

THE PRINCIPALS ROLE IN BUILDING POSITIVE TEACHER IDENTITY IN
EARLY CAREER PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education
in Professional Leadership

by

Gregory A. Foulds

May 2017

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN BUILDING POSITIVE TEACHER IDENTITY IN
EARLY CAREER PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

A Dissertation for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by

Gregory A. Foulds

Approved by Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Angus MacNeil, Chairperson

Dr. Michael W. Emerson, Committee Member

Dr. Laveria F. Hutchison, Committee Member

Dr. Javier Villarreal, Committee Member

Dr. Robert H. McPherson, Dean
College of Education

May 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PAGE

It is hard to believe that I am writing an acknowledgement page for something that I did not know if I would ever achieve. The completion of my doctorate has been a dream come true, and a professional goal of nearly twenty years. Returning to school to pursue a doctorate has been a journey that has been supported by everyone in my life: family, friends, and colleagues. This capstone experience has strengthened my belief in education, in myself, and in my hope for the future.

To my father Emmett, and my mother Aimee, I am so grateful for your love, support, and guidance in my life. Every educational opportunity I have ever had, I owe to you. I am so proud to be the son of two outstanding, life-long educators who taught me the value of education and the meaning of hard work. I am the man I am today, because of your hard work and belief in me.

To my best friends, my brothers Michael and Chris, thank you for your love and friendship. I am so proud to be your big brother, and thankful for all of the wonderful times we have shared over the years.

To all of my friends and colleagues who have encouraged me every step of the way, thank you for your encouraging words, thoughts, and prayers.

To my chair, Dr. Angus MacNeil, my sincere thanks for all of your guidance, support, and belief in me. Thank you for giving me your best, and for pushing me to keep writing! Your passion for my research topic allowed me to write with conviction. I am grateful for your knowledge and experience, without which, I would not have been able to complete this dissertation.

THE PRINCIPALS ROLE IN BUILDING POSITIVE TEACHER IDENTITY IN
EARLY CAREER PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

An Abstract
of a Dissertation Proposal Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Gregory A. Foulds

May 2017

ABSTRACT

As school teaching staffs become increasingly younger, the role principals play in helping teachers develop a positive teaching identity in the first five years of their careers becomes even more important. The purpose of this study is to examine the principals' role in building positive teacher identity in early career public school teachers. Teachers who create positive teaching identities are more likely to have higher job satisfaction and are more likely to remain in the profession. This study examined school leadership and the areas in which principals can exert influence on the formation of positive teaching identity. The research questions for this study examine the principal's role in new teacher job satisfaction and efficacy; a principals' sphere of influence on new teachers, mentoring and teacher induction; the principal's role in instructional support, teacher empowerment, building teacher relationships, trust and organizational commitment. The methods for this study included the facilitation of focus groups that provided the data collection source. Two focus groups with eleven participants total were convened one time each; one for principals, and one for the teachers who work together with them. The conversations were audio-taped, transcribed, and summarized. Common themes and connections were made between and across focus groups. This study is significant because teachers need to develop positive teaching identities in order to be successful in their profession. Principals have significant influence over the identity of early career teachers. Themes found in the participant responses included communication, support, relationship building, honesty, trust, visibility and mentoring. The themes and conclusions drawn from them can be used as items for reflection to inform individual practice, and provide some insight into the formation of positive teaching identity.

Further research could examine in greater depth, these, and other possible aspects of positive teacher identity formation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I Introduction.....	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study	9
Significance of the Study	9
Research Design	9
Research Questions	9
Theoretical Framework.....	12
Assumptions, Limitations, and Scope	15
Definition of Terms	16
Summary	18
Chapter II Review of the Literature.....	19
A need for Teachers.....	19
Leadership Style Theory	24
The Principal's Role in Job Satisfaction and New Teacher Efficacy.....	31
The principal's sphere of influence on new teachers, and their role in mentoring and teacher retention.....	48
The Principal's Role in Instructional Support.....	60

The Principal's Role in Teacher Empowerment	67
The Principal's Role in creating school climate and culture	80
The Principal's Role in building Relationships, Trust, and Organizational Commitment with Teachers	84
Chapter III Methodology	110
Introduction	110
Descriptions of Research Design	111
Philosophical Assumption	114
Research Questions	115
Setting	118
Subjects	119
Procedures	121
Instruments	121
Analysis	122
Limitations	122
Chapter IV Results	124
Introduction	124

Principal and Teacher Focus Groups.....	125
Focus Groups for Principals.....	126
Focus Groups for Teachers	153
Conclusion	183
Chapter V Conclusions	184
Discussion of the Results	186
Implications for School Leaders	200
Implications for Further Research.....	202
Conclusion	203
References.....	205
Appendix A	228
Appendix B	231
Appendix C	233
Appendix D.....	235

Chapter I

Introduction

Principals of the twenty-first century are charged with leading instruction as never before. Schools are failing at consistently delivering quality differentiated, research-based instruction. In order to lead a campus that delivers top quality instruction, principals need to recruit, develop and retain good teachers. In interviews with teacher candidates it is easy to see the enthusiasm and eagerness they have for wanting to begin their careers; teaching, forming positive relationships with students and preparing them for the future. However, as teachers leave teacher training programs and enter the profession, there is often a disconnectedness between the training they receive and the realities of their first teaching assignment. First year teachers are expected to perform the same job duties as veteran teachers but often perform them with less skill and ability because they are new to the profession.

Background of the Problem

In a 2011 study by Pearce & Morrison, “Early career teachers often experience a mismatch or dissonance between idealism and reality” (Pearce & Morrison, 2011, p. 49). Other commentators go further, arguing that beginners tend to end up in the most challenging and difficult classroom and school assignments, akin to a “trial by fire.” (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 1). The work of teachers is done largely in isolation from colleagues. As a result, newcomers often experience a “sink or swim” type experience (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 1). Based on research by Ingersoll there has been a “graying” trend in education.

With the “graying” of America, as baby-boomers have begun retiring from education, American schools will only need more teachers.

According to Teach.Com, it is estimated that an additional 500,000 teachers will need to be hired by the year 2018 (2U, Inc., (2015), para. 2). However, Ingersoll states, “the peak of retirements may have passed; we found that the numbers of teachers retiring slowed between 2005 and 2009 (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 2). Since the mid-1980’s, the teaching force has dramatically increased in size, a phenomenon Ingersoll calls “ballooning.” From the late 1980’s to 2008, “total k-12 enrollment went up by 19%. During the same period, the teaching force increased at over 2.5 times that rate, by 48%” (Ingersoll, 2012, p.2). While “ballooning” has meant an upsurge in hiring, this had led to yet another phenomenon known as the “greening” of the teaching force. In 1988, there were about 65,000 first-year teachers; by 2008, this number had grown to over 200,000 (Ingersoll, 2012, p.3). However, as Ingersoll notes, “there is a sobering side to this ‘greening’ (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 3). Not only are there far more beginners in the teaching force, these beginners are less likely to stay in teaching. In short, both the number and instability of beginning teachers have been increasing in recent years.

According to a report from the Texas Education Agency, “Employed Teacher Demographics 2011-2015”, there were 347,469 teachers employed in the state during the 2014-2015 academic school year. The state had seen a steady increase in regular classroom teachers since the 2010-2011 academic school year when 340,281 regular classroom teachers were reported to be working in Texas. These numbers did decline in the 2011-2012 school year, with a report of 10,929 less teachers working than in the previous academic school year. However, since 2012, the number of regular classroom

teachers has steadily increased once again. In the 2014-2015 school year, the number of regular classroom teachers (347,469) exceeded for the first time, the numbers that were reported in 2010-2011 (Ramsey, 2016, retrieved from <http://www.tea.texas.gov>).

In another Texas Education Agency Report, “Employed Teacher Attrition and New Hires 2008-2015”, *teacher attrition* is defined as, “Loss of employees”, and it is reported that “In most academic years, the public school system gained more teachers than it lost” (Ramsey, 2016, retrieved from <http://www.tea.texas.gov>). The findings from this report are:

- “The overall number of employed teachers increased during most academic years”
- “The exception was academic year 2011-2012, when the loss of teachers exceeded gain by nearly 11,000 teachers, and the overall number declined.”
- “Numerically, attrition was highest and new hires were lowest in academic year 2011-12.”
- “Attrition has been consistent since academic year 2011-12, and new hires, since academic year 2012-13 (Ramsey, 2016, retrieved from <http://www.tea.texas.gov>).
- While the attrition rate remained relatively stable from 2011-12 until the 2014-15 school year, the percentage of new hires had increased each year with the biggest increase being from 7.6% to 11.3% between 2011-12 and 2012-13 (Ramsey, 2016, retrieved from <http://www.tea.texas.gov>).

Statistics show that the first five years are critical for teachers. If a teacher successfully completes five years of teaching, the teacher is more likely to remain in the profession. Teachers leaving teaching, otherwise known as “teacher attrition”, is especially high in the first years on the job. According to Ingersoll (2012), “Several studies, including our own analyses (Ingersoll, 2003; Ingersoll & Perda, in press), have estimated that between 40% and 50% of new teachers leave within the first five years of entry into teaching. Moreover, we have found that the attrition rates of first-year teachers have increased by about one-third in the past two decades” (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 49). In work done by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, (1986), and Ashton & Webb, (1986), “Day to day morale and commitment to teaching as a career are not only associated with attrition rates overall, but also with quality of teaching” (as cited in Weiss, 1999, p. 862). Weiss (1999) talks about teacher attrition rate and states that “Responding to this high attrition rate focuses attention on the special predicament of new teachers who, more than any other group, are most vulnerable to the effects of workplace conditions” (Weiss, 1999, p. 862).

Why is this attrition occurring? One reason may be that teachers take other jobs and abandon their first career choice: teaching. Another explanation might involve the fact that “newly qualified teachers are not adequately prepared, theoretically, practically or mentally, for the overwhelming newly qualified teacher shock” (Høigaard et al., p. 348).

S. Feiman-Nemser, (1983), states that, “Adverse workplace conditions may affect new teachers’ commitment and intentions to stay and may leave an indelible imprint on the structure and quality of teaching itself. Some claim that it is during the first year that teachers form their permanent styles of teaching” (as cited in Weiss, 1999, p. 862).

According to Nancy Protheroe (2006), it is important for principals to listen to teachers, particularly new ones, because, “Teachers begin employment with expectations about their schools and principals that can have a significant negative effect on their morale if reality does not match these expectations” (Protheroe, 2006, p. 47). What can principals do to help improve morale? According to Protheroe (2006), things like, “Understanding the value of people was high on the list” (Protheroe, 2006, p. 47).

Therefore, in order to prepare teachers for the shock of their first professional jobs, it is critical to understand what factors lead to a teacher’s decision to leave the profession. Early career teachers undoubtedly experience particularly high levels of individual stress and burnout, leading to unacceptably high levels of attrition and teacher shortages (Pearce & Morrison, 2011, p. 48). As reported by Bobbitt, Leich, Whitener & Lynch, (1994), over 20% of teachers who left the profession between 1987 and 1991, did so due to general dissatisfaction, due to the pursuit of other career interests, or due to the lack of pay and benefits (as cited in Weiss, 1999, p. 862). Also, of the American teachers studied from 1993-1995, Whitener, Gruber, Lynch, Tingos, Perona, & Fondelier, (1997), the only things added to this list were lack of, or inadequate support from school administrators, and lack of student motivation for learning. Also, noted as a reason for leaving the profession, however, was an increased concern for student discipline problems (as cited in Weiss, 1999, p. 862).

Because early career teachers do experience burnout at an alarming rate, it is also important to investigate what factors lead to job satisfaction for early career teachers. Job satisfaction is an important part of what keeps most people employed in a particular career. Taylor and Tashakkori, 1995 state, “Job satisfaction is defined as the “feelings

an individual has toward work.” (p. 220). In another study by Skaalvik & Skaalvik (2010), job satisfaction is defined as “the positive or negative evaluative judgments people make about their jobs” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1030). It can be seen as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job. Therefore, teacher job satisfaction could be regarded as “teachers’ affective reactions to their work or to their teaching role” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1030).

In summary, because the transition from student to career teacher is a difficult one, how teachers in the early years of their careers create their professional identities, while at the same time maintaining their personal selves, is an important part of understanding resilience (Pearce & Morrison, p. 48). When teachers are resilient they can stand up to the pressures of the job and continue to teach year after year. While teachers complain about students and lack of discipline, many would agree that student-teacher relationships are important. As important as these relationships are, the principal-teacher relationship can also be just as important and may greatly impact the teacher-student relationship. Principals often spend more time building relationships with students and parents than they do with teachers. With all of the emphasis on educating the “whole child”, do principals need to focus on helping teachers build positive identities of themselves as teachers?

Statement of the problem

What is teacher identity and why is it important? Noting that the transition from student teacher to teacher is a difficult one, the way in which early career teachers create their professional identities, while at the same time maintaining their personal selves, is an important part of understanding resilience (Pearce & Morrison, p. 48).

Galman 2009 found the following:

Given the difficult nature of this transition, understanding how early career teachers shape their new professional identities while at the same time enabling their personal selves to persist and remain coherent would seem to be an important part of understanding resilience. The conflicts or dissonance experienced at such moments might have negative consequences, leading to people leaving the profession, but might also have positive consequences such as new learning or motivation for change (as cited in Pearce & Morrison, 2011, p. 49).

In a study by Pearce & Morrison (2011), teacher identity was developed as one domain in a framework of conditions that appear to enhance early career teacher resilience. Identity is something that is always a work in progress. As Pierce & Morrison explain, there are two types of identities worth noting. Personal identity is how we view the world and ourselves in it. “Our public identities are those that we present to the numerous different contexts in which we engage with the everyday world and behind which our personal identity ‘persists’” (p. 49). One way to distinguish the two is by thinking of personal identity as our ‘core’ identity and our professional identity as our “situational identity” (p. 49).

Tied to identity is job satisfaction which is often associated with intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Taylor and Tashakkori discuss extrinsic satisfaction as coming from rewards “dispensed by the organization, such as salary and benefits, promotion, status, a safe environment, and job security (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995, p. 220). Conversely, intrinsic sources of satisfaction include, “the opportunity to contribute to the social welfare,

involvement in challenging work with a variety of tasks, and autonomy and discretion in pursuing job task” (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995, p. 220).

In their study, “The Effect of the Social Organization of Schools on Teachers’ Efficacy and Satisfaction” (1991), Lee, Dedrick, and Smith state that “social psychology has identified both intrinsic and extrinsic sources of information about performance as important determinants of professional satisfaction and efficacy. While intrinsic sources originate from the actual work in progress, extrinsic information comes from outside the narrow work environment” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 191). Most of teachers’ intrinsic information comes from their work with students but may also come from new teaching techniques that they have learned or new material they are going to present to students. Extrinsic information comes from the larger school context and includes things like, “salary increases, recognition and/or support from other teachers, evaluation by administrators, or increased authority over some aspect of school organization (such as becoming a department head or a union leader)” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 191).

Teachers who don’t develop a strong sense of efficacy, do not feel empowered, have a low level of trust for administration and do not develop positive teacher identities. In order to be effective, teachers need to develop positive teaching identities. These identities are based on development of self-efficacy, a sense of empowerment and trust in principal leadership. Principal leadership can make a difference in the development of positive teacher identity for teachers in the first five years of their teaching career.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to determine what principal actions lead to the development of positive teacher self-identities in early career public school teachers. For the purposes of this study, I define “early career” to refer to educators in the first five years of their teaching careers. It is believed that if teachers create positive identities they are more likely to have higher job satisfaction and are more likely to remain in the profession.

Significance of the study

This study is significant because teachers must develop positive teacher identities in order to be successful in their profession. Principals can play an important role in the empowerment of teachers, in creating job satisfaction, and in building trust and personal teacher efficacy.

Research Design

Data for this research study will be conducted using focus groups. 6, K-12 campus principals will be interviewed. 6, K-12 teachers who also work for those principals, one per principal, will be interviewed. Questions will be asked related to this study in order to determine the principals’ role in building positive teacher identity. The focus group conversations will be transcribed and the data will be analyzed by trend and theme.

Research Questions

These research questions not only guide the study but provide the basic framework surrounding which questions will be asked of research participants in the focus groups that will be conducted. Principals will be asked two specific questions that relate to the

five overarching research questions that guide the study. Teachers will be asked similar questions that will mirror those that will be asked of the principals.

1. Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?

Specifically, campus principals will be asked,

- a. Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?
- b. How does the principal support teachers as they develop their own sense of teaching identity?

Specifically, teachers will be asked,

- a. How does your principal play a role in creating job satisfaction for teachers?
- b. How does your principal support teachers in creating their own sense of teaching identity?

2. What role does the Principal play in teacher induction, mentoring and professional development?

Specifically, principals will be asked,

- a. How do you develop early career teachers?
- b. What is the best way to retain teachers in years 1-5?

Specifically teachers will be asked,

- a. Describe the efforts of your principal in working to help you build your skills as a teacher.
- b. What sort of mentoring experiences were provided to you?

3. How does the principal provide instructional support for early career teachers?

Specifically, principals will be asked,

- a. Describe how you provide instructional support for new teachers.
- b. How do you involve yourself in instructional practices on a daily basis?

Specifically, teachers will be asked,

- a. How is your principal involved in instructional practices on your campus?
 - b. How does your principal support you in your daily instructional practices?
4. How does the principal empower teachers in their daily jobs, and to assume leadership positions as they grow in their careers?

Specifically, principals will be asked,

- a. How do you empower teachers?
- b. Describe the ideal teacher leader.

Specifically, teachers will be asked,

- a. Describe your principal's leadership style.
- b. How does your principal empower teachers on campus to assume leadership roles?

5. How can a principal develop relationships, trust, and organizational commitment with early career teachers?

Specifically, principals will be asked,

- a. How do you build trust with early career teachers on your campus?
- b. How do you build relationships with teachers?

Specifically, teachers will be asked,

- a. Describe your relationship with your principal.
- b. How does the principal build trust with teachers?

These questions and their implications for this research will be discussed in later chapters.

Theoretical Framework

The power of relationships

According to a September 2003 study conducted by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, authors Cori Brewster and Jennifer Railsback quote the Sebring & Byrk, 2000 study that states,

“The quality of the relationships within a school community makes a difference. In schools that are improving, where trust and cooperative adults are strong, students report that they feel safe, sense that teachers care about them, and experience greater academic challenge. In contrast, in schools with flat or declining test scores, teachers are more likely to state that they do not trust one another” (As cited by Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 2).

Few studies have examined the issue of trust as part of successful school improvement efforts, in part perhaps because of the “fuzzy” nature of the word ‘trust’. In studies by Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003 and Young, 1998, “trust” involves risk, reliability, vulnerability and expectation (as cited by Brewster & Railsback, p. 4). “If there is nothing at stake, or if one party does not require anything of the other, then trust is not an issue” (Brewster & Railsback, p. 4). However, in school settings where risk and expectations are always there, staff are likely to be placed in situations where they are not only expected to perform certain duties, but also where their well-being depends on others fulfilling their responsibilities (Brewster & Railsback, p. 4). A more precise definition of trust is given by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s 1998 comprehensive review as detailed by Brewster & Railsback. It includes five components: (1) Benevolence (2) Reliability (3) Competence (4) Honesty, and (5) Openness. These terms are defined in a subsequent section below.

Self-Efficacy

The literature defines different types of efficacy. For example, teacher self-efficacy is defined by Tobin, Muller, Turner, (2006), as “the extent to which teachers believe their efforts will have a positive effect on their students’ abilities.” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). This is contrasted with “teaching efficacy” which is defined as “people’s overall belief that the role of teaching plays an important role in motivating and influencing students compared to other variables in the students’ environment.” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). Adam E. Nir and Nati Kranot (2006), offer similar constructs and describe the differences as SE (Self Efficacy), GTE (General Teacher Efficacy), and PTE (Personal Teacher Efficacy). SE is defined as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and

execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 205). “SE beliefs influence thought patterns, emotions, and actions in which people expend substantial effort in pursuit of goals, persist in the face of adversity, and exercise some control over events that affect their lives” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 205). GTE is defined as “a teacher’s general feeling that teaching and the educational system are capable of fostering student academic achievement despite negative influences external to the teacher” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 206). PTE is also defined as “a belief in the teacher’s own ability to advance significantly the learning and achievements of his or her students” (Nir & Kranot, p. 207). Finally, Short and Johnson (1994), define “self-efficacy” as a teacher’s perception that they “have the skills and ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning” (Short, 1994, p.4).

Taylor and Tashakkori (1995) found that lack of obstacles to teaching and faculty communication were strong predictors of teachers’ sense of efficacy. In summarizing the finding from the Tobin et al. study (2006), both organizational learning and personal self-efficacy were significant predictors of teaching efficacy for teachers (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 311). Participation in organizational learning was also found to be a significant predictor of teaching efficacy for teachers (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). In particular their data indicate that teachers’ sense of efficacy is influenced by not only their personal self-efficacy but by their teaching efficacy as well (i.e. beliefs about their teaching roles).

In the Tobin et al. (2006) study, the predictor variables that were examined were personal self-efficacy, participation in organizational learning, and organizational climate. Having already defined “personal self-efficacy”, participation in organizational

learning refers to “employee perceptions of the degree of organizational support towards learning and developmental activities” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 305). Organizational climate “refers to the qualities and attributes that exist within an organization and that may be induced by the way the organization deals with its members and environments” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 306).

