting with them on a significantly greater basis, just even by quantity and time. So I’d like the principal to be more of an overarching idea as well as a guide to more specific sources, such as teacher mentors.

The opposite of the absent principal, but still a negative expectation, is the micromanager: participants expected a micromanaging principal to be overly involved in the teachers’ practice to the point of “stifling creativity,” leading to the teacher’s “loss of control” in their own teaching. According to some participants, the appearance of the principal in the classroom combined with their direct evaluation of the teacher was perceived as micromanagement—“the teachers would feel annoyed and disrespected.”

The administrative leader role encompassed those concepts that were professional norms and relatively neutral in nature. Participants used phrases such as “boss” and “manager” to refer to the managerial nature of the principals’ role that implements actions such as “running the school” and “bringing policy into the school.” For instance, one of the participants stated that “the principals bring policies to the school and they are expected to develop and provide specific guidelines for teachers and staff to follow.”

On the positive end of the preservice teacher expectation continuum, visionary leader and culture leader include those characteristics and actions of the principal’s role that provide vision and a positive culture for the whole school. For visionary leaders, preservice teachers expect the principal to provide long term and clear goals for the whole school with the ultimate purpose of making the school better for the students as well as teachers. Multiple participants brought up the importance of “clear” goals. For example, one of the participants stated, “I expect the principal to make the goals clear to everybody.” Similarly, another participant said that “the principal should have clear ideas, or vision, for the entire school.” For culture leaders, preservice teachers expect principals to create a positive and collaborative culture in the school, particularly in being aware of the impact of new teachers on the school. One participant suggested that “the principal should know the influence of incoming teachers and being collaborative with them.” Similarly, another participant expected the principal to initiate communication with new teachers.

Table 2. *Principals’ School Leader Role Continuum*

SCHOOL LEADER ROLES		
NEGATIVE	NEUTRAL	POSITIVE
<u>ABSENT</u>	<u>ADMINISTRATIVE</u>	<u>VISION LEADER</u>
“might be too busy” “they probably have more important things to do” “they don’t have time” expectation of limited availability “they got a school to run”	“boss” “manager” “time manager” “running the school” “gives an idea of the school” “guidelines to follow directly” “brings policy into the school”	“vision for entire school” “work towards bettering school” “have high expectations” “clear idea” “they see the future of the school” “umbrella goal to work towards” “make goals clear”

<p><u>MICROMANAGING</u> “stifling creativity” “loss of control” “doesn’t micromanage” no micromanagement not a micromanager direct involvement seen as micromanagement micromanaging – “annoyed, disrespected”</p>	<p>“uses delegation” “good time management” “certain things more of a priority”</p>	<p>“provide clear goals for whole school” <u>CULTURE LEADER</u> “culture of success that starts with principal” “promoting a positive community for morale” “community or collaborative capacity” know the influence of incoming teachers “being collaborative with teachers”</p>
---	---	---

Instructional Leader roles. Preservice teachers’ expectations of the principals’ Instructional Leader role (Table 3) encompasses four roles ranging from negative (Critic), neutral (Observer/Evaluator), to positive (Mentor and Advocate). The Critic role was described by participants as a principal who “puts rubrics to you [the beginning teacher]” or is very critical and unsupportive of the new teacher’s instructional choices. Some participants openly stated that if principals only came into their classroom to evaluate them without other communication, they would not go to them for support. For example, one participant said, “If they just come in with a rubric without telling me what they are looking for, I won’t go [to them] for help or guidance.” On the far extreme, participants reported a fear of termination of their job due to the principal’s role as critic.

Participants’ expectation of the principal’s observer/evaluator role comprised those concepts that were professional norms and relatively neutral in nature. For example, multiple participants mentioned that they expected the principal to “come in and check on teachers” and “come in and see what’s working, what isn’t and give feedback.” It is important to note that some participants specifically brought up their expectation of the principal to provide “model lessons” in the process of evaluation and feedback.