The leadership style exhibited by a principal does impact the way in which climate is established on a campus. Whether it is directly or indirectly established, climate is an important part of job satisfaction. In a study by Nir and Kranot (2006), job satisfaction can be directly related to the types of job experiences that individuals have. Job satisfaction involves a highly developed sense of efficacy.

Empowerment

Short & Rinehart (1992), identify six underlying dimensions of empowerment: (1) involvement in decision making, (2) teacher impact, (3), teacher status, (4), autonomy, (5) opportunities for professional development, and (6) teacher self-efficacy (Short et al., 1992, p. 4).

Instructional leadership, mentoring and induction practices, and school culture and climate

These are all areas in which the principal can have an impact on teacher identity, job satisfaction and retention and they will be addressed further in chapter 2.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Scope

Some assumptions made in this study are that the creation of a positive teaching identity leads to increased job satisfaction and less turnover in the teaching profession (i.e. less attrition). Some of the limitations of this study will include sample size,

researcher bias, and applicability to other settings. The scope of this analysis focuses on principals and teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels of public education. The scope of the research will be limited to two (one time each) focus groups that will allow principals and teachers to tell their stories and share their experiences related to positive teacher identity. Due to the limitations and the scope of this research, the results will not necessarily be generalizable to other schools and school districts.

Definition of Terms

Positive Teacher Identity

“Personal identity is a continuing feature of our point of view in the world and is connected to our sense of personal agency. Our public identities are those we present to the numerous different contexts in which we engage with the everyday world and behind which our personal identity ‘persists’” (Pierce & Morrison, 2011, p. 49).

Resilience

“The process of, capacity for, or outcome of successful adaptation despite challenging or threatening circumstances” (Pierce & Morrison, 2011, p. 49)

Job Satisfaction

“The positive or negative evaluative judgments people make about their jobs” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1030).

Empowerment

Teachers’ involvement in decision making.

Self-Efficacy

People's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances.

General Teacher Efficacy

A teacher's general feeling that teaching and the educational system are capable of fostering student academic achievement despite negative influences external to the teacher.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

A teacher's perception that they have the skills and ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning.

Transformational Leadership

Characterizes leaders as visionary, charismatic, intellectually stimulating, and focused on innovation, creativity, achievement and growth (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Retention

The phenomenon of teachers who choose to stay in the teaching profession (stayers) as opposed to those who leave the teaching profession (leavers).

Trust

Includes aspects of risk, reliability, vulnerability, and expectation.

Benevolence

Having confidence that another party has your best interests at heart and will protect your interests.

Reliability

The extent to which you can depend upon another party to come through, to act consistently, and to follow through for you.

Competence

Belief in a person's ability to perform the tasks required by his or her position.

Honesty

A person's integrity, character, and authenticity.

Openness

How freely another party shares information with others.

Summary

Chapter 1 has introduced the research topic, including the statement of the problem, and the purpose of the study. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the literature relevant to this topic that has been used to inform and guide the direction and design of this study. Chapter 3 details the research design used to answer the research questions that are proposed for this study. Chapter 4 presents the data and its analysis. Chapter 5 contains the summary, conclusions, and limitations of this study as well as recommendations for further study and for practitioners.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Chapter II discusses the various aspects of the principal's role in creating positive identity for early career teachers. This review addresses the need for teachers and the numbers of educators that choose to leave the profession each year. This discussion will include some of the theories related to leadership styles, and a discussion about efficacy; what efficacy is, and how it is created. Finally, this review of the literature will examine the principal's role in new teacher job satisfaction and efficacy; a principals' sphere of influence on new teachers, mentoring and teacher induction; the principal's role in instructional support, teacher empowerment, building teacher relationships, trust, culture and climate, and organizational commitment.

A need for teachers

Many people would agree that teachers are among the hardest-working individuals in the world. With limited resources, and with a never-ending supply of critics, teachers bravely enter their classrooms each and every day to educate the future of America. Indeed, without teachers, the future of the planet would be at risk. No matter what country or culture one comes from, there will always be a need for teachers. According to Teach.com, there will always be a need for great teachers.

Regardless of temporary economic conditions, hiring practices, budget cuts or any other factors that impact the education system, the need for teachers is timeless and universal. Society will always need educators, and in that respect, teaching is one

career in which you can be confident you will always have a purpose. (2U, Inc. (2015), para. 1).

According to the Occupational Outlook Handbook 2010-2011, employment of teachers is expected to grow by 13% between 2008 and 2018. In 2008, there were about 3.5 million kindergarten, elementary, middle and high school teachers in the country, so we can expect almost another 500,000 to be hired by 2018 (2U, Inc., (2015), para. 2). The specific needs of schools vary from district to district. In some areas, particularly in the south and the west, there are higher needs for teachers. There is also a demand for teachers by subject, with certain academic areas needing more teachers than others. Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) education is a great example of an area where there is a high demand for great teachers (2U, Inc. (2015), para. 2). As cited in Kathleen M. Brown and Susan R. Wynn (2009), Guarino, Santibanez, and Daley (2006) note that “schools and districts must struggle to maintain standards for teaching quality while simultaneously recruiting bright new teachers and seeking to retain their most effective existing teachers” (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 38).

Teaching is a difficult task, and those individuals who criticize the work that teachers do, make the job that much more difficult. We live in an age where there is pervasive public criticism of teachers and schools, particularly in the United States. As a result, Kristine A. Hipp (1997) notes that many teachers predictably experience significant doubts about the value of their work with students. (Hipp, 1997, p. 1). Why is there such a high need for teachers? In part, it may be because many people in society feel that teachers are underpaid. It could be argued that if we paid educators more money, we could attract better and brighter individuals to the profession and keep them because they

would be paid salaries that are competitive with industry. In fact, how much teachers are paid can influence quality and has an important bearing on costs. As noted by Carnoy and DeAngelis (2016), it can affect whether nations recruit the most able graduates into the teaching profession, as well as their capacity to adjust overall public spending (Carnoy & DeAngelis, 2016, p. 56). Teachers' pay has been an important issue because:

- “Teachers are generally viewed as the key to improved education; although pay levels do not directly determine teacher performance, the rewards and conditions of teaching can influence recruitment, retention and teacher morale”,
- “Their salaries represent the greater part of education spending – some 60 per cent in the case of primary and secondary education”, and
- “Teachers are generally organized into powerful collective bargaining units, often able to influence the direction of educational reform and educational costs” (Carnoy, 2016, p. 56).

However, as with most issues, there are two sides to consider. As big an issue as pay may be, it is not always cited as a primary reason why teachers leave the profession. In a 1996 study by Marlow, Inman, & Betancourt-Smith, salary did not rank among the top four reasons why teachers consider leaving the profession (as cited in Marlow et al., 1996, p. 5). Other reasons deemed to be more important included, students, emotional aspects, lack of respect, and working conditions.

Not only are teachers criticized, but school administrators fall under the same criticism(s). Principals of the twenty-first century are charged with leading instruction as never before. Schools are failing at consistently delivering quality, differentiated, research-based instruction. In order to lead a campus that delivers top quality instruction,

principals need to recruit, develop, and retain good teachers. In interviews with teacher candidates it is easy to see the enthusiasm and eagerness they have for wanting to begin their careers; teaching, forming positive relationships with students, and preparing them for the future. There is often disconnect, as teachers leave teacher training programs and enter the profession, between the training they receive and the realities of their first teaching assignment. First year teachers are expected to perform the same job duties as veteran teachers but often perform them with less skill and ability because they are new to the profession. Peter Youngs (2007) describes a principal whose leadership, despite the presence of mentors on his campus, “contributed to a professional culture in which new teachers were expected to take on the same roles and responsibilities as veterans, and many felt their needs were neglected” (Youngs, 2007, p. 125). Most administrators make a concerted effort to try and recruit and hire the most talented individuals they believe they can find. However, once hired, the same effort that was applied to the hiring process is often not sustained when working to develop and retain good quality teachers. Administrators must pay closer attention to early career teachers as they work to develop their professional identities.

It is vitally important to recruit top teaching talent, but in education, most of the effort and emphasis should still be placed on students. Students are the clients, and they are those with whom all educators are charged with educating and preparing for the future of our nation. Administrators, both at the central administration and campus levels, are in constant search of the one thing that is going to solve the difficulties of educating children. School leaders, in search of this magical fix, seem to live on the proverbial wheel-in-the-cage; where they go around and around focusing on different types of

programs related to improving student scores, engaging students in the learning process, differentiating instruction using research-based methods, and assessing student progress consistently, and with fidelity. Administrators seem to be so focused on student outcomes that they may not be spending enough of their leadership efforts on developing the teachers who deliver the instruction that leads to increased academic outcomes. They may not be spending enough time relating to early career educators who are often leaving the profession as a direct result of a lack of support from the principal.

A stronger administrative focus on new teachers is critical. Statistics show that the first five years are crucial for teachers. If a teacher successfully completes five years of teaching, the teacher is more likely to remain in the profession. Teachers who leave teaching, otherwise known as “teacher attrition”, is especially high in the first years on the job. According to Richard Ingersoll (2012), “Several studies, including our own analyses (Ingersoll, 2003; Ingersoll & Perda, in press), have estimated that between 40% and 50% of new teachers leave within the first five years of entry into teaching.

Moreover, we have found that the attrition rates of first-year teachers have increased by about one-third in the past two decades” (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 3). Why is this occurring? Besides pay, one reason may be that teachers take other jobs and abandon their first career choice: teaching. Another explanation, as noted in Høigaard, Giske, & Sundsli (2012), might involve the fact that “newly qualified teachers are not adequately prepared, theoretically, practically, or mentally, for the overwhelming newly qualified teacher shock” (Høigaard et al., 2012, p. 348). Therefore, in order to prepare teachers for the shock of their first professional jobs, it is critical to understand what factors lead to a teacher’s decision to leave the profession. Pearce & Morrison (2011), note that early

career teachers undoubtedly experience particularly high levels of individual stress and burnout, leading to unacceptably high levels of attrition and teacher shortages (Pearce & Morrison, 2011, p. 48).

It is important to understand how the principal can foster the development of positive teacher efficacy, and what strategies can be applied to strengthen it. To facilitate this, an understanding is needed of some of the various leadership styles that are exhibited by principals. A study of the literature would indicate that there are different types of leadership styles that are exhibited by principals; transformational, instructional, and shared instructional, among others.

Leadership Style Theory

In a 2014 study by Urick and Bowers entitled, “What are the Different Types of Principals across the United States? A latent class Analysis of Principal Perception of Leadership”, the authors describe these leadership styles. The purpose of the study was to identify different types of principals across the United States and to test the extent to which principal and school characteristics predict these types (Urick & Bowers 2014, p. 106). A sample size of (n=7,650) schools and principals across the U.S. was selected. The authors begin with a discussion of transformational leadership which is often measured by the degree that a principal communicates a mission, encourages development, and builds community. Teachers are motivated to contribute to the improvement of the school, when this occurs. (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 99).

Transformational leadership engages and empowers teacher involvement in school leadership. Under the type of climate where teachers feel empowered, innovation occurs.

Burns (1978), Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1990) describe transformational leadership as “a valuing of an organization and members over self, in contrast to transactional leadership, in which leaders attend to managerial tasks. A transformational leader, is in opposition to a leader who manages resources and closely monitors staff or fails to intervene” (as cited in Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 100). Urick and Bowers (2014) note that Leithwood (1994) identified six factors related to transformational leadership: “Building school vision and goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, modeling professional practices and values, demonstrating high performance expectations, and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions” (as cited in Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 100). Principals who are transformational leaders create a climate that focuses on mission, professional growth and a sense of community. Transformational leadership is focused on developing people and the organization.

Instructional leadership involves leaders working directly with teachers to guide the curriculum and instruction. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) define instructional leadership as “defining the school mission (setting and communicating goals), managing the instructional program (evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress) and creating a positive school climate (protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining visibility, and providing incentives)” (as cited in Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 101). The behaviors closely resemble those of the transformational leader, but with an expanded focus on the instructional program.

Urick and Bowers (2014) define the two main differences between instructional and transformational leadership. 1) In transformational leadership, teachers perform the

instructional tasks as their designated role. Transformational principals do not guide the curriculum and instruction or monitor student learning. Transformational leaders spend their time directly building community through support of the needs of teachers and the community through the “transfer of school goals to personal goals” (Urlick & Bowers, 2014, p. 101). 2) Instructional leaders build a positive climate through professional development and coordination and attainment of instructional goals (Urlick & Bowers, 2014, p. 101). It is important to note that instructional leaders do not work to build a climate. The focus is rather on the creation of a positive climate as an indirect result of a common and successful focus on instruction (Urlick & Bowers, 2014, p. 101).

Transformational leadership promotes increased engagement of teachers, while instructional leadership focuses the work of principals and teachers around instruction.

The third leadership style as defined by Urlick and Bowers (2014), is shared instructional leadership; leadership that promotes the collaboration of principals and teachers around instruction. Shared instructional leadership is described as a “synergistic power of leadership shared by individuals through the school organization” (Urlick & Bowers, 2014, p. 102). According to Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton (2010), this leadership style is marked by building a positive climate for teachers through the communication of a mission, shared decisions, supportive professional development, a sense of teacher community, and public relations with the outside community, all to promote an environment where teachers feel empowered and committed. “Teacher commitment and empowerment generated from effective leadership behavior has been found to increase performance and student achievement (As cited in Urlick & Bowers., 2014, p. 102). Guarino and others (2006), note that “Teachers who are empowered and

committed within their position are less likely to leave their job” (As cited in Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 102). Additionally, in multiple studies, including one by Hallinger and Heck (2011), “When principals gain “synergy” within the school, capacity is developed through teacher empowerment and the experience of continued success and reciprocal effects” (as cited in Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 102).

In their study, Urick and Bowers (2014) investigated the relationship between transformational and shared instructional leadership by plotting the standardized mean scores of shared instructional leadership by transformational leadership. By graphing the relationships they found that principals who practiced high-shared instructional leadership also exhibited characteristics of high transformational leadership. The authors “assigned the term *integrated leadership* to schools that exhibited both transformational and shared instructional leadership” (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 103). Again, the synergy that is created around the integrated style of leadership supports innovation and change.

In summary, transformational leadership utilizes particular strategies for building positive climate by communicating a sense of mission, providing for professional growth, and a sense of community. Instructional leadership takes a more direct approach, or top-down approach, in that it builds climate through high-visibility of the principal and offering of reward (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 103). It is important to note again, that instructional leadership adds one component not found in transformational leadership: the coordination of the instructional program. Finally, the shared-instructional leadership style allows teachers shared responsibility for organizational change and leadership centered on instruction. There is clearly a good deal of overlap amongst these styles (Urick, & Bowers, 2014, p. 103).

Do leaders reflect on their own leadership styles? Urick and Bowers (2014) is important because, as of the writing of this research, no studies had been done to examine the different types of principals on the basis of their own perceptions of their leadership styles. A limitation of this study is that “more evidence is needed to describe the types of leaders that exist and how these different types align with current conceptions of transformational, instructional, and shared instructional leadership using a large generalizable sample rather than evidence that urges principals to practice one leadership style over another” (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 105). As stated earlier, a random sample of 7,650 principals across the U.S. was studied. After reviewing the different principals’ responses, Urick and Bowers labeled the three principal types that emerged as *Integrating, Controlling, or Balkanizing* (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 112-113). These are the titles they gave to the styles that the principals surveyed saw themselves as providing their schools. The majority (59.3%) of the sample was identified as Integrating Principals. The remaining portion of the sample was split between the Controlling group (24.07%) and Balkanizing (22.0%) subgroups (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 113). These following titles were derived from the work of Marks and Printy (2003) who defined them as follows:

- **Integrating Principals** are those who “utilize multiple styles to ultimately build a synergy between themselves and teachers”
- **Controlling Principals** are those who demonstrate “more frequent principal leadership” and,

- **Balkanizing Principals** are those who exhibited “less frequent principal leadership and more frequent leadership shared with teachers” (as cited in Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 113).

According to the research, Integrating Principals reported more often the weekly practices of managerial tasks, transformational leadership, and instructional leadership and reported the greatest degree of teacher influence over managerial tasks and instructional leadership. This dual attention paid to their own leadership practices and the shared practices with teachers marks the Integrating Principal type. (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 116).

Controlling Principal types reported less frequency of managerial tasks and transformational and instructional leadership behaviors, which were fairly close to the Integrating Principal type. However, the Controlling type perceived their teachers having the least amount of influence over instructional leadership and managerial tasks. This difference is what defines the Controlling group. Members of this group practice the leadership behaviors themselves, but share the least amount of leadership with their teachers (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 116).

Balkanizing Principals reported weekly attention to managerial tasks and transformational and instructional leadership yet reported a higher degree of teacher influence over those tasks compared to Controlling Principals. The Balkanizing Principals appear to be the opposite of the Controlling Principals. They had the lowest frequencies of attending to transformational and instructional leadership even though the differences among the three groups was fairly small (Urick & Bowers, 2014, p. 117).

Both Balkanizing and Controlling Principals were less likely to meet district or state accountability goals, compared to Integrating Principals were less likely female (Urlick, & Bowers, 2014, p. 117). Specific to the Balkanizing type, these principals tended to serve in schools with fewer minority students and lower enrollment and were more often located in rural areas.

Still, based on the Marks & Printy study (2003), “Principals and schools may be simultaneously distributed along two dimensions of leadership: transformational leadership, which focuses on principals engaging teachers in the organizational processes of the school, and shared instructional leadership, which focuses on principals distributing leadership tasks to teachers and building a synergy between themselves and teachers around issues with curriculum, instruction, pedagogy and professional development” (As cited in Urlick & Bowers, 2014, p. 117-118).

In summary, the Integrating Principals had high transformational and high shared instructional leadership. There was less variation in the practice of this leadership style compared to the other types. This indicated that the Integrating Principals self-perceived high transformation and shared-leadership philosophies. By contrast, the Controlling type perceived they were leading their schools in management tasks and transformational and instructional ways, but were not distributing this leadership to their teachers. The Balkanizing type, had the lowest perceptions of their own leadership but reported that teachers had a high degree of influence over managerial and instructional tasks (Urlick & Bowers, 2014, p. 120).

In the abstract of her 2009 doctoral dissertation, “The relationship between principal transformational leadership practices and teacher retention”, Kristen Elaine Lazzaro

writes, “An implication to the field of education and more specifically principal leadership is that current and aspiring principals should be cognizant of how transformational leadership practices can help retain teachers in their schools as well as be aware of research that indicates the benefits of engaging in transformational leadership practices” (Lazzaro, 2009). As stated by Timothy Tobin, Ralph Muller, and Lauren Turner (2006), on the organizational level, “Learning might be one solution for improving the climate of schools in order to enhance teacher self-efficacy and possibly learning of students” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). Because principals do exhibit different leadership styles, self-reflection can lead to a heightened awareness of their influence on the teachers they supervise, especially early career teachers.

The principal’s role in job satisfaction and new teacher efficacy

Early career teachers do experience burnout at an alarming rate, and for this reason, it is important to investigate what factors lead to job satisfaction for them. Job satisfaction is an important part of what keeps most people employed in a particular career. As noted by Mary Shann (1998), “Teacher job satisfaction has been shown to be a predictor of teacher retention, a determinant of teacher commitment, and, in turn, a contributor to school effectiveness” (Shann, 1998, p. 67). Even before a teacher can make a commitment to the organization, principals need to work on helping teachers develop job satisfaction, because job satisfaction, as noted by Shin and Reyes (1995), “Is a determinant of teacher commitment” (As cited in Shann, 1998, p. 67). Overall, “Teacher satisfaction influences job performance, attrition, and ultimately, student performance” (Shann, 1998, p. 68). Job satisfaction is defined succinctly by authors Taylor and Tashakkori (1995), as the “Feelings an individual has toward work” (Taylor &

Tashakkori, 1995, p. 220). Another definition is offered by Skaalvik & Skaalvik (2010), who note that job satisfaction is “The positive or negative evaluative judgments people make about their jobs” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1030). Satisfaction can be seen as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job.

Therefore, teacher job satisfaction could be regarded as “Teachers affective reactions to their work or to their teaching role” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1030).

Ronit Bogler (1999), in citing Heller, Clay and Perkins, (1993), says that, “The education craft succeeds or fails depending on the way teachers feel about their work, and how satisfied they are with it. Therefore, it is not surprising that researchers suggest that ‘schools must give more attention to increasing teacher job satisfaction’” (as cited in Bogler, 1999, p. 4). Bogler (1999) cites research, (Macroff 1988, Rossmiller 1992) that shows a relationship between job satisfaction, participation in decision making, and transformational leadership. When teachers have the perception of their principal as someone who shares information and communicates openly, they report greater job satisfaction (Bogler, 1999, p. 5). Teachers may also positively affect satisfaction from their work, when they view their occupation as one “that provides high, status, promotion opportunities for talented individuals, possibilities for self-development, and personal growth, among other things...” (Bogler, 1999, p. 6).

Sergiovanni (1967), in testing Herzberg’s “two-factor theory” concluded that “‘satisfiers’ accounted for achievement, recognition and responsibility, and the ‘dissatisfiers’ included the interpersonal relationships with peers and subordinates, supervision (technical), school policy and personal life” (as cited in Bogler, 1999, p. 6). Another identified satisfaction was noted by Bogler (1999) as teachers’ perceived

autonomy in the classroom that was positively correlated with teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 1999, p. 6).

Collective job satisfaction may be just as, if not more important than, individual job satisfaction when it comes to retention and the effects that job satisfaction can have on the organization as a whole. Odell & Ferraro, (1992), note that, “Recently, the organizational supports of new teachers have been linked to their retention” (as cited in Weiss, 1999, p. 862). In an on-line article entitled, “How to Increase Job Satisfaction and Employee Morale”, author Jane Spark (2016), comments that, “Job satisfaction is the most important factor which highly reduces employee turnover and cost as well.” This article is written for a non-educational audience, but the consequences that are noted as a result of lack of job satisfaction are equally applicable to schools and education. While high employee turnover might give an advantage to rival firms in industry, in education, as in industry, job satisfaction may be the most important piece of a healthy working environment (Spark, 2016, p. 6). Among the benefits of organizations providing job satisfaction, these are particularly noteworthy for education:

- “It highly reduces employee turnover and it maximizes employee morale, it helps in retaining the skilled manpower and reduces the cost of recruitment and training.”
- “Lack of job satisfaction highly demotivates the employees due to the increase in stress; prolonged stress can cause mental pressure and serious health issues.”
- “Job satisfaction increases the morale of the employees and creates interest to perform work in an efficient manner” (Spark, 2016, p. 7).

Pearce & Morrison (2011), note a link between the development of positive teaching identity and resilience. When teachers are resilient they can stand up to the pressures of the job and continue to teach year after year. As critical as teachers are of students and as much as they complain about students and their lack of discipline, most would still agree that student-teacher relationships are extremely important. As important as these relationships are, however, the principal-teacher relationship is just as important and may greatly impact the teacher-student relationship. Principals often spend more time building relationships with students and their parents than they do with teachers. Teachers who don't develop a strong sense of efficacy do not feel empowered, have a low level of trust for administration, and do not develop positive teacher identities. In order to be effective, teachers need to develop positive teaching identities. These identities are based on development of self-efficacy, and trust in principal leadership. Principal leadership can make a difference in the development of positive teacher identity for teachers in the early years of their teaching career.

The types of job experiences that you have, be they positive or negative, can impact how you view yourself in that particular environment. Stated another way, Nir and Kranot (2006), note that job satisfaction can be directly related to the types of job experiences that individuals have, and that job satisfaction involves a highly developed sense of efficacy (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 213). The literature defines different types of efficacy. For example, teacher self-efficacy is defined by Tobin, Muller, and Turner (2006), as "the extent to which teachers believe their efforts will have a positive effect on their students' abilities." (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). This is contrasted with "teaching efficacy" which is defined as "people's overall belief that the role of teaching plays an

important role in motivating and influencing students compared to other variables in the students' environment.” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). Nir and Kranot (2006) offer similar constructs and describe the differences as SE (Self Efficacy), GTE (General Teacher Efficacy), and PTE (Personal Teacher Efficacy). SE is defined as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 205). “SE beliefs influence thought patterns, emotions, and actions in which people expend substantial effort in pursuit of goals, persist in the face of adversity, and exercise some control over events that affect their lives” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 205). GTE is defined as “a teacher’s general feeling that teaching and the educational system are capable of fostering student academic achievement despite negative influences external to the teacher” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 206). PTE is also defined as “a belief in the teacher’s own ability to advance significantly the learning and achievements of his or her students” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 207). Finally, Short and Johnson (1994), define “self-efficacy” as a teachers’ perception that they “have the skills and ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can affect changes in student learning” (Short & Johnson, 1994, p. 4). Nir and Kranot (2006) argue that “transformational leadership is more likely to increase teachers’ on-the-job challenge and support their initiatives and, in so doing, increase their job satisfaction which is a significant factor in their perceived PTE.” (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 213). Transformational leaders are more likely to influence the types of job circumstances or experiences that enable individual satisfaction and therefore, allow PTE to develop (Nir & Kranot, 2006, p. 213).

In the Tobin et al. (2006) study, the predictor variables that were examined were personal self-efficacy, participation in organizational learning, and organizational climate. “Self-efficacy” (SE) was defined previously, “Participation in organizational learning” refers to, “Employee perceptions of the degree of organizational support towards learning and developmental activities” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 305).

“Organizational climate” refers to, “The qualities and attributes that exist within an organization and that may be induced by the way the organization deals with its members and environments” (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 306). Taylor and Tashakkori (1995) found that lack of obstacles to teaching and faculty communication were strong predictors of teachers’ sense of efficacy (as cited in Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). In summarizing the findings from the Taylor and Tashakkori (1995) study, both organizational learning and personal self-efficacy were significant predictors of teaching efficacy for teachers (as cited in Tobin et al., 2006, p. 311). Participation in organizational learning was also found to be a significant predictor of teaching efficacy for teachers (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). In particular, the data indicate that teachers’ sense of efficacy is influenced by not only their personal self-efficacy but by their teaching efficacy as well (Tobin et al., 2006, p. 313). Høigaard, Giski, and Sundsli, (2012) in quoting Bandura (1986) state that,

Teachers’ beliefs in their efficacy affects their general orientation toward their educational process and their specific instructional activities. Teachers with low efficacy are associated with strict regulations and negative sanctions to get students to study and are generally pessimistic about students’ ability to improve. Teachers with high efficacy seem to (a) be more open to new ideas and are more willing to experiment with new methods (b) exhibit greater levels of planning and organization (c) display greater

enthusiasm for and commitment toward teaching (d) be less critical of students when they make errors and work longer with students who are struggling and (e) experience a greater number of teacher flow experiences (as cited in Høigaard et al., 2012, p. 348).

Høigaard et al., (2012), note that research indicates that teachers with low perceived efficacy are the ones most likely to drop out of the profession (Høigaard et al., 2012, p. 348). There have also been studies that link efficacy and burnout. In quoting Bandura (1997), Høigaard et al., (2012) explains that “teachers with low teacher efficacy seem to cope by avoiding dealing with academic problems while teachers with high perceived efficacy direct their efforts at resolving their problems” (as cited in Høigaard et al., 2012, p. 348). Teachers with low efficacy focus inward to deal with their emotional stress and cope by withdrawing, which only increases their emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization (Høigaard et al., 2012, p. 348). Leung and Lee (2006) also found that the exhaustion dimension of burnout predicted teachers’ intention to leave the profession (as cited in Høigaard et. al., 2012, p. 348).

In their study, “The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers’ efficacy and satisfaction”, Lee, Dedrick, and Smith, (1991), state that “social psychology has identified both intrinsic and extrinsic sources of information about performance as important determinants of professional satisfaction and efficacy. While intrinsic sources originate from the actual work in progress, extrinsic information comes from outside the narrow work environment” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 191). Most of teachers’ intrinsic information comes from their work with students but may also come from new teaching techniques that they have learned or new material they are going to present to students. Extrinsic information comes from the larger school context and includes things like,

“Salary increases, recognition and/or support from other teachers, evaluation by administrators, or increased authority over some aspect of school organization (such as becoming a department head or a union leader)” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 191). Lee et al. (1991), focused on the social dimensions of schools as organizations and to “teachers’ expressions of satisfaction with their work and perceptions of their efficacy in doing that work” (Lee, et al., 1991, p. 191). Stipek and Weisz (1981) define efficacy as “a person’s perceived expectation of succeeding at a task or obtaining a valued outcome through personal effort. It is, thus, a cognitive process that involves identifying a goal, assessing the necessary effort and abilities to achieve that goal, and predicting the outcome” (as cited in Lee et al., 1991, p. 191). Some might confuse the idea of satisfaction with efficacy, but Lee et al., (1991) regard these as two distinct elements. They state that “satisfaction” comes as an affective response to achieving efficacy. Ashton and Webb (1986), state, “Efficacy for teachers, is based on their perceived ability to affect students’ learning, whereas satisfaction derives from the value that teachers place on this activity” (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 191). According to Maehr (1987), efficacy and satisfaction “operate as two parts of a whole” (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 191). They reflect general feelings about the job based on a person’s feelings about the work environment as well as based on a person’s cumulative work experiences. Bronfenbrenner (1976) reported the two most influential factors in determining teachers’ self-efficacy which are:

1. The types of students in the classroom and 2. The amount of control a teacher has in determining the classroom environment (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 191). The latter of these two is of most interest in this study. Cooper, Burger, and Seymour (1979), and McNeil (1986) note that having control over one’s environment may help establish

feelings of efficacy by helping teachers determine how they establish their own work goals and by what criteria the goals will be measured as successful. Teachers who have control over their curriculum and materials can change the learning environment (as cited in Lee et al, 1991, p. 192). Teachers who have sufficient control over classroom discipline, are more likely to organize the daily agenda and control the class as opposed to those who lack control, which often leaves those teachers feeling ineffective.

“Teachers without control over the classroom environment are unable to make independent decisions concerning daily work goals and work operations” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 192). This lack of control could contribute to stress that teachers feel when dealing with the daily struggles of teaching and may produce a lower sense of self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

In citing research by Bryk and Driscoll (1988), Lee et al. (1991) argue that how schools are organized strongly influences overall teacher satisfaction and efficacy. The organization referred to here is not regarding policies and procedures, but an organization centered on communication and overall organizational goals. There is a distinction made between a “loosely coupled structure” versus an “integrated structure.” In a loose structure, the activities of one person have little impact on the work performance of another person, and vice versa (Lee et al. 1991, p. 192). As Bidwell (1965) and Lortie (1975) note, this structure characterizes school teachers in that they work in isolation away from their peers, and as such have limited knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms of other teachers and students (as cited in Lee et al., 1991, p. 192). Meyer and Rowan (1978), and Weick (1976) remark that this “detachment of instruction from the formal management system is in part, a buffering mechanism that allows public

schools to operate as institutions that respond to external demands without necessarily altering their core operations” (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 192.) This comment would indicate that what goes on in the classroom on a daily basis, is often separate and apart from long-range planning. Forsythe and Hoy (1978) note that due to the fact that teachers are separated from one another, each operates in “an information vacuum about the whole organization” (as cited in Lee et al., 1991, p. 193). In Fuller and Izu (1986) and Hoy and Ferguson (1985), an unfortunate consequence of this isolation may be that teacher’s goals (which are different for their students) are sometimes at odds with the overall goals of the school due to a lack of consensus about goals and mission, (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 193), The only source of feedback for teachers regarding their own performance may be found in their own classrooms.

An integrated structure, by contrast, would involve more consensus on shared mission, Bryk and Driscoll (1988), Purkey and Smith (1983), and Rosenholtz (1989) (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 193) and purpose with communication among members of the organization, Rosenholtz (1987), as part of the daily operation of the school (as cited in Lee et al. 1991, p. 193). Bridges and Hallinan (1978), Forsyth and Hoy (1978), Little (1982) and Rutter (1986) all note that the amount of communication between teachers and principals has been shown to contribute to positive teacher outcomes; for example, the overall level of satisfaction, performance, and organizational efficacy (as cited in Lee et al., 1991 p. 193). Due to increased communication in such a structure, teachers working in an integrated environment have access to both “intrinsic and extrinsic sources of information about his or her performance. Such teachers are better able to establish external, goal-directed criteria about their performance” (Lee et al. 1991, p. 193). In both

structures, the reality is still that teachers work in isolation from their peers, in their own classrooms, surrounded by their students. In loosely coupled structures, due to the inherent lack of supervision or daily observation, a teachers' sense of efficacy and job performance satisfaction comes from his or her classroom environment itself (Lee et al. 1991, p. 194). In the integrated structure, outside communication about teaching and consensus on daily classroom activities, may be "supplemented by more input into school-wide choices and possibly more consensus about classroom environments or a greater contribution to the schools' goals" (Lee et al. 1991, p. 194).

A similar finding was discussed in the Lee et al., (1991) study, in which it is hypothesized that the "intrinsic sources of classroom performance determines a teachers' sense of personal efficacy." (Lee et al, 1991, p. 194). Furthermore, they hypothesize that, "such factors are related to the social organization of the school, in particular to members' opportunities to communicate about the goals of the organization and their work within it" (Lee et al. 1991, p. 194.) In this quantitative study, the authors sampled, 8,488 teachers in the 307 public and 47 Catholic high schools from an earlier survey (High School and Beyond HS&B) that they had used in 1984. They created teacher-level dependent and independent measures. They found a strong relationship between "teacher efficacy and the amount of control teachers have over classroom conditions, which supports previous findings in the literature" (Lee et al. 1991, p. 195). It was also found that self-efficacy seemed to be related to the types of students that teachers teach (Lee et al., 1991, p. 195). In spite of the large salary differentials between public and private schools (private salaries are often lower), the researchers did not find a relationship between salary and efficacy (Lee et al., 1991, p. 196). What did appear to be highly

interrelated were staff influence, innovation, and responsiveness ($r > .5$). Also, principal leadership and staff influence on decision making were strongly related ($r = .536$). The authors are careful to note that “The analytic framework here implies different effect of social organization on teacher efficacy with various amounts of control by teachers over their classroom conditions. “It seems more logical to view teacher control as a function of school organization, rather than as a characteristic that varies among teachers within a school.” Therefore, “we regard teacher control as both a *function of* and an *aspect of* school organization” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 198). The results of this research study, show that, in general, in schools who have principals who are viewed as strong leaders, where the sense of community is strong, and where teachers have more control over their teaching, there exists a higher sense of efficacy. Conversely schools with less orderly environments are more likely to have teachers with lower efficacy (Lee et al, 1991, p. 201). It was also found that teacher demographics (race and sex), salary, experience, or subject matter, were not affected in the variation in efficacy. While the academic ability of students taught by individual teachers is important to their overall sense of efficacy, it was the social rather than the academic aspect of the organization of schools that “affects teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy and satisfaction” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 202).

Teachers, in reality, base their satisfaction and judge their sense of efficacy on both intrinsic and extrinsic information. In this study, it was determined that by far, the major source of efficacy and satisfaction, is intrinsic (Lee et al., 1991, p. 203). “Both the students’ level of ability and the degree to which teachers sense that they control classroom practices are both strongly associated with efficacy” (Lee et al., 1991, p. 203).

The overall strongest predictor of teacher efficacy is community. “Schools in which teachers feel more efficacious are likely to be environments in which human relationships are supportive” (Lee et al. 1991, p. 204).

Based on the research presented here, how teachers view themselves and their ability to teach can be directly influenced by effective professional leadership. According to Kristine A. Hipp (1997), in citing studies by Rosenholtz (1989), Bryk, and Driscoll (1988), states that “Empirical studies on teacher perceptions of school leadership have contributed greatly to knowledge of the effects of principals’ behaviors on alterable conditions within schools in which teaching and learning take place. Research is rich with evidence that teachers’ sense of efficacy significantly relates to student achievement and changes in teacher behavior” (as cited in Hipp, 1997, p. 3). “The extent to which principals actively engage in key instructional behaviors and leadership practices which help give direction, purpose and meaning to teachers’ work offers credence to the continuing notion that principals do make a difference” (Hipp, 1997, p. 3).

Hipp (1997), also states that “few studies involve systematic inquiry into the specific strategies principals apply either directly or indirectly to influence a sense of optimism and efficacy among teachers toward the future of education” (Hipp, 1997, p. 3). The extent to which principals can engage in key instructional behaviors and leadership practices helps give direction, purpose and meaning to the work teachers do.

For example, Efrat Kass (2013) writes a research study that notes, that it is the “human aspect of the teacher-principal relations” that is the determining factor in a teachers’ sense of professional self-efficacy” (Kass, 2013, p. 208). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2007), among others, note that a teachers’ sense of self-efficacy has a

great deal to do with the quality of their teaching as well as their interactions with students. The teachers with a strong sense of self-efficacy are more committed to their profession and to their work and are able to impact, with greater success, student achievement (Kass, 2013, p. 209). The purpose of the Kass (2013) study was to explore what leadership practices of principals either hinder or promote the development of teacher efficacy from the teachers' perspectives. This study specifically focused on the organizational aspects of those practices which promote efficacy, including "teachers' belief in their ability to influence decision-making processes, ascend the hierarchical ladder, and take part in shaping school policies" (Kass, 2013, p. 209). Therefore, "the purpose of this study was to explore, in the organizational domain, how teachers from opposite groups (high and low self-efficacy) describe common practices of their principals, which promote or hinder their sense of professional self-efficacy" (Kass, 2013, p. 209). Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy and Hoy (1998) cite that the principal plays a large role in determining the level of self-efficacy of the teaching staff (as cited in Kass, 2013, p. 210). Several studies have also shown (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Ross, 1994) that a high sense of teacher self-efficacy is "associated with less pressure placed on teachers as well as management that is considerate of its teaching staff's needs and welfare" (as cited in Kass, 2013, p. 210). Kass (2013) used both a quantitative approach, for selecting participants, as well as a qualitative one, for obtaining data. The participants were 357 women teachers from the center and south of Israel. A questionnaire was developed using a population of 1,100 Israeli teachers, but because 90% of the teachers in Israel are female, Kass ultimately decided to focus on 30 female teachers and their principals. The data was grouped into five categories or themes: "Modes of

communication, feedback from the principal, social atmosphere, strength of the principal, and shared values” (Kass, 2013, p. 215). LSE (Low Self-Efficacy) teachers complained that the principal gave ambiguous messages and that those in turn effected their self-efficacy negatively. HSE (High Self-Efficacy) teachers felt that they could admit their failures in front of the principal and had the opportunity to even criticize the principal within accepted boundaries. In contrast, LSE teachers complained that principals hid things from them and covered up or concealed problems. HSE teachers reported that regular feedback from the principal increased their sense of self-efficacy, while LSE teachers regarded a lack of communication as negatively affecting their self-efficacy. They felt the principal doubted their professionalism and they felt excluded from school-wide decision making. HSE teachers felt that the principal would back them up, while LSE teachers did not: “...in elementary school there is always a struggle to stay above water...you do what you can and then, when something happens, there is no backing... I believe that even if I complained to the principal, he wouldn’t have the strength to help me...” (Kass, 2013, p. 218). HSE teachers believed that the principal always acted in the best interest of the school and that the principal allowed them to have more freedom in their work. In summary, HSE teachers characterized the principal as someone who “was willing to show fierce determination for the benefit of the school” (Kass, 2013, p. 220). This principal would hire only the best teachers, would not demonstrate an ego, would be considerate to his teachers and give them the freedom to act in ways they deemed appropriate even when those ways weren’t exactly his own. “Teachers in the high sense of self-efficacy group outlined the autonomy granted by their principals, and how it made them act more effectively” (as cited in Kass, 2013, p. 221). In the Bass & Avolio model

(2004), the fourth transformational form of leadership known as “idealized influence” is what allows leaders to demonstrate their strength and confidence and in so doing they encouraged “the teachers to do likewise, empowering teachers through their strength” (as cited in Kass, 2013, p. 222). The leadership of principals as characterized by HSE teachers was primarily transformational while the principal described by the LSE teachers was someone who did nothing or who had adopted a more passive leadership style. “It is this interpersonal dimension of the principal’s role that the teachers of both groups perceived as most crucial for their sense of self-efficacy. The human dimension of teacher-principal relationships is the decisive factor determining those teachers’ sense of professional self-efficacy” (Kass, 2013, p. 222).

Detris Crane and Reginald Leon Green (2013) conducted a study with regard to teacher and principal relations. The study sought to determine if teacher job satisfaction was enhanced when principals practice a set of 13 core competencies. In an age when falling test scores on state assessments can cause teacher-principal relations to become strained, Hardy (1999), Tye and O’Brien (2002), note that “Increasing pressure from principals for teachers to raise student achievement can be problematic and can cause some teachers to experience lower morale, decreased job satisfaction, or even exit the profession” (as cited in Crane & Green, 2013, p. 34). Crane and Green (2013) looked at 13 competencies as developed by Green (2010):

1. “Visionary Leadership”
2. “Unity of Purpose”
3. “Learning Community”
4. “Instructional Leadership”

5. “Curriculum and Instruction”
6. “Professional Development”
7. “Organizational Management”
8. “Assessment”
9. “Reflection”
10. “Collaboration”
11. “Diversity”
12. “Inquiry”
13. “Professionalism” (as cited in Crane & Green, 2013, pp. 35-36).

Crane and Green (2012) sought to determine to what extent, if any, school leaders utilize the thirteen competencies and how they affect their behavior as leaders, and to what extent teachers perceived leader behaviors to be influenced by the competencies. Also examined was what, if any, relationship exists between job satisfaction of teachers and their belief that their leaders are influenced by the thirteen competencies. A significant correlation was found to exist between teacher job satisfaction and their perception that their leaders’ behavior was informed by the competencies.

Barth (2006) notes that the nature of the relationship between the principal and the teacher has a greater influence on students and on the culture of the school than anything else (as cited in Crane & Green, 2013, p. 37). It is important to note, as Goodlad (2004) points out that it cannot be assumed that the relationship with the leader is the only thing that affects teacher satisfaction, but rather, it is important to determine overall, the factors that lead to teacher satisfaction (as cited in Crane & Green, 2013, p. 37).