On the positive end of the spectrum, preservice teachers see principals as mentors and advocates. As mentors, participants expect the principal to use their professional experience to guide and improve the instruction of teachers through observation, communication, feedback, and constructive criticism. It is important to note that this expectation of the mentor is very different from the role of a critic described above; here, participants expect feedback and support, not just filling in an evaluation form. For example, one participant stated that “the principal can help me because of their experiences and I expect them to give me a good evaluation and additional support.” Another participant emphasized the importance of communication between the principal and new teachers by stating that “genuine feedback is appreciated.”

Finally, in the advocate role, preservice teachers expect the principal to support teachers in conflict situations such as having instructional or student issues. Beyond that, in the advocate role, participants expect the principal to value them, be curious about them, and reassure them. For instance, one participant stated that “I hope the principal values me and makes me feel I’m worth hiring.” The intersection of these two roles is an emphasis on supporting the instruction and classroom management decisions of teachers.

Table 3. *Principals’ Instructional Leader Role Continuum*

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER		
NEGATIVE	NEUTRAL	POSITIVE
<p><u>CRITIC</u></p> <p>“putting rubrics to you” “advocacy not part of their job” “not as forthright as colleague” “keep bringing up problem area” “I won’t go for help or guidance” fear of termination</p>	<p><u>OBSERVER/EVALUATOR</u></p> <p>delegate evaluations “coming in, seeing what’s working, what isn’t” “model lessons” “give feedback” “complete observations” “come in and check on teachers”</p>	<p><u>MENTOR</u></p> <p>has classroom experience from before “they have more experience” “help me b/c their experience” “give good evals and additional support” “genuine pov appreciated”</p> <p><u>ADVOCATE</u></p> <p>principal resolves issues “supports teachers in conflict” “support decisions we make” “values me” “I’m worth hiring”</p>

Development of Expectations of Principals’ Roles

Based on the experiences of participants, it seems that teacher preparation field experiences affect preservice teachers’ expectations of principal roles. A prime example is the experience of one of the Practicum I participants, who had extensive relationships and interactions with their K-12 principal but absolutely no contact with the principal during her practicum. In this case, they preferred the extensive involvement of the principal that they experienced in her K-12 experience, but believe that the lesser practicum experience will be what actually occurs in their future career. When asked if they would hold overly ideal expectations of the principal (based on her K-12 experience) if they had not had the practicum experience of an Absent principal, they responded, “Yes, I think I would be very optimistic. I think I would, but, I’m really grateful that I was placed at the school I was for my practicum because I think that this has given me a clear picture.”

In contrast, a Practicum II participant experienced a “hands-on” principal in their practicum but an Absent principal in their own secondary middle school and high school experience. This field experience changed their expectations from a neutral generic norm to a specific positive role. When asked if they held any specific expectations of the principal before practicum experiences, they responded,

No. Not to the extent that I have seen them involved now...I figured they were just there to make sure everything was working how it was supposed to, and to be...in charge. But now that I’ve seen the hands-on version, I like it a lot.

One participant was enrolled in Practicum I but ended up having to postpone their practicum. Their experience of the principal’s roles was one that became more and more removed from the classroom as they progressed through higher grades during their own K-12 education, similar to the Practicum II participant discussed above. This participant did not, however, have a practicum experience and therefore their original K-12 belief remained the foremost expectation:

When I was in elementary school, the principal was really involved in a lot of school events, was really personable with a lot of the students and with that also interacted a lot with the teachers. Which is really great, and I started going to higher, higher levels that you came a little bit more disconnected and just kind of an entity that was there if students messed up, which I suppose it is probably a source of my idea of the principal being a layer slightly separate from the teachers even now.