The principal's sphere of influence on new teachers, and their role in mentoring and teacher retention

A principal's influence and relationship building is critical for all teachers but no more so than for new teachers. Teacher turnover costs the United States about seven billion dollars annually (Wallis, Healy, Hylton, & Klarreich, 2008). In Mentorship: Toward Success in Teacher Induction and Retention (2005), author Sonya Vierstraete notes that mentoring programs are a good way to help retain new teachers to the profession and to help them succeed. Boreen, Johnson, Niday, and Potts (1993), report that 30% of beginning teachers will leave the profession within the first five years of their career" (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005, p. 381). And sadly noted by Gonzales and Sosa (1993), the teachers who leave the profession are often the most talented and creative (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005, p. 381). Smith and Ingersoll (2004), reported that "Having a helpful mentor who taught in the same field reduced the likelihood that a new teacher would leave the profession by 32%" (As cited in Youngs, 2007, p. 128). Steffy & Wolfe (1998) add, "These valuable teachers are leaving the profession not because of a lack of skills and knowledge, but rather because of a perception of a lack of efficacy. They feel overwhelmed by the professional demands that exist and do not feel a sense of accomplishment, achievement, and success" (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005, p. 385). Podsen and Denmark (2000) define mentoring as "Helping novices speed up the learning of a new job or skill and reduce the stress of transition, improving instructional performance of novices through modeling by a top performer, and socializing novices into the profession of teaching" (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005, p. 383). The relationship of mentor is a special one in which both parties benefit mutually from each other, and one in which both parties are able to grow both personally and professionally. Boreen,

Johnson, Niday, and Potts, (2000) note that the quality of the first year teaching experience may have greater impact on a teachers' retention than either the college preparation program or on their prior academic experiences (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005).

In order for mentoring programs to be successful, principals need to take an active role because the success of these programs, depends in large part, on the level of involvement and commitment the principal makes to mentoring. Principals need to make sure that mentor/protégé pairings are made appropriately, make sure that the programs are closely monitored, and then ensure that they are evaluated effectively at the end (Vierstraete, 2005, p. 390). Brock (1999) offers several steps that are important to include in the implementation of mentoring programs including, "defining the needs of beginning teachers, selecting mentors, defining mentors' roles, providing training for mentors, staying personally involved with both mentors and protégés, and evaluating the program" (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005, p. 387). Principals are wise to include teachers in the planning of mentoring relationships because the expertise of a particular campus' teachers will allow for a program that will be tailored to best meet the needs of that campus. Principals can also initiate the use of an assessment questionnaire or checklist, Brock (1999), Gordon (1991), Newton et al. (1994), that can help principals create a mentoring program that will meet the needs of the teachers at a particular school (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005). Mentors should be selected on the basis of their willingness to work with new teachers and not just on their seniority at the school, and as Podsen and Denmark (2000) suggest, the success of mentor/protégé pairings depends in large part on matching grade level and specific content area (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005). If mentors

and protégés are not matched appropriately, the mentoring relationship is not going to work as well as it might otherwise. And even in a worst case scenario, “Mismatched mentor relationships will tend to fall apart or fizzle out, and this could leave the beginning teacher without support or alone” (Vierstraete, 2005, p. 388).

Principals helping teachers not only succeed in their current assignment, but in the teaching profession in general, is an important role they play, in supporting new teacher efforts. The principal needs to be directly involved in a mentoring program in order for it to be successful. Also, it is important to note that the relationship between teacher and administrator should not be overlooked. The principal not only serves as the mentor to the teacher mentor, but also as the “secondary mentor to the beginning teacher” (Vierstraete, 2005, p. 389). DePaul (2000) added that beginning teachers who establish good relationships with their principals create a network of benefits that likely will last past the beginning year of teaching (as cited in Vierstraete, 2005, p. 389). In summary, Vierstraete (2005) notes that “The principal is a key player in the program; he or she needs to take part in the initiation of the program, help define the needs of beginning teachers, select mentors and define mentors’ roles, provide staff training, stay personally involved, and evaluate the mentorship program” (Vierstraete, 2005, p. 390). Brown & Wynn (2009) note that “Principals’ support for mentoring and induction programs, particularly those related to collegial support, appears to play a prominent role in beginning teachers’ decisions to quit or to remain on the job” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 43).

Tom Ganser (2001) argues in his research on “The Principal as New Teacher Mentor”, that the principal can have a major impact on the success of a new teacher mentoring

program. He suggests that the principal should even have candid discussions with job candidates during the interview about the school's mentoring programs. Ganser believes that if teachers perceive the level of support through mentoring to be strong, they may leave the interview with the overall impression that the school wants them to succeed (Ganser, 2001, p. 39). It is also the principal's responsibility to be involved in the selection process for mentors. The principal needs to be clear and articulate the responsibilities for what is required of any prospective mentors in a school. Mentors should be given time and flexibility, and be freed from other job responsibilities in order to meet with their protégé, even daily, in order for the program to succeed (Ganser, 2001, p. 40). The principal can also impact the success of the mentoring program in two ways: By paying close attention to teaching assignments and by orienting faculty and staff. The principal should make sure, if at all possible, that the mentor and protégé are teaching the same subject, and are even teaching in close proximity to one another. This would also include, looking at their teaching schedules to further help accommodate meeting times. Principals should make an on-going effort to keep their faculty informed of the mentoring program and how it ties in to the overall professional development program in place at the school (Ganser, 2001, p. 40).

Closely related to mentorship is "induction". Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) define *induction* as "A planned, sustained, and systemic approach to ushering a new teacher into a career" (Bickmore, & Bickmore, 2010, p. 446). Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) note that a teacher's success really depends largely on the experience that he/she has during the early years of teaching; whether or not those years are marked by personal learning and growth or are marked by struggling and coping to survive day to day (Bickmore &

Bickmore, 2010, p. 446). Several studies, Odell and Ferraro (1992); Schlechty and Vance (1983); Serpell and Bozeman, (1999), point to the fact that teacher retention rates are greatly increased when teachers are systematically inducted into their careers. Retention rates ranged from 84% to 97% for 1st through 5th-year teachers (as cited in Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 447). Many reasons exist for why teachers might leave the profession including working conditions, too many demands on their time, while reasons for remaining include resources needed for teaching, opportunities for professional growth, collegial relationships, autonomy, input in decision making, etc. (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 447). Whether or not teachers' professional as well as personal needs are met (Gold, 1996), impacts their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with teaching (as cited in Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 448). Professional needs include things like "knowledge, skills, content-specific strategies, pedagogy, and personal reflection. Personal needs encompass new teachers' sense of self through confidence guiding, developing feelings of effectiveness, encouraging positive self-esteem, enhancing self-reliance, and learning how to handle stress" (as cited by Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 448).

How are induction programs evaluated? In the Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) qualitative study, narratives are examined to discuss the impact that induction programs can have on novice teachers. The stories that novice teachers told about the positive role of the principal became a point of interest in their research (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 453). In 19 of the 48 stories in this study, principals dominated the narratives told by the teachers. In their findings, Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) noted that principals met specific needs of their teachers. Specifically, "The principal is key in establishing the

personal needs of respect, belonging, self-esteem, and autonomy” (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 457). The stories revealed themes that emerged from the stories that the novice teachers told about interactions with their principals. Specifically, principals impacted a range of needs including “Competence, respect, belonging, confidence, autonomy, and self-esteem” (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, 464). The major conclusion from their research includes the fact the principal be viewed as an integral part of the teacher induction process. The interactions that principals had with teachers impacted the school climate and the experiences that teachers had with their induction programs (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 465).

In a 2007 study of elementary teachers, Peter Youngs examined the ways in which elementary principals in Connecticut influenced the induction experiences of new teachers and their own personal backgrounds and professional beliefs influenced the ways in which they approached new teacher induction (Youngs, 2007, p. 101). According to data from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), there is an indication that 30% of first year teachers in 1999-2000 either left teaching at the end of the year or moved to another (different) school district the next year (as cited in Youngs, 2007, p. 102). Youngs argues that due to the fact that little research has been done on the role of the principal in induction practices, there is a need for developing a better understanding of their roles in this process. Specifically he studied six elementary principals in three districts and observed their direct interactions with teachers as well as how their actions and the decisions they made indirectly impacted new teachers. The Youngs (2007) study focused on two stages. The first stage focused on the direct and indirect interactions between novice teachers and the principal and the second stage focused on how direct

and indirect interactions with the principal were influenced by the principals' backgrounds and beliefs (Youngs, 2007, p. 112). Youngs (2007) observed both dynamic and strong, weak and ineffective leadership, in his study, and determined that elementary school principals can impact new teachers through both direct interaction with them, and also through the facilitation of the new teachers' work with their mentors. Other research includes induction as part of a menu of initiatives needed for success.

Of note in the Paul Watkins (2005) study are his recommendations for strong induction programs, mentoring and coaching. With regard to induction programs, they should be characterized by:

- A strong mentor who is assigned to the new or novice teacher
- A program that emphasizes research as a way to inform creative practice
- A program that supports collegiality and discussion through the use of study groups (Watkins, 2005, p. 84).

Mentoring involves coaching, and good mentoring programs pair a mentor with a protégé who can learn from the mentors' experiences. This mentor (coach) can give regular feedback and assist the novice teacher by offering non-judgmental feedback, using data to drive discussions, and including guidelines for growth for the new teacher. (Watkins, 2005, p. 84). The principal can also impact the mentor-protégé relationship by providing time and resources that allow the mentor to visit the protégé's classroom for the purpose of observation.

Watkins (2005) writes, "Effective teaching is not intuitive. Whether new teachers come to the classroom as a second career or directly from a teacher education program,

they all share the need for support and belonging” (Watkins, 2005, p. 83). Induction and mentoring fill that need.

Why is it important to retain good teachers? According to Watkins, “Retaining and developing quality teachers must become a principal’s priority. The stakes for children are too high to do otherwise” (Watkins, 2005, p. 83). Teachers need not only clear expectations set by principals, but they need to be empowered with the freedom to go out and teach. Principals can also have an impact on how they nurture environments in order to help new teachers take control of the ways in which they teach. New teachers, Watkins argues, must be encouraged by the principal to develop their own identity. “Teachers cannot be left to figure things out in a vacuum” (Watkins, 2005, p. 83).

In Brown and Wynn (2009), principal leadership is studied in order to determine what leadership styles are practiced by principals who have high teacher retention rates versus those who do not. These authors note three negative side-effects of teacher turnover. Teachers leaving the profession, can result in a shortage of good teachers, a lack of continuity for students and staff, and can cause school leaders to have to devote more financial resources to recruitment rather than retention (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 37). As recent as 2004, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future predicted that over two million new teachers would need to be hired by 2014, to replace not only retirees, but to respond to the increased demands for hiring, demanded by demographic and policy changes (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 37). Teachers are the single most important determiner of student academic growth from year-to-year and they are the single most important factor that influences student learning. The first way to ensure that students are successful is to hire the best teaching staff (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 39).

Ingersoll (2001) states that teachers are leaving the profession long before retirement age. Only 12% of teacher reduction each year can be attributed to retirement. The reason she argues is that, “The pool keeps losing water because no one is paying attention to the leak. ... We’re misdiagnosing the problem as recruitment when it’s really retention... We train teachers poorly and then treat them badly- and so they leave in droves” (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 40). Ingersoll (2001) notes that the problem is not a shortage of teacher candidates but rather a problem with teacher turnover (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009). The financial cost of teacher turnover is noted by Moir (2003). “Advertising for open positions, reviewing applications, conducting criminal background checks, and orienting new staff members are just a few of the budgetary expenses that systems incur when a teacher leaves the classroom” (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 41). Ingersoll (2000) also notes that about a third of teachers who are dissatisfied and leave the profession do so because of a lack of administrative support (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 42). Principal leadership and school climate can have a big impact on whether or not teachers choose to remain at their schools. “School leaders play an important role in shaping building-level factors that can affect new teachers’ attitudes toward the profession and their sense of efficacy as educators” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 43).

What strategies are effective leaders using to retain teachers? In the Brown and Wynn (2009) study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with twelve principals who were studied to determine what strategies they used to retain teachers. The study was conducted in a southeastern state in a small urban school district comprised of 32,000 students in 45 schools that were diverse in terms of student demographics enrollment, and

programs (Brown & Wynn, 2009). After the data were analyzed and coded by theme, it was noted that all of the principals interviewed talked about finding best “fit” when hiring teachers for their schools. Once they found the best “fit” (teachers who would integrate well with, and work well within existing teams), the principals talked about building bonds with their teachers as well as placing them properly (Brown & Wynn, 2009).

Most of the principals interviewed look for teachers who:

- “Are knowledgeable and eager to reach every student”
- “Have a passion for educating the whole child”
- “Love, respect, and put children first”
- “Know how to build relationships and connect with their students”
- “Engage and challenge each and every child” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 49).

Brown and Wynn (2009) note that every hiring decision was made with the student (child) in mind. Their schools are run for the students, not the adults. In addition to valuing kids, principals reported that they are looking for teachers who have a vision for quality teaching. This includes willingness to not only work with students, but their parents as well, with other teachers who teach the same students, and with a focus on communicating and supporting good teaching that is responsive to student needs (Brown & Wynn, 2009). When asked about their primary role in relating to teachers, the principals in the study listed “support” as their primary answer (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 51). Interestingly, the same principals interviewed noted that lack of support was the primary reason given for teacher attrition. “It’s harder than they thought. They’re not getting what they need, either from the kids or the parents or the staff or the principal”

(Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 52). Principals characterized *support* as leadership that is committed to growth and development of teachers and not just punitive evaluations. They characterized support as having an open-door policy where teachers are free to come and openly discuss their concerns in a supportive environment. “It’s about protecting your new teachers, setting them up for success to begin with and providing a safety net just in case” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 52). One principal told a new teacher, “Look, I believe in you. I hired you because of the skills and talents you have, and now we’re going to make it work. You’re not alone in this. This is us together. So what do we need to do?” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 52). The principals interviewed in the Brown and Wynn (2009) study made note of what they called the “Gumby Philosophy”. You need to “Bend, mold and twist yourself in whatever direction is needed for the circumstances at the time” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 52). Included in this philosophy, is making yourself available to teachers to spend time with them, and to listen to them. The principals established relationships by being open and honest with teachers, thus instilling confidence in them through the principals’ consistency and fairness. Shirley M. Hord (1997) writes, “A school whose staff is learning together and participating in decisions about its operation requires a campus administrator who can let go of power and his/her own sense of omnipotence and omniscience and thereby share the leadership of the school” (as cited in Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 55). In summary, the Brown and Wynn (2009) study clearly shows that principal support of new teachers is important.

“Beginning teachers seem to value a principal who provides direction but at the same time does not stifle them” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 58). If principals can view teachers, even beginning teachers, as professionals who can exercise professional judgment, and

then vow to support them, they (principals) then make themselves more essential in the life of the beginning teacher (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 58).

Boyd, Grossman, Ing, Lankford, Loeb and Wyckoff (2011), note in a similar study that, a teacher's perception of school administration is a major factor in determining teacher retention. This study looked at the relationship between teacher turnover and school related factors that might influence teacher turnover, including but not limited to teachers' influence over school policy, and how effective the school administration was. In a study by Johnson (2006), teachers who have greater autonomy in their work, derive greater satisfaction from their work and tend to remain in the profession. In Boyd et al. (2011), "Administrative support" is defined as "The extent to which principals and other school leaders make teachers' work easier and help them to improve their teaching" (Boyd et al, 2011, p. 307). A survey was administered in the spring of 2005 to all first-year teachers in New York City. While this study included the entire sample population, a possible limitation might be that only first-year teachers were invited to participate. This study determined that of all the school contextual factors that were considered, only administrative support, after controlling for the other factors, could be considered the one factor that significantly predicted teacher retention (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 323). "Teachers who have less positive perceptions of their school administrators are more likely to transfer to another school and to leave teaching in New York City" (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 323). For teachers who reported job satisfaction as the number one reason for either leaving, or considering leaving the profession, each set of teachers was asked about what factors influenced their dissatisfaction with their job. Of importance was the fact that "over 40% of both groups identified dissatisfaction with the administration as the most

important factor” (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 327). Hardly any teachers reported dissatisfaction with the other factors including support from colleagues, respect from students and their parents, emphasis on testing or even with school safety. Fewer than 10% found their principals to be exceptional in communicating respect or appreciation for teachers, encouraging teachers to change teaching methods if students were not doing well, working with teaching staff to solve school or departmental problems, encouraging staff to use student assessment results in planning curriculum and instruction, or working to develop broad agreement among teaching staff about the school’s mission (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 327).

Additionally, 20% of teachers in the study indicated that principals did not work collaboratively with staff on curriculum and 30% did not encourage collaboration among colleagues (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 327). While these authors state that a substantial amount of literature exists to support the fact that good principals matter for teachers and students, the fact remains that principals can impact the quality of their schools’ instruction by the recruitment of, support of, and retention of good quality teachers (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 328).

The Principal’s Role in Instructional Support

As instructional leaders, a principal’s knowledge of curriculum and instruction matters for teachers and students. Research has shown (Burch & Spillane, 2003; Stein & D’Amico, 2002) that principals who have knowledge of subject matter can help new teachers develop their pedagogical skills and knowledge (as cited in Youngs, 2007, p. 103). Carver (2003), Spillane, et al., (2001), and Youngs and King, (2002) note that,

“Principals who view themselves as instructional leaders are more likely to facilitate novices’ work with mentors and colleagues and to address instructional issues in direct interactions with them” (as cited in Youngs, 2007, p. 104). In most schools that are effective, there are leaders who are focused on instruction. David W. Peterson (2001), cites Valentine, Trimble and Whitaker, (1997) who note that, “One of the most consistent findings in educational research is that high-achieving schools have strong, competent leaders” (as cited in Peterson, 2001, p.9). In the Peterson (2001) study, it is noted in discussions with principals, that their first three or four years at the same school were really focused on simply building trust, support, and climate, but then they remark that instructionally things began to take off (Peterson, 2001, p. 10). Hallinger (2005), writes that there are many examples in the literature that highlight the importance of the principal to instruction. C.M. Neumerski (2012) writes that “The aims of instructional leadership are tied to the core work of schools: teaching and learning” (Neumerski, 2012, p. 316). In the Neumerski (2012) study, the author seeks to examine what is known about instructional leadership and ascribes to the “leader-plus” philosophy which espouses the belief that instruction can and should be led by the principal but shouldered by all types of campus leaders including teacher leaders and instructional coaches (Neumerski, 2012, p. 315). During the 1970’s effective schools movement, in studies by Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds and Frederikson, (1978), and others, of all of the key characteristics of effective schools, among them was the role of the principal as an instructional leader (as cited in Neumerski, 2012). However, there was never any clear or strong definition as to what an instructional leader did or how he or she worked to make a school effective. It was noted that principals were no longer just managers of

schools but leaders of the primary work of schools: teaching and learning. Early research by Rosenholtz (1985), Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982), and Edmonds (1981), focused on the belief that successful principals were visible and were highly involved in monitoring student progress. According to Bossert et al. (1982), and Hallinger (2005), most common among the behaviors was that “Instructional leadership was to be carried out by the principal alone, and he or she was to be a strong, directive leader, focused on building school culture, academic press, and high expectations for student achievement” (as cited in Neumerski, 2012, pp. 318-319).

One way in which principals can support instruction is through the development of instructional coaches. This development allows principals to include others in instructional decision making and utilizes the expertise of instructional leaders on the campus. These could be deans of instruction or campus improvement specialists. Studies by Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004), suggest that “Teacher leaders are more effective when they have principal support, such as when the principal acknowledges the role of the teacher leader or provides time for them to work with teachers” (as cited by Neumerski, 2012, p. 325). Youngs and King (2002) also report that principals can build school capacity when they work with their teacher leaders. Datnow and Castellano (2001) also found that administrators themselves felt satisfaction when they worked with their teacher leaders on curriculum issues (as cited in Neumerski, 2012). By contrast in a study by Printy (2008), principals who were removed from instructional support were not likely to influence their teachers’ instructional competence (as cited in Neumerski, 2012). Goddard, Neumerski, Goddard, Salloum, and Berebitsky, (2010), noted that teachers who perceived their principals as engaged in instruction were

more likely to differentiate the instruction in their classrooms. Neumerski (2012) remarks that “Providing opportunities for teachers to learn how to improve instruction is sometimes confounded with actual learning.” Researchers, Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee, (1982), and Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, (1990), believe that principals should focus on those school-level factors that can influence the overall level of teaching and learning (as cited in Neumerski, 2012). For example, Hallinger (2005) proposes creating the necessary conditions for teachers to be able to learn how to improve their instruction that can lead to the desired overall school-wide instructional changes that are often needed (as cited in Neumerski, 2012).

There are many important aspects of principal leadership, including the characteristics exhibited by principals as instructional leaders. In a study by Joseph Blase and Jo Blase (1999), it is noted that instructional leadership is being shared with teachers and is being implemented in things like coaching, study teams, problem solving and reflection. This study specifically looks at what characteristics of principals positively impact classroom teaching and instruction and which characteristics negatively impact instruction. Smith and Andrews (1989) define instructional leadership as, “a blend of several tasks, such as supervision of classroom instruction, staff development, and curriculum development” (as cited in Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 350). Glickman (1985) defined five tasks related to instructional leadership which include “Direct assistance to teachers, group development, staff development, curriculum development, and action research” (as cited by Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 350). Pajak (1989) also generated a similar list but included, “Planning, organizing, facilitating change, and motivating staff” (as cited by Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 350). According to Reitzug and Cross (1993), the principal’s role “Is one of facilitating a

teacher's thinking about practice" (as cited by Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 351). In the Blase and Blase (1999) study, the authors specifically looked at a principal who had provided good staff development for his teachers and had modeled effective inquiry. He allowed his teachers to take risks and required them to justify their practices. This led to empowerment through increased collaboration with colleagues and innovativeness (as cited by Blase & Blase, 1999). Sheppard (1996) synthesized existing studies that showed that effective instructional leadership has positive effects on teacher commitment, professional involvement, and innovativeness. The principal behaviors that were associated with these effects include:

- "Framing school goals"
- "Communicating school goals"
- "Supervising and evaluating instruction"
- "Coordinating the curriculum"
- "Monitoring student progress"
- "Protecting instructional time"
- "Maintaining high visibility"
- "Providing incentives for teachers", and
- "Providing incentives for learning" (as cited in Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 353).

Blase and Blase (1999) utilized "The Inventory of Strategies Used by Principals to Influence Classroom Teaching (ISUPICT)", which was an open-ended questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to test the authors' beliefs that there are principal characteristics that influence classroom teaching and that despite these factors, teachers may or may not feel that their principals impacted their teaching positively or negatively (Blase & Blase,

1999). In the results section of the their study, the authors determined that the single most important characteristic related to instruction was the conversations or dialogues that principals held with teachers that caused the teachers to, as a result, reflect on their instruction and to become critically aware of their own personal learning and professional practices (Blase & Blase, 1999). The principals used five strategies when talking with teachers about instruction which included “making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling, using inquiry and soliciting advice and opinions, and giving praise” (Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 359). The researchers found that “using inquiry and soliciting advice were related to positive impact on teacher motivation, self-esteem, efficacy, sense of security, and reflective behavior, including greater innovation/creativity and variety in use of instructional materials” (Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 362). When principals provided staff development opportunities for teachers where attendance was not mandatory, but allowed for teacher input and focused on support for teacher innovativeness, impact was noted on teacher risk-taking, motivation, self-esteem, and efficacy. Also, principals who believed in the power of collaboration between teachers and who provided time for teachers to collaborate regularly also saw increased teacher motivation, efficacy, creativity, self-esteem, and risk taking (Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 367). The researchers stated that in the leadership behaviors noted previously, there were subthemes related to effective instructional leadership. It was noted that effective instructional leaders show authentic interest in dialogues about instruction, that interactions between teachers and principals are non-threatening, and that the interactions allow for teacher choice and discretion to choose their own methods for instruction (Blase & Blase, 1999). “Effective instructional leadership is imbedded in school culture, it is expected and routinely delivered” (Blase &

Blase, 1999, p. 368). Blase & Blase note a variety of implications for instructional leaders. Principals who are effective instructional leaders:

1. Use a broad-based approach meaning they combine reflection with the need for improvement.
2. Talk often and openly with teachers about instruction.
3. Strive to develop working partnerships that are characterized by the freedom to make mistakes in an atmosphere of trust and openness.
4. Are willing to model teaching skills.
5. Are supportive of collaboration and reflective dialogue among teachers.
6. Are intent on improving communication.
7. Provide time for teachers to connect with and communicate with one another.
8. View teachers as professionals who need opportunities to grow and develop and believe that this is best achieved in non-threatening environments free from criticism and judgement.
9. Develop programs by providing time and resources for staff development activities.
10. Promote positive school culture and climate by providing time for collaboration, teamwork, and growth in order to enhance teacher efficacy (Blase & Blase, 1999).

The manner in which campus leaders frame professional development and set schedules can impact feelings of efficacy. The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement's June 2007 newsletter includes an article entitled, "Improving Teacher Retention with Supportive Workplace Conditions". Suggestions are made for principals with regard to time, professional development and curricular resources. It is suggested

that principals are fair in the way teaching assignments are given, that they build in time for planning, either during the regular academic day, or on early-release days, and that they include teachers in discussions surrounding students and course loads ([“www.centerforcsri.org”](http://www.centerforcsri.org), June 1, 2007). It is recommended that principals encourage teachers to use data to determine professional development needs, and involve them in that decision making process. Teacher input is valuable because “Developing teachers’ abilities to educate students is at the core of successful professional development” ([“www.centerforcsri.org”](http://www.centerforcsri.org), June 1, 2007). Also, principals can impact a teacher’s perception of the working environment by providing appropriate and sufficient instructional resources. “Teachers new to the profession regularly spend many hours outside the school day locating or creating curricular materials – often at their own expense. These teachers operate in ‘survival’ mode, staying just ahead of their students and scrambling to add flesh to the skeleton of standards” ([“www.centerforcsri.org”](http://www.centerforcsri.org), June 1, 2007).

The Principal’s Role in Teacher Empowerment

Principals should hire well, provide appropriate induction and mentoring experiences, and instructional support, and then focus on empowerment. The way in which principals empower teachers, impacts commitment and longevity. In Transformational Leadership by authors, Bernard M. Bass and Ronald E. Riggio, “Empowerment” is defined as “providing autonomy to one’s followers” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 193). Empowerment is important for leadership particularly in situations where you need followers’ commitment, involvement and ultimately loyalty. Developing one’s followers is a critical component of both empowerment and transformational leadership.

Empowerment involves delegation and trusting followers to carry out the responsibilities that they have been given. The authors state, “The passing of responsibility to followers, however, is also a characteristic of laissez-faire leadership” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 193). The focus of the books’ chapter 13 is to differentiate true empowerment from laissez-faire leadership. Laissez-faire leadership is defined as a situation in which “the autonomy of one’s followers is obtained by default. (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p.193).

This type of leadership is described as hands-off leadership that is marked by a lack of care or concern for what followers are doing, busying oneself in paperwork, ignoring requests for help and responsibility for follower performance, and often being absent either mentally or physically.

Laissez-Faire leadership correlates to all of the negative aspects of empowerment but can “masquerade as empowerment” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 194). Truly empowered employees are more likely to have a transformational leader and will “Typically perform better and have better personal development” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 194).

The ultimate goal of empowerment is for followers to be able to lead themselves. “The empowering superleader educates the follower so that each learns how to act as a self-leader” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 195). Manz and Sims (1995) talk about “Superleadership” and how there are both behavioral strategies and cognitive strategies that provide structure for empowerment. Specifically, behavioral strategies relate to behaviors that a leader might want to change, whereas, cognitive strategies would allow the leader to help instill in followers a sense of those things that are naturally rewarding about the work that is done (as cited in Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 195).

Behavior focused strategies begin with self-observation and self-set goals. You must know who you are before you can lead others. In “What makes a Leader?” by Daniel Goleman, “Self-Awareness” “Is the first component of emotional intelligence” (Goleman, 2004, p. 5). As the Delphic oracle stated thousands of years ago, “Know Thyself”, self-awareness means “Having a deep understanding of one’s emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs and drives” (Goleman, 2004, p. 5). People who are self-aware are neither “Overly critical nor unrealistically hopeful” (Goleman, 2004, p. 5). They are honest with others. They know how their feelings affect them, other people and their job performance. By knowing their values and goals, a person who is sufficiently self-aware also knows where he or she is headed. The decisions that are made by self-aware people align with their values and consequently they often find their work “energizing” (Goleman, 2004, p. 6). When leaders are energized by their work, they are more likely to energize and empower their followers. Self-aware people have a self confidence that is noticed by others. “They have a firm grasp of their capabilities and are less likely to set themselves up to fail by, for example, overstretching on assignments. They know when to ask for help” (Goleman, 2004, p. 8). You must know yourself first and you must have a clear sense of your own values and ethics before you can lead, and more specifically, before you can empower others. “Existing research suggests that school leaders’ personal values play an important role in leadership decision-making” (Bussey, 2006, p. 1). Also, Allport and Lindzey (1960) note, “Values have cognitive, affective, and behavioral features, opening up opportunities to influence value change through intellectual reflection, emotional engagement, and experience (as cited by Bussey, 2006, p. 3).

By contrast, cognitive-focused strategies focus on building natural rewards into tasks, focusing thinking on natural rewards and establishing effective thought patterns.

Followers need to feel a sense of competence, self-control and purpose (p. 196). Fred Nickols (2010) describes four change management strategies, one of which is the *Empirical-Rational Change* strategy, based on work by Robert Chin and Kenneth D. Benne (1969), General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems, and Section 1.3 of Chapter 1 *The Planning of Change* (2nd Edition). This strategy argues that people are basically rational and will follow their self-interests once those have been revealed to them. Nickols argues that successful change is based on incentives. He argues that while people can be persuaded and are for the most part reasonable, they can also be bought (p. 4.) He describes the carrot part (incentive) of the carrot and stick paradigm. In order for reason and incentives to work there has to be very little in terms of a downside to the change that is taking place. If there is a big downside there must be an even bigger upside to “Null out any risk involved” (p. 2). As is described, behavior-focused transformational leaders can arrange and alter cues in the work environment in order to facilitate personal desired behaviors. If people are able to buy into change through incentives, they eventually begin to see the rewards that come from success. And even, perhaps, the natural rewards that come from work, where the work is the reward itself, begin to replace the carrots that were offered in the beginning. Having accepted, and now being motivated by the natural rewards, followers enjoy “A sense of competence, a sense of self-control, and a sense of purpose” (as cited in Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 196).

Other factors that are critical to the value of empowerment are internalization of goals, building a collective sense of efficacy, and offering a participative work environment.

Menon (2001) describes the internalization of goals as an “important component of successful empowerment of followers” (Menon, 2001, p. 197). Jung and Sosik (2002) studied 47 teams in four Korean organizations and found that leaders who empowered their workers increased the sense of collective self-efficacy which in turn influenced the extent to which teams felt they were successful or effective (p. 197). In a 2000 study by Brossait, 300 employees of a Fortune 100 Company were examined. There was a significant relationship between transformational leadership, job satisfaction and empowerment (As cited by Bass & Riggio, p. 197). Jung, Chow, and Wu, (2003) also found that “transformational leadership led to greater employee empowerment and a more creative/innovative organizational culture in Taiwanese companies” (p. 198). Finally, in a 2006 study by Spreitzer, empowerment is needed for those employees who may have a low sense of their role in an organization. “Those who have access to important organizational information, and who work in a participative environment felt more empowered” (As cited by Bass & Riggio, p. 198).

Empowerment of followers is important, but is not without its challenges. The “dark side of empowerment” according to Bass and Riggio is when the followers’ goals are out of alignment with the leaders’. This can have negative consequences on the organization because this might provide followers with the opportunity to sabotage the organization. There can still be an imbalance of power amongst leaders and followers, when the former still hold on to the power rather than encourage full self-actualization. Those leaders who rely on charisma for empowerment might also encourage an “unhealthy dependence on the leader” (p. 199). In a 1994 study by Howard and Wellins, it was concluded that “Consistent behavior should be a constant of someone in a leadership role. If this doesn’t

exist, then trust breaks down, and the whole ship begins to sink” (Howard, & Wellins, 1994, p. 201). If leaders feel that they are better at empowerment than they really are, they run the risk of becoming complacent and this could lessen their motivation to change. Additionally, “Leaders who are most out of touch with their subordinates’ reports are likely to have difficulty in establishing trust between themselves and their followers” (Howard & Wellins, 1994, p. 201). Finally, delegation is sometimes seen as being problematic because while the leader may have delegated responsibility he/she may often hold back on resources. What leaders may think of as empowerment may actually turn into laissez-faire leadership as their own work load increases (Howard & Wellins, 1994, p. 202).

An additional “dark side” to empowerment is when a laissez-faire style of management masquerades as empowerment. “Laissez-faire leaders delay and appear indifferent to what is happening. They avoid taking stands on issues, do not emphasize results, refrain from intervening, and fail to perform follow-up” (p. 206). Laissez-faire leaders

- Avoid making decisions
- Abdicate responsibilities
- Divert attention from hard choices
- Refuse to take sides in a dispute
- Are disorganized in dealing with priorities and,
- Talk about getting down to work but never really do (Avolio & Bass, 1991).

If the leader does not have the ability to compensate for these deficiencies, things can intensify to the extent to which followers no longer have the abilities to compensate.

As Bass and Riggio state, it is possible to confuse empowerment with laissez-faire leadership, but true transformational leaders are those who with “Inspiration, delegation and individualized consideration, make followers feel empowered. Empowerment heightens followers’ sense of self-efficacy and reciprocal trust between the leaders and the followers” (Bass & Riggio, p. 208).

Empowerment of those who follow us as leaders is an important part of transformational leadership. It helps define what we believe as well as how we lead. There is always a delicate balance between true empowerment and laissez-faire leadership. The more we understand ourselves, our values and beliefs, and what we intend to do with the “carrot and the stick”, the more valuable we will be to ourselves and to those whom we lead.

Teacher empowerment is an area in which principals can have great impact. According to Paula M. Short and Patsy E. Johnson in their 1994 study, “Exploring the Links Among Teacher Empowerment, Leader Power, and Conflict” it states, “Teacher empowerment has become a focus of educational reform, leadership models, and teaching effectiveness” (Short & Johnson, 1994, p. 1). They go on to state the driving force behind teacher empowerment is teacher effectiveness. “When teachers are more effective, student achievement, responsiveness to student conflict, teacher satisfaction, and the school environment improves” (Short & Johnson, 1994, p.1). Additionally, leader use of power to influence teacher action can impact teacher commitment.

S.M. Johnson (2006) notes that “Teachers are more likely to stay in schools where they have the opportunity to contribute to school-wide decision making – such as decisions about scheduling, selection of materials, and selection of professional development experiences” (as cited in Boyd et al., 2011, p. 306). Kirby, Wimpelberg, and Keaster (1992) write that any program or initiative designed to increase teacher empowerment depends to a large degree on the principal’s level of comfort with sharing decision making as well as with his or her experience with shared decision making (Kirby et al., 1992, p. 90). “Teacher empowerment is an integral component of the problem-solving process, yet it can be surreptitiously circumvented by the principal who is unaccustomed to relinquishing control” (Kirby et al., 1992, pp. 90-91). Why do some principals hesitate to share control? It might have to do with the fact the some principals justify to themselves that their central administration expects principals to be strong and to take charge. Still for others, it may be that they lack the confidence in their staffs to know whether or not they are capable of collaborative decision making (Kirby et al., 1992, p. 91). Whatever the reason, perhaps only a positive experience with shared decision making, after a little coaxing by others to try it, may convince a principal of the worth of shared decision making. The realities of the job itself are often at odds with the behaviors that are required for success with shared decision making. For example, because of the busied, fluid nature of running a school on a daily basis, decisions have to be made quickly, and oftentimes, particularly for those decisions that affect the campus leader directly, it is easier for him or her to just make a quick, on-the-spot decision. This behavior stands in contrast with what is required for shared decision making which includes things like “Reflection, deliberation, and multiple perspectives” (Kirby et al.,

1992, p. 92). It is important for principals to commit to the change that is required for shared decision making including viewing the teaching staff as a true source of expertise. “It is this strength of the collective faculty that must inform decision making” (Kirby et al., 1992, p. 92).

What are some of the factors that an effective principal needs to consider in order to implement effective, shared decision making? The members of the site-based committees and how they are selected is of primary importance. Often principals, particularly those who don’t want to share control, select members that they know will support the wishes of the principal, either by not challenging the status quo, or simply because they are weak in leadership and aren’t reflective. These types of committees rarely truly reflect the voice of the faculty as a whole and help lead schools to effective change (Kirby et al., 1992, p. 92). Principals must however, select a diverse group of teachers with which to work even if some of them might be adverse to the principal’s position. Principals should neither be afraid to develop these diverse membership groups nor be afraid of revising and replacing members of groups that are ineffective or non-productive. Maeroff (1988) claims that “faculty empowerment requires elevation of teachers in three areas: status, knowledge, and access to decision making” (as cited in Kirby et al., 1992, p. 94).

Empowerment of teachers must extend to include instructional empowerment as well. Liz Hollingworth (2012) writes that more research is needed in the area of leadership practice and specifically, in the area of leading classroom instruction. In order to improve instruction, leadership is needed to help teachers make sense of their work and to trust in their principal, all in an effort to empower teachers to help other teachers with curricular change (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 366). In the Hollingworth (2012) study, a

qualitative approach was used to examine how principals can empower teachers to implement formative assessments. A high-school principal in Iowa was examined, who had applied for a grant to implement BLT's (Building Learning Team – a type of Professional Learning Community 'PLC') in his school. One of the research questions that guided this study was, "What is the role of the school administrator in the adoption and implementation of assessment for learning?" (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 368). The themes that emerged from the data were aligned with the theory that guided this study (Black, et al., 2003, p. 113), namely that "The people in formal leadership positions should provide the leadership, stimulus, and support to make assessment for learning possible" (as cited in Hollingworth, 2012, p. 370). This research was a single site case study that was designed to learn about a single phenomenon, the formation of teacher created classroom formative assessments designed to inform pedagogical decisions made at the school (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 371). As part of the study, both the superintendent and the principal were asked to elaborate their vision for school leadership. The principal involved in the study stated, that when he first arrived at his school, he developed all of the instructional presentations for his staff, but that this "here-it-is, go do it" approach was not effective because his staff did not buy into what he was presenting. After creating a formative assessment team, of which he himself was a member, the level of participation was reported as high (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 373). Hollingworth (2012) reports that this principal saw his leadership role as two-fold: making administrative changes that allow teachers to work effectively together, but also making instructional changes in the way that teachers work in their classrooms (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 373). One of the most effective changes made, was the addition of a weekly schedule where

teachers could collectively collaborate. One day a week, the school day began twenty minutes later than normal in order to provide teachers with the time needed to work together in their BLT's or by departments. In answer to the research question regarding the role of the principal, two administrative practices that can guide other administrators stand out: 1) Time for teachers to reflect with one another and 2) Allowing teacher conversation in the professional learning communities. "For sustained change, teachers need practical support in the form of time for teacher learning and collaboration" (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 377).

In summary, one of the most powerful things that occurred during this change effort, was the fact that the principal became an active member in the process and became informed himself of the process of assessments for learning. He attended the same professional development sessions as his teachers which allowed him to better assess what types of support his teachers would need in the classroom. While he not only empowered his teachers, he demonstrated his willingness to position himself as an instructional leader. He realized that "It is insufficient for teachers to be the only staff people engaged in new learning. The knowledge base of the teacher-leader must also grow" (Hollingworth, 2012, p. 377).

As principals have utilized empowerment to expand the role of teachers in schools, they have had to recognize their own roles in empowerment efforts and the power they hold as leaders of the school. Joan Davis and Sandra M. Wilson (2000) write that "power involves the formal authority or control over organizational resources, and empowerment is the process of sharing that power" (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 349). In recognizing the work of Bass (1990) and others, Davis and Wilson (2000) remark that leadership "Plays

an important role in creating an empowering environment, one that is positive and motivating, one that promotes self-determination and self-efficacy” (as cited in Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 349). Davis and Wilson (2000) study how Principals’ Empowering Behaviors (PEB) relate to teacher motivation, or in other words, teacher intrinsic empowerment, job satisfaction, and stress. The authors used Thomas and Velthouse’s (1990) cognitive model of intrinsic empowerment as a partial framework for their study. This model is comprised of four factors: Impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 350). The terms are defined as follows:

- Impact – “The degree to which one’s behavior is perceived as producing intended effects in one’s task environment.”
- Competence – “The degree to which individuals believe they can perform task activities skillfully when they try.”
- Meaningfulness – “Concerns the values of the task, goal, or purpose judged according to the individual’s own ideals or standards”, and
- Choice – “Involves intentionally selecting actions that likely lead to desired outcomes.” (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 350).

Empowering behaviors by the principal can also impact teacher job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a function of what someone wants, as compared to what they are receiving from their job, or what they perceive they are receiving. Morse (1953) notes that an individual’s level of aspirations in an organization is related to job satisfaction. “Those with the strongest desires or highest aspirations are least happy with their job if the environment does not facilitate satisfaction of their needs” (as cited in Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 350). Stress, which is linked to low self-efficacy can be defined as “a demand

made by the internal or external environment that upsets a person's balance and for which restoration is needed" (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 350). Of special interest to the Davis and Wilson (2000) study is whether or not principals are able to influence a teacher's intrinsic empowerment, job satisfaction, or stress. The population selected for this study included teachers and principals in schools in eastern Washington state. Surveys were distributed to teachers with the assistance of the local campus principal and a teacher who agreed to collect the surveys. The questionnaires were designed to measure four variables: "PEB, motivation, job satisfaction, and job stress" (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 351). The findings in this study showed a significant relationship between PEB and teacher motivation. The higher the PEB score was, the higher the teacher motivation appeared to be. More specifically stated, "The more principals participate in empowering behaviors, the greater the impact teachers feel they are able to make by fulfilling work-related tasks" (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 352). Also noted was the relationship between job satisfaction and job stress. If teachers are more intrinsically motivated, their job satisfaction is higher, and they experience less job stress. Teachers felt that the more personally empowering the principal behaved, the more choice the teachers had in completing their work and the greater impact they could make through their own efforts (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 352). Teacher motivation and both teacher job satisfaction and teacher job stress were found to be moderately strongly associated.