One salient finding with implications for teacher education is that coursework was not considered impactful to preservice teachers' expectations with regard to the principal or even supervisory roles of administrators. When asked in interviews if they had discussed roles of principals or administrators in coursework or classes, participants generally stated that they had not: "I can't really think of a specific moment or discussion or a chapter that I read or any lecture where they talked specifically about what to expect from your principal or what you should talk to your principal about". Likewise, another participant stated:

I would say barely. I remember in a couple of my textbooks and mentioning the importance of our relationship with your administration, but it was never the center of a lesson or it was never really discussed at large with my instructors or my peers.

Discussion and Implications

Expected Roles of the Principal

Understanding that negative roles exist within preservice teachers' expectations is one of the major contributions of this study to the literature on principals' roles in novice teacher induction. It is known that negative management and leadership styles exist in expectations (Bodycott, Walker, & Chi, 2001). This study highlights that preservice teachers' expectations of principals' roles form a spectrum from negative to neutral to positive. In essence, the principal is always expected to enact the two roles of School Leader and Instructional Leader; at question is where on the spectrum the roles will be found.

Preservice teachers perceive a principal's invisibility in classrooms as prioritizing the management of the school over individual interactions with teachers from the principal's perspective, enacting the "time manager" sub-role of the School Leader. In fact, one of the roles in the negative spectrum of the school leader is actually the opposite of the dereliction of principal duties, the Micromanager. In this case, preservice teachers think that if principals show up in the classrooms too often, they are too involved and too structured, leading to a negative image of micromanaging what teachers do. This study shows that both the Absent Principal and the Micromanager exist simultaneously in preservice teachers' expectations of the principals, with the idea of micromanagement being more prevalent.

This study also contributes to the idea of a combined role of Visionary Leader and Culture Leader. In preservice teachers' expectations, the roles of leading a collaborative school culture and leading with a shared vision are inextricably linked. As vision is more effectively transmitted through a collaborative school culture (Wong, 2004), this expectation may be due to the experiential nature of the principals' role itself. Those who had developed this specific role expectation had done so through field experience that embraces a collaborative culture.

Unexpected Roles of the Principal

Certain roles that are described in the literature fall outside of the preservice teachers' expectations in this study. Wood (2005) specifically delineated the role of "novice teacher recruiter" which is not reflected in preservice teacher expectations in our study. Preservice teachers do not expect to be directly recruited by the principal. In many cases, preservice teachers reported that they were not informed of hiring practices and processes in the field of K-12 education. Nevertheless, preservice teacher participants were acutely aware that termination was the responsibility of the principal.

Another role is the “mentor facilitator” role, which does appear in preservice expectations, but it is extremely vague. Preservice teachers expect the principal to be somewhat involved in the mentor-mentee assignment but do not have a clear picture of what this entails. In this role, it is important that the principal considers several factors with regard to matching the mentor and mentee, such as subject area, teaching style, and the strengths and weaknesses of both the mentor and mentee (Andrews & Quinn, 2005). Beyond this, the principal is also expected to facilitate the mentoring process through the provision of a vision of the professional standards of the school as well as time for the mentoring to occur (Gumus, 2019). Preservice teachers, on the other hand, view this facilitation as a facet of the principal's role in building and maintaining a collaborative school culture but not as an explicit, stand-alone role.

Implications for School Leadership

The expectations of preservice teachers regarding principals' roles in induction will become their initial beliefs when they enter the teaching profession. Therefore, the findings in this study have strong implications for school leadership development. The role of the principal as a mentor coordinator and facilitator (Wood, 2005) is vague in the expectations of preservice teachers. As such, principals should make sure to include beginning teachers in the process of selecting and pairing mentors, making efforts to explain to them the rationale behind mentor selection decisions. In addition, although preservice teachers understand well that principals play the role of an evaluator of their work, they also hold the expectation of the principal in the role of a mentor due to their prior teaching experiences and expertise. Thus, principals may need to make sure to communicate with beginning teachers about the purpose and procedures of evaluation before observing their teaching, and more importantly, provide genuine feedback and further support after the evaluation is done. Otherwise, new teachers may have a negative perspective of the principal's role in evaluating them, only providing critiques without actual feedback and support. Finally, preservice teachers in this study demonstrate their expectations of the principals' role in providing a clear vision and creating a collaborative culture for the entire school. Although the Visionary Leader and Culture Leader are not new in school leadership development, it is important for principals to rethink how to convey their vision clearly to new teachers at the beginning of their job and include their input in the process of developing new visions.