Retention is also related to job satisfaction. In the June 1, 2007 edition of The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement newsletter, administered by Learning Point Associates[®] in partnership with the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL), the idea of using supportive workplace conditions to explore teacher

retention is examined. It is noted that teachers gain job satisfaction when they are able to contribute to decision making, scheduling, professional development opportunities, etc. One way to empower teachers is by creating a school-improvement team. This was done in North Carolina, and through the results of a survey, it was determined that “The effectiveness of a school improvement team at the middle and high school levels has an effect on teacher retention” (“www.centerforcsri.org”, June, 2007).

The Principal’s Role in creating school climate and culture

Of all the areas of leadership that a principal is responsible for, the overarching area that impacts it all is climate and culture. Principals are responsible for creating a productive and healthy climate and culture. The leadership style exhibited by a principal impacts the way in which climate is established on a campus. Whether it is directly or indirectly established, climate is an important part of job satisfaction. One of the principal’s primary job responsibilities is the creation of a positive climate and culture in his or her school. Stephen Swymer (1986) discusses the fact that in an age of change and of taking different directions in schools to help students achieve greater success, the one component that is needed is a positive school climate and atmosphere. If the climate is not in place, it does not matter what else is going on. He states that improvements must be made at the building level. (Swymer, 1986). “Research shows us that at the center of strong schools are strong and effective principals who are fair, consistent, capable, and visible” (Swymer, 1986, p. 89). He argues that a principal must focus on being visible and on creating a positive tone each day and attend to other duties after students and staff have left for the day. Principals must know what is going on in their buildings and must be in classrooms to observe instruction. This cannot take place in the comfort of one’s

office. Morale will also improve when the principal is in the building and is visible during the day. Visibility gives the principal the ability to hold informal conferences or conversations with teachers that help build relationships and create an atmosphere in which problems are able to be solved (Swymer, 1986). Swymer refers to “management by mingling” which is described as “Walks through the building that can give the principal a real handle on what is going on in the school and can contribute greatly to the overall positive tone and learning atmosphere” (Swymer, 1986, p. 90).

H. Karpicke and M. E. Murphy (1996) write about what principals can do inside the school to increase productivity and a positive school culture. Kaufman and Herman (1991) define organizational culture as, “A composite of the values and beliefs of the people within the organization. The values and beliefs that make up a successful organization’s culture generally are shared by all members, and the group operates within a common set of assumptions about the way things are done” (as cited in Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 26). The first thing you have to know as a leader, is yourself. Your position as a principal requires passion and courage in order to do what is right for, not only students, but for staff as well. As a leader you must stand for things also. “If you have no vision, leadership will be assumed by those who do. If your vision is unclear or poorly articulated, confusion – even chaos – will result. You must have well-developed ‘people skills’ and be able to use them wisely” (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 34). In order to impact climate in a building, several things are required:

“Forthright speech and action are challenging. Courage is required, especially where entrenchment is the target. Questions and counter-challenges should be expected. Your strongest allies are your skills in clear thinking, diplomacy, good judgment, fairness, and

consistency. These are the talents for which you were hired” (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 33).

For a principal new to a building this can be especially challenging. From day one a new principal is judged by his or her constituents as a good fit or not a good fit. The very things that are communicated by the new leader are critical for the determination of this fit. It is a good idea for the new principal to take a position of leadership that is non-threatening, a position that will lead to the creation of trust (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 27).

Karpicke and Murphy (1996) distinguish between climate and culture by stating that climate is marked by a comfortable, safe, and orderly environment, while culture is one in which all of the norms and ways of doing things are known to everyone in the organization and are followed (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 26). Often when a principal is new to a school, there are certain aspects of the climate and/or culture that must be changed and three things that the principal should focus on to help create this change are listening, responding and questioning (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 27). By truly listening to staff, principals can keep themselves from being isolated culturally, and can keep themselves involved in knowing what is truly going on in the school by enlisting the support of and help from his or her staff members. By realizing that each staff members’ perceptions and thoughts are important, the principal can receive valuable information about things that he or she might otherwise be excluded from knowing. By responding appropriately to what they have listened to, effective principals can impact culture and climate by demonstrating that they understand what is needed to help direct discussions and enrich the culture. Finally, by questioning what they have heard, principals can

provide two important elements of communication: Clarified responses and focused feedback (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 28).

The principal must decide which type of cultural model he or she is most interested in. Of the many available, Karpicke and Murphy (1996) detail two. The “McSchool” model is similar to a fast food franchise in that efficiency is celebrated and teachers are charged with turning out the same product in the same way each and every day. This “consistency” is designed to ensure predictability and uniformity. “Variation is the enemy” (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 29). In the other model, the “Spaceship Discovery” model, the principal is more like the mission control director. Like a NASA mission, each classroom is a ship and the ship’s captain (the teacher) stays in constant contact with the mission controller (the principal). The principal is available to the teacher when the teacher has a problem and actually works to become part of the solution (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996). The decision to adopt either cultural ideal really depends on the level of trust and freedom that a principal is willing to give up or share with the teachers and staff. Due to the fact that people also have varying abilities with which to accept climate and/or cultural change, the successful principal must hold forums and meetings to communicate his or her vision for the school and to ensure that a positive climate and culture are being established or re-established. “The principal who took the time to lead the input meetings developed the necessary trust to implement the change” (Karpicke & Murphy, 1986, p. 30).

How does climate impact retention? Steven T. Bickmore and Dana L. Bickmore (2010) speak to climate as an important aspect of a prerequisite for teacher induction programs designed at retaining teachers. They argue that schools that have healthy

climates are more likely to succeed in designing induction experiences for new teachers that meet both their personal and professional needs (Bickmore & Bickmore, p. 449). Principals with good communication and relationship skills are usually friendly, open, and supportive of their teachers. For novice teachers the interactions that they have with their principal can have an impact on their job satisfaction and job performance.

“Principals can promote new teachers’ professional growth through direct interactions with them” (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 449). In a study involving a principal, a new teacher, and mentor, Tillman (2005) takes the argument a step further by noting that the direct interactions that principals have with novice teachers can have an impact on them. Specifically, a lack of direct contact led a new teacher to decide that she was not valued as a staff member and even caused her to doubt her competence as a teacher (as cited in Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010, p. 449). In creating climate and in developing a shared vision, principals in a study by David W. Peterson (2001) referred to their schools as “This is a ‘we’ operation in this school, we’re all on the same page in this school, and everything we do is teacher-driven.” (Peterson, 2001, p. 10).

The Principal’s Role in building Relationships, Trust, and Organizational Commitment with Teachers

Culture and climate set the overall tone and mood of a school, but real relationship building that leads to trust and organizational commitment, is critically important and must be attended to by the principal leader.

Followers of any leader look for a leader who not only “talks the talk” but who also “walks the walk.” Followers crave personal integrity in their leadership. They desire leaders who espouse a strong sense of, not only personal identity, but personal integrity. For example, leaders who maintain a strong moral compass, to which they can either

attach to, or detach from. Simons (1999) refers to behavior integrity as “the degree of congruency between the values or actions espoused by leaders and the actual adherence to them” (As quoted by Bass & Riggio, p. 36).

Transformational leaders gain the trust of their followers by maintaining their own integrity and determination to do their jobs. Additionally, trust is garnered by treating your followers in a fair manner, by demonstrating trust and by empowering them. This can often be done through “self-sacrificial behaviors” (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House & Shamir, 1993, as cited by Bass & Riggio, p. 43). Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams (1999) “hypothesized that the transformational leader-follower commitment connection was mediated by both trust in the leader and perceptions of leader fairness (As cited in Bass & Riggio, p. 44).

David FultzBelinda Gimbert (2009), quotes a study by Colley (2002), which noted that the “Pace at which novice teachers adapt and develop and the choice to either stay or leave the profession appear to be related to a principal’s involvement with beginning teachers” (as cited in Gimbert, 2009, para. 4). The purpose of the FultzBelinda Gimbert (2009) study, was to identify interactions that either facilitated or hindered beginning teachers’ success. The questions that drove this study were: 1) “How do novice teachers experience interactions with principals? And, 2) “How do these reported interactions appear to influence beginning teachers’ success from the lived experience of the new teacher?” (FultzBelinda Gimbert, 2009, para. 4). The conceptual framework of the study centered around four themes: relationships, expectation, perceptions, and teacher development. Twenty-four participants from elementary, middle, and high schools were selected who were participating in a Peer Assistance Review (PAR) program in their

urban district in Ohio. The participants were asked to identify three actions that the principal had taken that helped the beginning teacher achieve success in their first year. After the data was collected and categorized, the majority of participants indicated that the interactions with the principal were positive. However, when asked what the principal could have done to assist a new teacher in having a successful school year, 71.4% of elementary teachers, 54.5% of middle school teachers, and 42.9% of high school teachers, stated that they desired more support from the principal than they received (FultzBelinda Gimbert, 2009, para. 31). The majority of the responses to the questions they were asked related to the theme of *relationship*. Specifically, that “effectual principals used feedback, modeling, guidance, and praise to help promote teacher reflection and success” (FultzBelinda Gimbert, 2009, para. 37). With regard to *expectation*, it was interesting to note that high school teachers wanted principals to provide supplies and resources for instruction, whereas elementary and middle school teachers were not as concerned with this. Elementary teachers wanted more *mentoring*, whereas middle and high school teachers wanted the principal to do more in terms of *professional development* (Fultz Belinda Gimbert, 2009, para. 40).

Schools are marked by either authentic or inauthentic relationships. In some schools, staff simply perform their roles as required but without much enthusiasm or genuine commitment to their task. They are simply doing a job. In order to create vibrant, authentic environments in schools, principals need to focus on authentic leadership. Hoy and Kupersmith (1984), researched public elementary school principals and report that not much research has been conducted on the authenticity of principal behaviors, in part perhaps because “Leader authenticity is a slippery concept” (Hoy& Kupersmith, 1984, p.

80). Henderson and Hoy (1982) describe three components of authentic leadership as accountability, non-manipulation, and salience of self over role. *Accountability* is a mark of a true leader. True leaders accept responsibility for their actions and for the actions of others and apologize when mistakes are made. This stands in stark contrast to those leaders who never admit to making mistakes and who blame others for their own shortcomings (as cited in Hoy & Kупersmith, 1984 p. 80). *Non-manipulation* (of subordinates) involves treating subordinates as human beings rather than things, “they avoid manipulating others as if they were objects – pawns to be moved in a game of chess.” (as cited in Hoy & Kупersmith, 1984, p. 80). The authentic leader is one who treats subordinates with care and concern and treats them with respect. *Salience of self over roles*, refers to those individuals who always defer to their role or their positions when dealing with others. They don’t operate from a compassionate, caring side, rather, they hide behind the authority given them by their role (as cited in Hoy & Kупersmith, 1984, p. 81). In summary, Hoy and Kупersmith (1984), in citing Henderson and Hoy (1982) define *leader authenticity* as “a general and consistent pattern of behavior in which subordinates perceive their leader as demonstrating acceptance of organizational and personal responsibility for actions, outcomes and mistakes; being non-manipulating of subordinates; and exhibiting a salience of self over role” (as cited in Hoy & Kупersmith, 1984, p. 81). By contrast, leader inauthenticity is “the extent to which subordinates perceive their leader to be ‘passing the buck’, to be manipulating subordinates, and to be hiding behind his or her position rather than being open as an individual” (Hoy & Kупersmith, 1984, p. 81).

Authenticity and also trust, must be present in order to build strong human relationships. Without trust, there does not exist a strong enough relationship for either party to either change behavior, or be willing to take risks. Realizing that trust is a necessary component in effective relationships with others, critical for building teams and for commitment and cooperation, Hoy and Kупersmith (1984) argue that trust is strongly linked to confidence and optimism. In order to build trust, the principal must demonstrate (Ouchi, 1981) “Openness, honesty, and candor” (as cited in Hoy and Kупersmith, 1984, p. 83). Specifically, trust is defined as “a generalized expectancy held by the work group that the word, promise, and written or oral statement of another individual, group, or organization, can be relied upon” (as cited in Hoy and Kупersmith, 1984, p. 82). Additionally, the “authenticity in the behavior of the principal was a key to explaining a climate of trust in schools” (Hoy and Kупersmith, 1984, p. 83). Halpin (1966), and Hoy and Henderson (1983) note that the principal is the most important individual for setting the tone for relationships in (an elementary) school. They note that “Trust produces trust” and that as the symbolic leader of the school, the overall faculty’s perception of organizational trust is linked to their trust in the principal (as cited in Hoy and Kупersmith, 1984, p. 83).

In the Hoy and Kупersmith (1984) study, one of the aspects of trust that was studied was “Faculty trust in the principal” and the hypothesis related to this was that “The greater the degree of perceived authenticity in the behavior of the elementary school principal, the greater the teacher’s trust in the principal” (Hoy and Kупersmith, 1984, p. 83). Hoy and Kупersmith (1984) state that principals who act like real people, who don’t manipulate teachers, who openly admit their mistakes and are candid with their teachers,

are more likely to develop trust. Because the principal is the symbolic head of the school, the more authentic she/he is, the more likely they are to engender trust in the organization (Hoy and Kopersmith, 1984, p. 86). Additionally, “As principals let themselves be treated as human beings and as teachers are freed from the fear of authority, teachers will begin to base their behavior on intimacy and trust rather than power and distrust” (Hoy and Kopersmith, 1984, p. 86). The authors make the case that principals who engage in authentic behaviors provide consideration for, and structure to teachers, take steps to build trust between themselves and their teachers.

J. Ceyanes and A. MacNeil (1998), note that, “A culture of organizational trust occurs when teachers and principals both share mutual trust” (Ceyanes & MacNeil, 1998, p. 4). When principals are viewed as competent, focused on professional growth and empowering to teachers, they are more likely to be trusted by teachers. However, the authors state that building trust is as important as, if not more important than, principal leadership, because in the absence of trust it does not matter how competent a principal may be (Ceyanes & MacNeil, 1998, p. 4). It is noteworthy that in this study, “The most important factor leading to a teacher trusting a principal is the principal being kind to the teacher” (Ceyanes & MacNeil, 1998, p. 4).

Trust in the principal/teacher relationship is important because many principals don’t operate as real leaders, but rather just rely on their title and position. The title “Principal” might engender respect for the position that results in teachers who do their jobs, but for teachers who go the extra mile, who innovate in the classroom and who are willing to help out as needed, principals need to “Command informal authority as well as formal authority” (Hoy and Kopersmith, 1984, p. 86). Without the trust and support of the

faculty, the principal is not going to be able to effectively lead and it is this informal authority and the influence that goes along with it, that makes a difference in the trust relationship. In summary, this study found the following suggestions related to the importance of trust:

- “Authenticity in principal behavior is characterized by accountability, non-manipulation, and the salience of self over roles.”
- “Principals seem instrumental in creating an atmosphere of trust or distrust in schools.”
- “Open and authentic principal behavior is a key factor in generating faculty trust.”
- “Faculty trust is needed by the principal to establish effective informal authority, which enables the principal to encourage teachers to exert extra effort, to accept added responsibility, and to innovate.”
- “Authenticity and trust are critical ingredients in promoting a healthy organizational climate where constructive change is possible” (Hoy and Kopersmith, 1984, p. 87).

According to a September 2003 study conducted by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, authors Cori Brewster and Jennifer Railsback, state that, “While it seems to be generally assumed that trust is a core criterion of successful school improvement efforts, few publications address the issue specifically or examine it in much depth. Part of the problem, no doubt, is the fuzzy nature of the word “trust” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 2). The authors admit that it is hard, from the perspective of educational researchers to tie trust to concrete outcomes like student performance or teacher retention (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 2). This article

however, attempts to examine trust from the teacher-teacher perspective and, more importantly to this study, from the teacher-principal perspective; to study the issue of trust between teachers and principals. The relationship that exists between principals and teachers can be considered an indicator for success in successful sustainment of change initiatives. If school efforts are to be successful over the long run, principals must create school cultures that are characterized by trust, collegial relationships and buy-in and support for initiatives (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 2). Also important, is that they both share the same vision for change. The Sebring and Bryk (2000) study states,

The quality of the relationships within a school community makes a difference. In schools that are improving, where trust and cooperative adult efforts are strong, students report that they feel safe, sense that teachers care about them, and experience greater academic challenge. By contrast, in schools with flat or declining test scores, teachers are more likely to state that they do not trust one another (As cited in Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 2).

When there is nothing at stake and one party does not need anything from the other, trust is really not an issue. (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 4). However, in school settings where risk and expectations are always there, staff are likely to be placed in situations where they are not only expected to perform certain duties, but also where their well-being depends on others fulfilling their responsibilities (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 4). In studies by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) and Young (1998), *trust* involves risk, reliability, vulnerability and expectation (as cited in Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 4). Hoy and Tschannen-Moran include five key components commonly used to measure trustworthiness:

Benevolence: Having confidence that another party has your best interests at heart and will protect your interests is a key ingredient of trust.

Reliability: Reliability refers to the extent to which you can depend upon another party to come through for you, to act consistently and to follow through.

Competence: Similar to reliability, competence has to do with belief in another party's ability to perform the tasks required by his or her position.

Honesty: A person's integrity, character, and authenticity are all dimensions of trust. The degree to which a person can be counted on to represent situations fairly makes a huge difference in whether or not he or she is trusted by others in the school community.

Openness: Judgments about openness have to do with how freely another party shares information with others. Guarded communication, for instance, provokes distrust because people wonder what is being withheld and why. Openness is crucial to the development of trust between supervisors and subordinates, particularly in times of increased vulnerability for staff (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 5).

Bryk and Schneider (2003), state,

In the absence of prior contact with a person or institution, participants may rely on the general reputation of the other and also on commonalities of race, gender, age, religion, or upbringing" to assess how trustworthy they are. The more interaction parties have over time, however, the more their willingness to trust one another is based upon the other party's actions and their perceptions of one another's intentions, competence, and integrity (as cited by Brewster & Railsback, p. 5).

In the best-known current and largest study on trust in schools, the same authors Bryk and Schneider, in “Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement” (2002) examined 400 Chicago elementary schools for a period of 10 years. They found that trust “Fosters a set of organizational conditions, some structural and others socio-psychological, that make it more conducive for individuals to initiate and sustain the kinds of activities necessary to affect productivity improvements” (as cited by Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 6). This occurs in four ways:

1. As faculties engage in the new and uncertain work of reform, trust among educators lowers their feelings of vulnerability.
2. Trust fosters problem-solving within organizations.
3. Trust fosters social control to the extent to which individuals need minimal supervision or external pressure placed on them to carry out their tasks.
4. Trust constitutes a moral resource for school improvement and helps to advance what is in the best interests of children. (Brewster & Railsback, p. 7).

In summary, the work of Bryk and Schneider (2002), does not guarantee that trust will create success, but makes note of the reality that without trust, schools have little to no chance of improving (Brewster & Railsback, p. 7).

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) developed a “Trust Scale” to measure the level of trust in schools and to examine the “Interrelationships of faculty, trust in students, teachers, principals, and parents” (as cited in Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 8). The scales were used in 97 Ohio high schools, 64 Virginia middle schools, and 143 Ohio elementary schools. The findings from the data generated by these surveys indicated that “When there was a greater perceived level of trust in a school, teachers had a greater

sense of efficacy – the belief in their ability to affect actions leading to success. Trust tended to be pervasive: when teachers trusted their principal, they also were more likely to trust staff, parents, and students” (As cited by Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 8). In Tschannen-Moran (2001), relationships between the level of trust and the level of collaboration in a school are examined. Her results indicated a significant link between teachers’ trust in the principal and collaboration with the principal, with trust and collaboration between colleagues and between teachers and parents (as cited by Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 8). As the 2001 Tschannen-Moran study suggests, the level of trust that exists in the relationship between parties, influences not only their willingness to work together, but also their ability to work together. The greater the trust between teachers and principals, the more likely it is that true collaboration will occur” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 9). Examining roadblocks to building and maintaining trust, is rarely an easy task. The more turnover there exists in campus leadership, the greater and more often the layoffs, the more budget shortfalls that are experienced, etc., the more obstacles may exist for establishing true trust. The obstacles that they cited are:

- “Top-down decision making that is perceived as arbitrary, misinformed, or not in the best interests of the school”,
- “Ineffective communication”,
- “Lack of follow-through on or support for school improvement efforts and other projects”,
- “Unstable or inadequate school funding”,
- “Failure to remove teachers or principals who are widely viewed to be ineffective”,

- “Frequent turnover in school leadership”,
- “High teacher turnover”, and
- “Teacher isolation” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, pp. 10-11).

The authors state that perhaps the biggest obstacle to overcome is a schools’ past. It is understanding the past history of an organization that allows schools to make the commitment to begin to establish trust and take that important first step (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 11).

Building trust between teachers and principals is key, but as Brewster & Railsback (2003), discuss, how schools approach this issue will depend on things like “School size, stability, history, existing relationships among faculty and administrators, and so on” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 12). In order to lay a proper foundation for establishing trust between teachers and principals, Brewster& Railsback (2003), suggest ten different strategies that have been examined, used and/or developed by practitioners, educational researchers and professors of education. They first suggest that it is important to demonstrate personal integrity. As a part of integrity, focus on honesty and commitment to follow through. Even though the teachers’ actions are important to the formation of trust, the authors state that “It is the responsibility of the principal – the person with more power in the relationship – to set the stage for trusting relationships with teachers and other school staff” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 12). In “Power, Risk, and Utility: Interpreting the Landscape of Culture in Educational Leadership” (2011), Lumby, and Foskett define *power* as the “Capacity of an individual or group to influence positively or negatively the psychological and material resource of others” (Lumby and Foskett, 2011, p. 447). Therefore, show that you care by taking a personal interest in the well-being of

others and be accessible. “Principals earn trust from members of the school community by encouraging open communication and actively making themselves available to teachers, parents, students, and staff” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 12). If a leader is willing to take a risk, others may be willing to take risk also. Facilitate and model effective communication by listening. “Individuals’ inability or unwillingness to listen to what others have to say, is a sure way to confound problem solving, reduce trust, and magnify feelings of isolation among administrators, teachers and support personnel” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 13). Involve staff in decision making, and celebrate experimentation and support risk. Allow teachers to try new things and have enough respect for teachers as professionals to show that you trust their judgment. Express the fact that you as the principal place value in different points of view. For example, “Being able to express concerns and disagreement without fear of reprisal is essential to building trusting relationships” (Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 13). Reduce teachers’ sense of vulnerability. Bryk and Schneider (2002) remark that “teachers need to know that their principal values their efforts, and senses their good intentions... Demonstrating through both words and action, that teachers can and should be trusted to do what is best for students” (as cited in Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 14).

Ensure that teachers have basic resources, and finally, don’t be afraid to replace ineffective teachers. Removing a staff member can negatively affect, sometimes without warning, the trust in the school. “There may be situations in which taking action to replace ineffective staff members with strong teachers who support the schools’ mission is necessary. A principal’s unwillingness or inability to remove teachers who are widely regarded as incompetent is likely to undermine his or her trust with other staff members”

(Brewster & Railsback, 2003, p. 14). Sergiovanni (1992), writes that principals should take an active role in creating the necessary conditions for teacher relationships that are both collegial and congenial (as cited by Brewster & Railsback, 2013, p. 15).

Leadership is more than a title or privilege. It involves establishing climate through building relationships, trust and collaboration. Working with teachers to help them develop a strong sense of efficacy and self-identity, paired with knowing one's own skills and what capacities are required for true servant leadership are what keep leaders current and in touch with those they serve.

In their 2008 study, "Principal Leadership: Building Trust to Support School Improvement", Hallam and Mathews, discuss trust from a study of a newly appointed elementary school principal. Using the five facets of trust, from Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), they define *trust* as "One party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is a) benevolent, b) reliable, c) competent, d) honest, and e) open" (as cited in Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 213). Related to trust is the concept of *benevolence* which is also defined as "having the confidence that one's well-being will be protected and not harmed by the trusted party" (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 213). As both parties come to know each other better and begin to trust in each other's benevolence, the confidence they have in each other builds over time. However, even if someone is reliable and benevolent, a skill-set is still required of the leader, if people are going to trust that person to lead the school. Honesty and openness are also components of trust that cannot be overlooked. "Openness strengthens the characteristics of benevolence, reliability, competence, and honesty" (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 214). Without openness, Hallam and Mathews argue that

people begin to wonder what the leader is hiding and why (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 214). Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) found that people are more willing to be vulnerable and take risks when they know that the leaders' actions contain the five facets of trust (as cited in Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 214).

Hallam and Mathews (2008) state that trust is what holds organizations together. It can be thought of as the "Bonding agent that glues together disparate parts, a catalyst that facilitates action" (p. 215). Louis (2007), argues that just the opposite is true in low-trust environments. Organizations with low trust environments are marked by employees who are distrustful and as a result are less productive and are less willing to collaborate with colleagues or take direction from someone. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) write, "One of the most difficult things about distrust is that once it is established it has a strong likelihood of being self-perpetuating, when interacting with a distrusted person, even normally benign actions are regarded with suspicion" (as cited in Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 215).

The findings from the Hallam and Mathews (2008) study are organized around each of the five facets of trust. The first facet, *competence*, is defined by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), as "The belief in another party's ability to perform the tasks required by its position" (as cited in Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 218). The interview data indicated that principals who developed a shared vision for the school and who exhibited self-trust, demonstrated the competence facet of trust. A principal who had a vision for the school and shared it continuously, inspired a sense of trust and belief in their own competence. Once this competence piece was established, followers viewed the leader as someone

who was capable of leading the school. The data indicated that it was important to also lead with confidence without being arrogant (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 220).

Benevolence was also found to be an important part of building trust. Principals need to work with teachers to try and reduce fear and anxiety that comes with their position and authority. By building trust you can help others realize that you are approachable and that you are compassionate (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 221). *Caring* is related to benevolence and caring is strongly related to whether or not people will want to follow you. (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 222). *Reliability* means that you act consistently and you follow through. School leaders who demonstrate their own reliability inspire others to take responsibility and accountability for their own work. “Sharing responsibility for a culture of trust creates ownership and self-monitoring” (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 224). Fairholm (1994) asserts that “The leader’s role is to develop an atmosphere that expects individual accountability, as well as responsibility for the needed work” (as cited in Hallam & Mathews, p. 224).

Openness as it relates to transparency in organizations is crucial to the development of trust between principals and teachers particularly during times of stress and vulnerability among staff. As people become more willing to increase their vulnerability with others they increase their levels of trust. Developing personal relationships with teachers is one way that principals can focus more on one-on-one relationships with the teachers they supervise. And finally, *honesty* relates to a person’s “Integrity, character, and authenticity” (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 227). Honesty involves acting with integrity and showing respect to others. When principals act in ways that are authentic and real, their staff who follow them, are more likely to see them as trustworthy, and therefore,

honest. As stated earlier, schools will always be charged with raising accountability standards, however, “Trust has been found to be a critical factor in building the kinds of relationships necessary to initiate rigorous school improvement initiatives” (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 229). In Hallam and Mathews (2008), honesty and benevolence seemed to be the most important, of the five themes, as related to the building of trust (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 231). “Leaders who expect their people to trust them must first demonstrate that they are trustworthy. Principals cannot simply check off desirable practices and assume that they have built enduring relationships of trust” (Hallam & Mathews, 2008, p. 232).

In addition to trust between teacher and principal, trust should be extended throughout the entire building. In the Mitchell, Ripley, Adams, and Raju, (2011) study, “Trust an Essential Ingredient in Collaborative Decision Making”, it is noted that “Trust plays a role in collaborative relationships among all parties in school” (Mitchell, et al., 2011, p. 165). Specifically, “Trust involves willingness to risk vulnerability. Without the sense of risk, it would be unnecessary to trust in the first place” (Mitchell, et al., 2011, p. 147). These authors also cite studies by Elangovan and Shapiro (1998), Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), and Lewicki and Bunker (1996), that note the fact that trust is essential to the very work of schools and that trust is essential for all relationships in schools; if trust is violated relationships prove difficult to repair (as cited in Mitchell, et al., 2011, p. 148). Mitchell et al., (2011) describe the many benefits for principals in working with teachers collaboratively. Specifically, recognizing that teachers bring skills and expertise that can help principals make sound instructional and managerial decisions. As a result of including teachers in this collaboration, principals can increase authentic teacher

involvement that can lead to increased job satisfaction and commitment (Mitchell, et al., 2011, p. 150). The authors agree that it would be difficult to have authentic collaboration between groups in schools without trust (Mitchell et al., 2011, p. 152). Mitchell et al. (2011) used trust and collaboration measures and collected data from a large suburban northeastern school district. Data were collected in the spring of 2007 and responses came from 77 elementary teachers, 25 middle school teachers, and 34 high school teachers (Mitchell, et al., 2011, p. 157). The results included finding bivariate correlations of the variables in the study and revealed that teachers who trust their principals also seem to trust their colleagues and have an overall feeling of influence over what goes on in their schools. Also, collaboration with the principal was found to significantly correlate to collaboration with colleagues. In other words, teachers who felt that they could collaborate with the principal, also felt more empowered to collaborate with other classroom teachers (Mitchell, et al., 2011, p. 160). The Mitchell et al. (2011) study states that when “Teachers trust the principal, they are more likely to collaborate with the principal on school-level decisions, and there seems to be a greater degree of trust between teachers and colleagues and teachers and parents” (Mitchell et al., 2011, p. 166). The authors note that if trust is established between the principal and teachers, then a climate of trust may be created school-wide as well. “Administrators concerned with establishing a culture of trust need to engage in open and honest communication, and they need to model and encourage trustworthy behavior between all parties” (Mitchell et al., 2011, 166).

In her April 2009 study, “Fostering Teacher Professionalism in Schools”, Megan Tschannen-Moran discusses that given the bureaucratic and professional structures that

exist in schools, it is necessary that they be grounded in trust in order to give teachers and administrators the ability to adapt to different and changing conditions in schools and to meet the demands of ever-changing student complexities (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 218). Her hypothesis is that “Teachers will demonstrate greater professionalism in their behavior where a) leaders demonstrate a more professional orientation in their management of work processes and b) greater trust is evident throughout the organization.” (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 218). Tschannen-Moran (2009) refers to orientations as bureaucratic and professional and relates the two as being either hindering or enabling (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 220). She describes a *bureaucratic orientation* as embodying “an implicit distrust of teachers and the contributions they have to offer, whereas a *professional orientation* is grounded in trust – specifically that teachers have the knowledge and ethical orientations to be granted greater autonomy and discretion in the conduct of their work” (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 221).

Present in the bureaucratic orientation, is a low regard for the capabilities of teachers. The assumption is made that teachers are motivated by their paychecks and unless they are closely supervised they will only cut corners in their work, because they are not motivated by the job itself. (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 221). This type of orientation leads to constrained communication, micromanaging, a proliferation of rules, and a rigidity that marks the organization (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). “Rigid rules and regulations are likely to be effective only when the requirements of a task are inherently routine and well enough understood to be specified clearly and concisely” (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Schools do not fit this mold. By imposing strict rules, principals who follow the bureaucratic orientation model, try to encourage teacher compliance in order

to achieve what they desire for the school. Teachers, however, are often resentful of this and are less willing to cooperate with the principal. Solomon and Flores (2001) state, that “Although teachers may outwardly comply with the rules, many utilize their creativity to find ways to surreptitiously sabotage and thwart a leader’s efforts” (as cited in Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

By contrast, the professional orientation is one in which the professional can apply judgment to non-routine situations. Professional learning communities are one way that school leaders can demonstrate a more flexible approach to management and to structuring the organization. The professional leader recognizes the ability of his teachers to “Exercise good judgment in responding to the needs of students” (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 228). Roberts and O’Reilly (1974) report that “Where subordinates report a high level of trust in their leader, they were more likely to have higher levels of confidence in the accuracy of information coming from the leader, a greater desire for interaction with the leader, and a greater satisfaction with communication with the leader” (as cited in Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 229).

Bryk and Schneider (2002) argue that in order to create trust in schools, the policies of the school must demonstrate an expectation of trust that teachers will use good discretion in making instructional decisions for students. Principals who want to create a professional orientation in their schools, should be intentional about building trust in relationships with their teachers. Tschannen-Moran (2004) writes, “Principals must be trustworthy in their actions; they must demonstrate an unfailing ethic of care, as well as an integrity of the highest degree, in all their dealings” (as cited in Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

In studies by Fox (1974), and Sitkin and Stickel (1996) the policies must also allow administrators the ability to deal with instances in which trust is broken with appropriate consequences for those individuals who violate trust (as cited in Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 230). While principals must trust their teachers to act in ways that are professional and appropriate, a leaders' actions also determine the extent to which teachers will trust in their school leadership. In the Tschannen-Moran (2009) study, the results indicated that teacher professionalism was strongly related to the professional orientation of principals and that teacher professionalism was strongly related to faculty trust in colleagues. In organizations with a professional orientation and an established degree of trust, teachers are more likely to demonstrate greater professionalism. As related to trust, when faculties trusted that the administrators would treat them as professionals they were more likely to demonstrate trust in the principal (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 231). "Where trust was high, trust functioned as a substitute for the rigid enforcement of rules" (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 240). For those principals who want to foster greater professionalism among their teachers, it is necessary to adopt a professional orientation to management as well as creating a climate of trust. By allowing teachers more freedom to exercise professional judgment about students, principals are able to create schools where there is more evidence of professional work behaviors, more enthusiasm for work and a greater trust in relationships (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 241). Principals who include teachers in shared decision making and extend a certain level of trust, may receive trust in return as a result of having given more delegation of authority, rather than micromanagement, to teachers as they make decisions that affect students (Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

In “The Substance of Trust Between Teachers and Principals”, Blumberg, Greenfield, Jr. and Nason, (1975), determined to better define trust and provide a more precise meaning of the word, while also determining what teachers mean when they think about trusting their principals. Specifically, this study looked at whether trust in the principal came as a result of the sex of the teacher, the sex of the principal, or the type of school, elementary or secondary (Blumberg et al., 1975). Eighty-five teachers responded in writing to what the phrase “I trust my principal” meant for them. The results were categorized across ten categories including: Personal warmth, fairness, interpersonal openness, professional openness, technical competence, confidentiality, follow-through, credibility, participative decision making, and support (Blumberg et al., 1975 pp. 4-5). The biggest differences between male and female teachers came in the areas of “Technical competence, professional openness, fairness and support” (Blumberg et al., 1975, p. 6). The women specifically felt more strongly than did the men about technical competence and fairness. The results also suggested that with male principals, teachers placed more emphasis on trust in the areas of support, credibility and interpersonal openness, while with female principals, fairness, personal warmth and confidentiality seemed to be more important (Blumberg et al., 1975).

In the 1999 study by Bulach and Peterson, levels of openness and trust between principals and their teachers are examined. In a 1998 study by Bulach, Boothe, and Pickett, a survey of 375 teachers identified 14 categories of mistakes that principals make. Specifically, “A lack of trust and an uncaring attitude” (as cited by Bulach & Peterson, 1999, p. 1). Saxl, Miles, and Lieberman (1989) stated that “Building trust is the most important skill leaders need to improve organizations” (as cited by Bulach &

Peterson, 1999, p. 1). The study by Saxl et al. (1989), similar to the research conducted by Blumberg et al. (1975), looked to determine what levels of trust exist between teachers and their principal as well as whether or not the sex of the teacher or of the principal had any effect on levels of trust. Two of the hypotheses presented in this study related to overall levels of trust and overall levels of openness that existed between principals and teachers. One hundred sixteen students in graduate classes at the University of Florida in the department of Educational Leadership responded to a five-point Likert scale related to levels of openness and trust. Descriptive statistics were used to report the data. A t-test was used to determine the significance between expected and actual behaviors reported. In a very important finding, it was noted that levels of openness play a role in overcoming low trust. Kouzes and Posner (1993) report that “Building trust begins by building a personal relationship through listening” (as cited in Bulach & Peterson, 1999, p. 6). If principals want to improve trust they must work on levels of openness. The two are closely related and teachers will not be open with someone that they do not trust; they will not trust someone they feel is not open. In order to create trust, principals need to focus on being more open with their teachers and by communicating with them and by seeking the input or feedback on matters related to school (Bulach & Peterson, 1999). In a 1993 study by Kouzes and Posner, it is noted that “Trust is maintained when people see that we are not ‘know-it-alls’ and are interested in learning from others” (as cited in Bulach & Peterson, 1999, p. 8).

Another important dimension of the trust construct as noted by the Bulach and Peterson (1999) study is that authenticity is a huge component of trust. “Living authentic lives is integral to deepening levels of openness and trust” (Bulach & Peterson, 1999, p.

9). Administrators are able to lead with integrity and be authentic when they discard or eliminate things that would keep them from being authentic with their teachers.

Authenticity requires one to reveal himself to others (Bulach & Peterson, 1999).

In a study of trust in middle schools, Tarter, Sabo and Hoy (1995), found that supportive behavior by the principal, not teacher behavior, is what determined whether or not there was trust in the principal (Tarter et al., 1995). The authors describe middle schools as “hybrids” of both elementary and high school organizations because they have things in common with both. They have the specialized curriculum found in high schools with the need for individualization that marks elementary education. The middle school has replaced the junior high as the “dominant educational experience for young adolescents” (Tarter et al., 1995, p. 41). While not as highly specialized as the high school, middle school learning experiences are based on exploration and are delivered by interdisciplinary teams. These teams work to guide not only the academic experiences of students, but the social and emotional ones as well. There is a diversity of curriculum that may not be found at either the elementary or high school (Tarter et al., 1995). Because there are more marked differences in curriculum beginning at the middle school level, administrators must find ways to build agreement and create cooperation amongst teachers. Middle school teachers depend on their administrators to support them as needed, particularly in the development of building wide curriculum implementation. Therefore it would seem that administrators who support more autonomy for a more specialized teaching faculty will have more success than those who do not. By creating an atmosphere of trust and openness, teachers will come to trust their principals as they feel less at risk when they make mistakes (Tarter et al, 1995).

In the Tarter et al. (1995) study, three guiding questions were asked:

- a) “What is the path that links principal behavior with middle school effectiveness?”
- b) “How do the leadership of principals and the professional relations of teachers promote trust and effectiveness in middle schools?”
- c) “How do aspects of trust influence middle school effectiveness?” (Tarter et al., 1995, p. 42).

As part of the conceptual framework for this study, the authors examined supportive leadership, faculty collegiality, faculty trust, and effectiveness. Supportive leadership by principals is characterized by frequent praise and limited criticism and is leadership that supports teachers by developing healthy relationships amongst colleagues. Faculty collegiality is characterized by developing supportive relationships between principal and teacher which can lead to supportive relationships between teachers. Faculty trust includes acting in the best interest of others and the fact that subordinates come to rely on that consistency. “Faculty trust in the principal is the teachers’ confidence that the principal will keep faith with the teachers and act in their best interests; faculty trust in colleagues is the same confidence placed in their coworkers” (Tarter et al., 1995, p. 42). Effectiveness is characterized by having clearly defined goals and a value system that is set and in tune with the environment of the organization (Tarter et al., 1995). Tarter et al. (1995) discuss what fosters trust in schools. The answer lies in part with the creation of open and trusting relationships. School effectiveness depends on trust being established as a prerequisite. Supportive principals trust their teachers and rely on their expertise. They listen to them, develop them, and offer constructive criticism. In turn, teachers

cooperate with, have trust in, and have a commitment to their principals (Tarter et al., 1995).

A sample of 87 middle schools in New Jersey was selected for the Tarter et al. (1995) study. “Faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues were measured using scales developed by Hoy and Koppersmith (1985)” (as cited in Tarter et al., 1995, 44.). Correlational analyses were used to test the hypotheses and it was found that the more supportive the leadership of the principal, the more trust in relationships among faculty and the greater the perceived school effectiveness. “Supportive principal leadership and collegial relations among teachers are mutually reinforcing” (Tarter et al., 1995, p. 45). In summary, Tarter et al. (1995) state that what seems to be an important determinant of effectiveness in middle schools is whether or not there is an atmosphere of trust; an atmosphere in which teachers not only have confidence in their principal, but also an atmosphere in which teachers have learned to rely on each other. Trust is an intrinsic part of the value system of the school (Tarter et al., 1995).

As cited in work by Peter Youngs (2007), research shows (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Louis, Kruse, & Marks, 1996; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001), that “Trust develops when school leaders support teachers’ work on a consistent basis and share responsibility for decisions related to curriculum, hiring, and professional development” (Youngs, 2007, p. 104).

Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

As stated in Chapter 1 of this research, the first five years of a teacher's career are critical. It is during these years that teachers either demonstrate competence, or they struggle and fail to grow professionally. Teachers who leave the profession often leave as, or even before, they have finished their fifth year of teaching. Teachers who do not develop a strong teacher identity, and are not supported in their efforts, are much more likely to leave the profession than those who do grow professionally, and do receive the support they need. As part of developing a positive teacher identity, successful teachers also develop a strong sense of teacher efficacy, meaning that they truly feel that they possess the knowledge and skills, and have the confidence to positively affect student outcomes.

As school leaders seek to hire the best teachers for their campuses, they must also recognize the role that they play in the development of positive teaching identities for the educators they employ. Principals can impact teacher development through creating conditions that lead to job satisfaction including a positive culture and climate, building relationships and establishing trust, induction and mentoring programs that are implemented with fidelity, meaningful instructional support, and teacher empowerment.

The research methodology of this study was designed to discuss the perceptions and professional experiences of both principals and teachers as they discuss the impact and the role that the principal plays in the development of early career teacher identity. Much of the literature on research in this area is conducted at the elementary school level

(primarily grades pre-k through 5); far less research is concerned with the experiences of secondary school teachers and their principals.

It is important to conduct research that is not only able to be added to the current literature, but to inform local practice and provide an insight into problems of research that affect practitioners and their campuses. Specifically, this research allows school leadership to take a more focused look at the factors that influence the development of positive teacher identity as well as aid leaders in making informed decisions about improving practice in areas over which they have significant control. In order to retain teachers, as well as to develop good teachers, so that they can have the best teaching experience possible, it is important to focus on those areas, as discussed in the literature review of chapter II, that relate to positive identity formation.