Implications for Teacher Induction and Teacher Education Program Design

Induction program design and implementation should take into account the expectations for principals' roles that preservice teachers hold. Preservice teachers in this study see teacher induction within the framework of collaborative culture, which serves as a vehicle to convey their ideas and affect change in the school. Aligned with the preservice expectation, induction structures should be collaborative in nature. The collaborative structure can provide professional and personal support to beginning teachers, foster socialization, and facilitate collaboration among peers. With mentor teachers' and/or principals' formative assessment (Schwille & Wolf, 1996; Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008) rather than acting as a supervisor, beginning teachers will not only accept the induction process but also be an active agent within it (Assucao-Flores, 2010; Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

Due to the fact that the teacher education program in the study solely focuses on preservice teachers' learning to teach inside the classroom, preservice teachers did not have a clear understanding of the format or process of induction. Research has long discussed what role teacher education programs should play in teacher induction (Feiman-Nemser, Schwille, Carver, & Yusko,

1999; Wong, 2004). In order to enhance preservice teachers' understanding of teacher induction, teacher education programs should build coursework and field experiences that go beyond classroom teaching. Although it is impossible for preservice teachers to fully experience the complexities of novice teacher induction and how principals work in induction, even rudimentary knowledge may help them have a clear understanding of the process of induction and develop expectations that are aligned with current roles of principals in induction.

The study demonstrates that preservice teachers who experienced Absent Principals in field experiences simply extended the neutral, normed expectations of their role. Those who experienced a positive interaction with the principal had a more developed and complex vision of the positive roles that principals could encompass, thus impacting their preferences but not necessarily their belief that all principals behave in the same manner. The study has not explored what specific interactions with the principals may make a difference. Future research should explore field experiences that expose preservice teachers to induction, including understanding principals' roles in it.

Conclusion

This study used grounded theory method to explore preservice teachers' expectations of principals' role in teacher induction. Two broad roles, the school leader and the instructional leader, were identified as a spectrum of sub-roles from negative to neutral to positive. The principals' role as a School Leader formed a continuum from absent/micromanaging (negative) to administrative manager (neutral) to vision and culture leader (positive). The principals' roles as an Instructional Leader formed a continuum from critic (negative) to observer/evaluator (neutral) to mentor and advocate (positive). Another finding is that teacher preparation field experiences affect preservice teachers' expectations of principal roles. This study bridges a gap in the literature regarding preservice teachers' expectations of the principals' roles in novice teacher induction. Based on the findings, researchers could follow the continuum of induction from preservice through inservice and investigate the consequences of these developed role expectations.

References

- Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Queen, A. J., & Cowan-Hathcock, M. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of their induction program experiences. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 80(3), 137–143.
- Andrews, S. P., Gilbert, L. S., & Martin, E. P. (2007). The first years of teaching: Disparities in perceptions of support. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 4–13.
- Andrews, B. D. A., & Quinn, R. J. (2005). The effects of mentoring on first-year teachers' perceptions of support received. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 78(3), 110–117.
- Angelle, P. S. (2002). *T.O.S.S. it to the new teacher: The principal's role in the induction process*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, February 14–16, 2002).
- Angelle, P. S. (2006). Instructional leadership and monitoring: Increasing teacher intent to stay through socialization. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(4), 318–334.
- Assuncao-Flores, M. (2010). School cultures and organizations and teacher induction. In J. Wang, S. Odell, & R. Clift (Eds.), *Past, present, and future research on teacher induction: An anthology for researchers, policy makers, and practitioners*, (pp. 45–56). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Bickmore, D. L., & Bickmore, S. T. (2010a). A multifaceted approach to teacher induction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1006–1014.
- Bickmore, S. T., & Bickmore, D. L. (2010b). Revealing the principal's role in the induction process: Novice teachers telling their stories. *Journal of School Leadership*, 20(4), 445–469.
- Biddle, B. J. (1979). *Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent development in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1) 67–92.
- Bodycott, P., Walker, A., & Chi Kin, J. L. (2001). More than heroes and villains: pre-service teacher beliefs about principals. *Educational Research*, 43(1), 15–31.
- Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(1), 37–63.
- Cherian, F., & Daniel, Y. (2008). Principal leadership in new teacher induction: Becoming agents of change. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 3(2), 1–11.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating* (3rd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage.
- Duke, D. L., Tucker, P. D., Salmonowicz, M. J., & Levy, M. K. (2007). How comparable are the perceived challenges facing principals of low-performing schools? *International Studies in*

- Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM)), 35(1), 3–21.*
- Eilers, L. H., & D'Amico, M. (2012). Essential leadership elements in implementing common core state standards. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 78(4), 46–50.*
- Feiman-Nemser, S. , Schwille, S. , Carver, C. , & Yusko, B. (1999). A conceptual review of literature on new teacher induction. Washington, DC: National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching.
- Fry, S. W. (2007). First-year teachers and induction support: Ups, downs, and in-betweens. *Qualitative Report, 12(2), 216–237.*
- Fry, S. W. (2010). The analysis of an unsuccessful novice teacher's induction experiences: A case study presented through layered account. *Qualitative Report, 15(5), 1164–1190.*
- Gumus, E. (2019). Investigation of Mentorship Process and Programs for Professional Development of School Principals in the USA: The Case of Georgia. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 7(1), 2–41.*
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2012). Beginning teacher induction: What the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93(8), 47–51.*
- Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Ishimaru, A. (2013). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education organizing in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49(1), 3–51.*
- Kang, S., & Berliner, D. C. (2012). Characteristics of teacher induction programs and turnover rates of beginning teachers. *The teacher educator, 47(4), 268–282.*
- Kober, N., McIntosh, S., & Rentner, D. S. (2013). Year 3 of Implementing the Common Core State Standards: Professional Development for Teachers and Principals. *Center on Education Policy.*
- Machado, L. J., & Chung, C. J. (2015). Integrating Technology: The Principals' Role and Effect. *International Education Studies, 8(5), 43–53.*
- Quinn, R. J., & Andrews, B. D. A. (2004). The struggles of first-year teachers: Investigating support mechanisms. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 77(4), 164–168.*
- Richards, J. (2004). What new teachers value most in principals. *Principal Magazine, 83 (3) 42–44.*
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business studies students.* Harlow: Pearson.
- Scherff, L. (2008). Disavowed: The stories of two novice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(5), 1317–1332.*
- Schwille, S. & Wolf, N. (1996). *Mentoring as professional practice.* East Lansing, MI: MSU, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681–714.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Villar, A., & Strong, M. (2007). Is mentoring worth the money? A benefit-cost analysis and five-year rate of return of a comprehensive mentoring program for beginning teachers. *ERS Spectrum*, 25(3), 1–17.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1988). Preservice teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(1), 31–40.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. *Journal of teacher education*, 40(2), 53–60.
- Womack-Wynne, C., Dees, E., Leech, D., LaPlant, J., Brockmeier, L., & Gibson, N. (2011). Teacher's perceptions of the first-year experience and mentoring. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(4), 1–11.
- Wong, H. K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP bulletin*, 88(638), 41–58.
- Wood, A. L. (2005). The importance of principals: Site administrators' roles in novice teacher induction. *American Secondary Education*, 33(2), 39–63.
- Wood, A. L., & Stanulis, R. (2010). Components of 1997–2008 teacher induction programs. In J. Wang, S. Odell, & R. Clift (Eds.), *Past, present, and future research on teacher induction: An anthology for researchers, policy makers, and practitioners* (pp. 91–108). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Yusko, B., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). Embracing contraries: Combining assistance and assessment in new teacher induction. *The Teachers College Record*, 110(5), 923–953.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 1–20, 89–99.
- Zeichner, K. G., & Gore, Y. J. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 329–348). New York: MacMillan.

APPENDIX A: Role of the Principal Questionnaire

Part 1: Open-ended

1.	Describe how you expect to receive <i>personal support</i> from your school principal when you begin your teaching career.
2.	Describe how you expect to receive <i>professional guidance</i> from your school principal when you begin your teaching career.
3.	Describe how you expect to receive <i>instructional assistance</i> from your school principal when you begin your teaching career.
4.	What actions do you expect your principal to take on your behalf? In situations and in general.

Part 2: Closed-ended

Rank each statement in the order that you believe is important or the degree to which the statement aligns with your beliefs (1st being the most important or most aligning).

{Conceptualizations} My early teaching career will...	
_____	be supported by people who help me adjust to the school and the profession of teaching.
_____	develop through continued learning on the job (experience and learning opportunities).
_____	be assisted through formal, systematic structures intended to enhance my instruction and acclimate me to my new surroundings (orientation, workshops, etc.)
{Paradigms} Support provided in my early career should...	
_____	match the general professional needs of a beginning teacher.
_____	attend to my individual needs, to help me adjust to starting a career.
_____	come from multiple places to meet my varied needs.
_____	develop me as a teaching professional, at my own pace.
_____	develop me as a teaching professional, based on national professional standards
_____	help identify my strengths, to be utilized to impact the school as a whole
{Optimism/Pessimism} I think my early career in teaching....	
_____	will be more successful and impactful than the usual beginning teacher.
_____	will be about the same as the average beginning teacher.
_____	will have much more challenges than the average beginning teacher.

{Principal Roles from Literature} My future first principal should...	
_____	foster a collaborative school environment that supports me as a beginning teacher.
_____	articulate a vision of effective instruction and provide feedback on my practice.
_____	involved in my classroom regularly and directly assist me with my practice.
_____	match me with a colleague to assist me and provide time for us to collaborate.
_____	be the one that recruits, interviews, and hires me, and later advocates for me.
{Modes of Expectations} What I expect of my future principal is...	
_____	what I personally prefer.
_____	based on experience and is what I believe.
_____	what the education profession as a whole expects.

*Note: Titles to sections in brackets {} will be omitted in questionnaire presented to participants

APPENDIX B: Interview Protocol

Semi-Structured Interview

Interview Questions

1. Describe principals in your past educational experiences (in primary/secondary school).
Can you describe any specific interactions or experiences that you had with your principals when you were a student? {episodic interview question}
2. Describe how you imagine that your principal will be involved in your early career.
(Same questions from questionnaire, but refined and reiterated for clarity)
Describe how you expect to receive personal support from your school principal when you begin your teaching career.
Describe how you expect to receive professional guidance from your school principal when you begin your teaching career.
Describe how you expect to receive instructional assistance from your school principal when you begin your teaching career.
What actions do you expect your principal to take on your behalf? In situations and in general.
3. How comfortable would you be directly communicating with your future principal?
4. In your university preparation, have roles of school leaders been discussed?
Has it impacted your expectations?
Was there any particular course, professor, reading, or other educational experience in your university preparation that impacted your expectations?
Can you describe a specific instance where principals were discussed in a course?
5. How do your current expectations compare to what you have learned in your university preparation about principals?
6. How do your current expectations compare to your K-12 experiences of principals?
7. How do your current expectations compare to your experiences in student teaching?