Descriptions of Research Design

It is important for principals to be aware of the influence they have on teachers who are in the early years of their professional careers. Without this awareness and without exploring the role of the principal and his or her influence on early career teachers, principals will not be able to reflect appropriately and make changes to their own practice. A qualitative research design was used for this study because this issue needed to be explored from both the principal perspective as well as from the perspective of the early career teacher. As stated by John W. Creswell (2013), in Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches, exploration is needed, because of a need “to study a group or population, identify variables that cannot be easily measured, or hear silenced voices” (Creswell, 2013, p. 48). It is not often that teachers are able to discuss freely, in a safe setting, the influence that their principal has on the development

of their own identity. The primary researcher conducted a qualitative study in part, because of the need to talk directly to people to allow them to tell their stories, in order to gain a more detailed understanding of the issues (Creswell, 2013, p. 48).

A qualitative approach was chosen in order to allow the participants to have their voices heard. As Creswell (2013) describes, this allows the researcher to empower individuals to “share their stories, hear their voices, and minimize the power relationships that often exist between a researcher and the participants in a study” (Creswell, 2013, p. 48).

This research study was conducted with the use of focus groups for current K-12 public school principals and their teachers. Focus groups began to be used in the 1940’s based on the work of Merton and Fiske (as cited in Cohen & Crabtree, 2006, p. 1). Focus groups are described as a data collection method in both Cohen and Crabtree (2006), and Creswell (2013). P. Gill, K. Stewart, E. Treasure, and B. Chadwick (2008), note that “Focus groups use group dynamics to generate qualitative data” (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, and Chadwick, 2008, p. 291). As these authors continue to discuss the concept of the focus group as a research tool, they note,

Focus groups share many common features with less structured interviews, but there is more to them than merely collecting similar data from many participants at once. A focus group is a group discussion on a particular topic organised for research purposes. This discussion is guided, monitored and recorded by a researcher sometimes called a moderator or facilitator (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, and Chadwick, 2008, p. 194).

Focus groups are useful when the researcher wants to not only determine the collective insight of the group of participants, but also for when the researcher wants to know more about the meanings of the words that lie behind the views themselves (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, and Chadwick, 2008, p. 194). In this same research article, even more important than the mix of age, sex, etc. is the need for participants to interact well with one another; and this thought must be given consideration in advance. (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, and Chadwick, 2008, p. 195). While these authors state that group size matters, they specifically note that, “the optimum size for a focus group is six to eight participants (excluding researchers), but focus groups can work successfully with as few as three and as many as 14 participants (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, and Chadwick, 2008, p. 195).

The questions were designed to allow the participants to discuss the role of the principal, in building positive teacher identity. The principals gave input from their perspectives as well as the teachers who work with these principals, some of whom may have even started their careers with these principals. Specifically, this research design gave subjects the opportunity to discuss the role of the principal in providing leadership in the creation of a positive school climate and culture, in building relationships and establishing trust, in the quality of the mentoring experience, in the instructional support received and in the level of empowerment principals provide. The answers to the questions were critical, in that insight was gained from not only the principals, but from the teachers as well. The importance of this study lies in the connections made between the principals’ role and the reality of the experiences of the teachers who work for them. The literature is rich with quantitative studies that measure teacher satisfaction and principal involvement. However, even in qualitative studies that have been conducted, the

focus is often on either the principal or the teachers' perspectives but not necessarily both simultaneously.

Two focus groups were conducted: one for campus principals and a second one for teachers who work for those principals. Two elementary, two middle school, and two high school principals participated in the first focus group and were interviewed collectively. One teacher from each of their campuses, with one exception, participated in the second focus group. The data was collected, transcribed, and analyzed for themes and connections. The themes and connections were analyzed both from within and across groups.

Philosophical Assumption

The primary philosophical assumption of this study is that hearing the stories of the participants is the best way to study this problem. The strength of the focus group method of data collection lies in the fact that the face-to-face interactions with the participants provided the primary researcher with "live" feedback that was based on their individual views and opinions of the questions that were asked. The focus groups were conducted in the field, in a meeting room at a school, in the district where the research was conducted. With the focus groups, the primary researcher made the contact between researcher and the focus group participants as real and authentic as possible. This was done in an attempt to help minimize, as described by Guba & Lincoln, (1998), "the 'distance' or 'objective separateness' between himself or herself and those being researched" (as cited in Creswell, 2013, p. 20). Time in the field was limited and face-to-face interaction was limited to the two, two-hour focus group sessions that were conducted with both principals and teachers.

Research Questions

The research questions were organized by theme and participant group: principals and teachers. When asking the questions the primary researcher, as moderator, did not participate or give an opinion on any of the questions, in an attempt to avoid biasing the answers that were given. The primary researcher did not want to give participants any ideas as to what they should say, but wanted them to feel free to express their own opinions without fear of reprisal or disapproval. The primary researcher, as moderator, kept the conversation moving in order to avoid having one or two members of the group dominate the discussion.

The principal's role in job satisfaction and new teacher efficacy

The questions related to this topic were designed to determine the attitude of principals in terms of how they view themselves as being responsible for creating job satisfaction and helping teachers develop a strong sense of personal teaching efficacy. The questions for teachers were designed to probe their attitudes and beliefs as to their principals' role in helping them create their own personal teaching identity, as well as their role in creating teacher job satisfaction, individually or collectively.

Questions for principals.

Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?

How does the principal support teachers as they develop their own sense of teaching identity?

Questions for teachers.

How does your principal play a role in creating job satisfaction for teachers?

How does your principal support teachers in creating their own sense of teaching identity?

The principal's sphere of influence on new teachers and their role in mentoring and teacher retention

The questions related to this topic were designed to elicit information from principals regarding their experiences with mentoring programs and the principals' role in developing and providing mentoring opportunities. The questions for teachers were designed to allow them to comment on the types and quality of mentoring experiences that they were provided.

Questions for principals.

How do you develop early career teachers?

What is the best way to retain teachers in years 1-5?

Questions for teachers.

Describe the efforts of your principal in working to help you build your skills as a teacher.

What sort of mentoring experiences were provided to you?

The Principal's role in instructional support

The questions related to this topic were designed to discover how the principal is involved in providing early career teachers the instructional support that they need. The questions for teachers, were designed to elicit information regarding the teachers' perceptions of the level of instructional leadership provided by their principal.

Questions for principals.

How do you involve yourself in instructional practices on a daily basis?

Describe how you provide instructional support for new teachers.

Questions for teachers.

How is your principal involved in instructional practices on your campus?

How does your principal support you in your daily instructional practices?

The principal's role in teacher empowerment

The questions related to this topic were designed to elicit feedback regarding principals' beliefs regarding the importance of teacher empowerment and how this aligns with their own vision for their campus. Included in these questions were items designed to elicit what empowerment looks like on campuses and what specific things leaders are doing to empower early career teachers. The questions for teachers were designed to provide answers as to whether or not teachers feel empowered to do their jobs, or to assume leadership roles at their schools.

Questions for principals.

How do you empower teachers?

Describe the ideal teacher leader.

Questions for teachers.

Describe your principal's leadership style.

How does your principal empower teachers on campus to assume leadership roles?

The Principal's Role in building Relationships, Trust, and Organizational Commitment with Teachers

The questions related to this topic were designed to examine the importance of the principal, in establishing trust and building relationships with teachers. The questions for teachers, were designed provide insight into how they feel their principal has or has not worked at relationship and trust building.

Questions for principals.

How do you build trust with early career teachers on your campus?

How do you build relationships with teachers?

Questions for teachers.

Describe your relationship with your principal.

How does the principal build trust with teachers?

Setting

The school district in which the study was conducted is located in a large suburban community in southeast Texas. As one of the largest school districts in the state, it is an educational leader in the community, and one of the most demographically diverse districts in the state and nation.

Campus leaders have been given many tools with which to work successfully with all teachers, but specifically with those new to the profession. For example, the district implemented a new mentoring program, in alignment with changes in state standards and expectations. This replaced a former mentoring initiative which was a highly successful program as well.

In recent years, the school district provided customer service training for all administrators and teachers in order to help them improve the quality of educational experiences that were given to stakeholders, both internal and external. Initiatives such as the commitment to professional learning communities (PLC's) have provided teachers with the ability to expand their own teaching experiences, while allowing campus leaders the flexibility to support teachers instructionally. The school leadership department provided administrative training in how to have crucial conversations with staff in order to build positive working relationships with them, and to give them a level of empowerment to do their jobs.

Subjects

Principals and teachers were chosen from six (two elementary, two middle, and two high school campuses) in a large suburban school district in southeast Texas. The sample size included six principals who were invited and volunteered to attend, and five teachers who work for the participating principals, who volunteered to participate in this study. The desired total sample size for this study was 12, but only 11 individuals participated. Five, instead of six, teachers participated in the teachers' focus group. This discrepancy will be discussed further in chapter IV of this research study. With regard to determining which principals participated, the primary researcher utilized a purposeful sampling procedure. The principals selected for the study were not new to their schools or to the role of principal. They were also not new leaders for the teachers on their campuses who participated in the study. "Principals" are defined as the leaders of their respective campuses, the building principals. They are not associate or assistant principals. At the conclusion of the principals' focus group, each principal, with one exception, emailed the

primary researcher a list of names of the early career teachers on each of their campuses. “Early career teachers” are defined as those teachers who are in the first five years of their teaching careers. With the lists of names of these eligible candidates, the primary researcher sent a recruitment letter, via email, along with the “Consent to Take Part in a Human Research Study” document to each of the individuals named by each campus principal. The first person to volunteer from each campus was selected for participation. The participants were strangers to one another, and to the primary researcher. The night of the focus group was the first time that any participant or the primary researcher/moderator, had spoken to each other. As part of the process of maintaining anonymity, the identity of which teachers had actually participated in the teacher focus group, was withheld from the campus principals. As described by Creswell, 2013, the participants were chosen “because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study” (Creswell, 2013, p. 156).

All of the participants volunteered to participate in this research study and gave of their time to participate in focus groups and answer the questions listed above. The principals’ focus group consisted of six different campuses in the district being studied, including two elementary school, two middle school, and two high school principals, who were chosen to represent the district. The campus where the researcher is currently employed was not included in the study in an attempt to eliminate bias.

The setting for the focus groups was the conference room of the school where the primary researcher is employed. While the participants were not observed on the campuses where they work, the location for the focus groups was selected for convenience and allowed the primary researcher access to all participants at the same

time. Despite these limitations, all participants had an opinion about the questions that they were asked and they were able to hold a conversation regarding these questions without having to be at their own individual schools.

Procedures

Permission to conduct this study was granted by the Committee of the Protection of Human Subjects, at the University of Houston. The questions that were used in this research study, were asked during focus groups and allowed for open-ended responses that provided insight into the role of the principal in creating positive teacher identity, from both the principals' and teachers' perspectives. As described by Creswell, 2013, the primary researcher took the raw data, transcribed the focus group conversations, and used the transcriptions to look for themes and for ways to organize individual responses into broader categories. (Creswell, 2013, p. 52). The use of the focus groups provided discussions that were summarized so that, as Creswell, 2013 says, "The reader experiences 'being there'" (Creswell, 2013, p. 54).

Instruments

The focus group conversations were audio recorded and the discussions were transcribed after the conclusion of the focus groups. Off-subject comments or answers, were not transcribed. Only responses that were relevant to the topic of this research were transcribed. A digital recorder was used for the data collection and the conversations that were recorded from each focus group were downloaded to a computer and saved for transcription. The transcribed recordings will be kept in a locked file cabinet, accessible only to the researcher, for a minimum of three calendar years.

Analysis

The data collected was in the form of transcriptions of the two, two-hour focus groups that were conducted (one with principals and one with teachers). The primary researcher used reasoning skills to analyze the data using an inductive-deductive logic process as described by Creswell. (Creswell, 2013, p. 45). It was important to look for the specific meaning of the problems and issues generated in the conversations, as determined by the participants (Creswell, 2013, p. 46). The data was analyzed for themes and checked against the transcriptions of the conversations held in the focus groups.

The analysis looks for themes in the answers given by participants based on their varied and diverse viewpoints that lead to, as described by Creswell (2013), a qualitative study that “should reflect multiple perspectives of the participants in the study” (Creswell, 2013, p. 47). The conversations were transcribed verbatim with the exception of off-task, non-related discussion. The participants were identified by pseudonym so as to maintain their anonymity when their responses were analyzed.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is that a small sample size was chosen for study, from a single school district. As a result, the findings of this study may not be generalizable to a larger population. The findings might not even fully explain the relationships between principals and teachers in the selected schools, except perhaps at the particular moment in time, and under the particular circumstances, in which the study was conducted. In an attempt to eliminate bias from the study, the principal researcher did not include the principal, or any teacher from the campus where he is employed. Additionally, the two high school principals had to leave the focus group before it

concluded, and did not answer three of the ten questions that were asked of all of the remaining four principal participants. The primary researcher can only assume whether or not their responses would have mirrored the responses of the two middle school and two elementary school principals who answered all of the questions. Another limitation of the study is that one of the principals who participated only met half of the criteria set by the primary researcher in order to be selected for the study. The fact that he has had multiple years' experience as a principal overrides, to some degree, the fact that he was at a new campus. He was selected, when another principal, who did meet all of the criteria, expressed regrets at having to rescind the offer to participate due to a scheduling conflict. Finally, there were teacher participants from only five of the six campuses that the principal participants represented. The absence of an early career teacher from one of the middle school campuses posed the same limitation as the principals who were not able to answer all ten questions. There was no way for the primary researcher to make direct connections as to how the teacher at that campus would have felt about that principals' role in his or her own identity development.

The data that was collected during the focus groups was analyzed qualitatively and the results of the study, including transcribed portions of the relevant conversations, are included as the subject of Chapter IV of this research study.

Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter III, this research study's principal researcher used qualitative research methodology that utilized focus groups for the collection of rich, authentic, descriptive data, based on the real-world experiences of the principals and teachers who participated in the focus groups. Between the two focus groups, the sample size was eleven, including eight females, and three males. The questions that the participants were asked, are directly aligned with the five research questions that guide this research. Again, those questions are:

1. Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?
2. What role does the principal play in teacher induction, mentoring, and professional development?
3. How does the principal provide instructional support for early career teachers?
4. How does the principal empower teachers in their daily jobs, and to assume leadership positions as they grow in their careers?
5. How can a principal develop relationships, trust, and organizational commitment with early career teachers?

The questions that the teachers were asked in the focus group, mirror the questions that the principals were asked. The principal participants were not new to their role as principal or new to the campus they are currently leading, with one exception that is noted below. The teachers are all early career teachers who are in the first five years of their careers.

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the principals' role in building positive teacher identity in early career public school teachers. Principals are the instructional leaders of their schools and while they can't lead alone, they must hire, and retain the best quality teachers that they possibly can. Current research recounts numerous ways in which principals can help teachers develop positive teaching identities; including ways in which principals provide leadership in the areas of creating a positive climate and culture, offering solid induction and mentoring programs, creating job satisfaction through building relationships and trust; offering instructional support and empowering teachers to do their jobs and to grow professionally.

Principal and Teacher Focus Groups

As described in Chapter III, two focus groups were convened; one for principals, and one for early career teachers who work for them. The focus groups were designed to elicit feedback from the participants based on their perceptions, feelings, and actual work experiences. The participants for each group were invited to the school where the primary researcher is employed and the focus groups were conducted in the front office conference room of the school. The participants were provided some light snacks and water, and a printed copy of the focus group questions that were to be asked. The questions were provided to help alleviate any anxiety that the participants might have felt related to questions that they were going to be asked, as well as to provide the participants with a "roadmap" of sorts for the conversation.

Focus group for principals

The primary researcher conducted a focus group with campus principals. There were six participants total; there were two high school principals, two middle school principals, and two elementary school principals. Three of the participants were White males, and the other three participants were women, two White and one African-American. The participants all knew one another as they have all served as principals in the district where the research was conducted for several years. Some of them had worked together, been mentored by, or attended principal's meetings with each other. The participants seemed to enjoy the conversation, and several participants told the primary researcher that they were excited about the topic of the research and enjoyed the experience of participating in the focus group.

The participants are briefly described below. The names used are pseudonyms in order to maintain the anonymity of the participants.

Principal Tom is a White male between 35-55 years of age, and he has been a principal for several years in the school district where the research was conducted. He is currently a high school principal, and he has been a principal at both the middle school and high school levels. He is a former high school assistant and associate principal. He has over twenty years' experience in education. He is new to his campus, however, as of the time of the focus group he had been on this campus for longer than one academic semester. He is the only candidate that participated that did not completely meet the selection criteria set by the researcher. As noted in chapter III, this principal was selected, after another participant offered their regrets for not being able to participate in the study, due to a scheduling conflict.

Principal Alan is a White male between 35-55 years of age, and he has been a principal for several years in the school district where the research was conducted. He is currently a high school principal, and he has been a principal at both the middle school and high school levels. He is a former high school assistant and associate principal. He has over twenty years' experience in education.

Principal Dan is a White male between 35-55 years of age, and he has been a principal for several years in the school district where the research was conducted. He is currently a middle school principal, and he has also been a principal at an elementary school. The primary researcher was unable to determine the number of years Principal "Dan" has worked in education.

Principal Teri is a White female between 35-55 years of age, and she has been a principal for several years in the school district where the research was conducted. She is currently a middle school principal, and she has been a principal at only the middle school level. She is a former high school assistant and associate principal. She has over twenty years' experience in education.

Principal Janet is a White female between 35-55 years of age, and she has been a principal for several years in the school district where the research was conducted. She is currently an elementary school principal, and she has only been a principal at the elementary level. She is a former middle school assistant principal. She has between 15-20 years of experience in education.

Principal Robin is an African-American female, between 35-55 years of age, and she has been a principal for two years in the school district where the research was

conducted. She is currently an elementary school principal, and she has been a principal at only the elementary school level. She is a former elementary school assistant principal. The primary researcher was not able to determine the number of years that Principal Robin has worked in education.

The focus group for principals was scheduled for 5:00-7:00 p.m. on a Thursday evening. The focus group ran for approximately for one hour and twenty-five minutes. The two high school principals had to leave at 6:00 p.m. (25 minutes before the focus group actually ended) due to evening commitments at their respective campuses. Typically, there are more evening activities or events at the high school level that require the presence of the campus principal, than there are at either the middle or elementary school levels.

In order to elicit feedback from everyone, and prior to the high school principals' departure, the primary researcher moved ahead in the questioning to make sure that every participant answered at least one question for each theme. After the high school principals left the group, the primary researcher worked backward and picked up the last questions that still needed to be answered by the remaining members of the group. The questions that the two high school principals did not answer were questions 4, 5, and 8.

After a brief welcome that included the purpose of the study and introductions of each participant, the primary researcher read the title of the study to the participants: **THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN BUILDING POSITIVE TEACHER IDENTITY IN EARLY CAREER PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS**. Using the definition of terms listed in Chapter I, the primary researcher defined for the participants, the terms "Positive teacher identity," and "Teacher efficacy."

The principal's focus group consisted of a total of ten questions that were asked that directly relate to the research questions for this study. Each research question was translated into a category or "theme", and two questions were asked related to each category. The categories are listed below, along with a brief explanation of what the questions are designed to ask, in relation to each category. The question is stated, followed by the responses given by participants. As stated earlier, only those responses that related to the question being asked, were transcribed. Off-topic or non-relevant comments were not included.

Category 1: The principal's role in job satisfaction and new teacher efficacy

In this category, the questions are designed to determine the attitude of principals in terms of how they view themselves as responsible for creating job satisfaction and helping teachers develop a strong sense of personal teaching efficacy.

Question 1: Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below:

- Developing their skills as teachers, both administratively and pedagogically
- Surviving year 1, and practicing what they learned in year 1, in year 2
- The disconnect that exists between the dream vision of teaching and the reality of teaching

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

Other than a short stint at student teaching, they are finding out whether or not they want to do it, whether or not they want to make this their life-long profession, and so it's their feeling their way through. They are learning from others, and they're just developing themselves as to what kind of teacher they are going to be in the classroom.

Dan:

I tell teachers, 'What calls you to become a teacher?', 'What makes you do that?' And I think a big impact is the first two years. You really can tell because the first year, they're still getting their feet wet, learning the system, learning what they have to teach, learning the content. But the second year really tells the story, because they've had that experience. I think that really sets the tone, for those next two or three years after that, if they can make it through that.

Janet:

I think year one of new teachers, is like survival year, and year two is like a practice, like everything they learn the first year, now they can practice. And so that year 2 is just as important, and it's different.

Robin:

Within the first five years is that dream land. I've got my dream job. I'm here now, and I see all my students' names on paper, and then the little faces show up and now you're moving from the dream to the reality. And the reality is that you'll have some

students that are textbook, and what you learned in the program and what you observed in the student teaching process, and you'll have some students that are not textbook, and they're not following the mode of what the instructor said they would do or how they would react, and so now it's that learning/doing and that application and that real-world life. And the reality is not always matching what the dream world is.

Alan:

The other piece that is really critical in the first couple of years, is the administrative tasks of teaching. They might be the best in their content, they might have great teaching strategies that are all ready, and all those things with the kids could be just spot-on, but can they handle all of the other stuff that teachers just have to do as part of the profession?

Teri:

I agree, in talking about survival. They don't know what they don't know. Especially the student-teaching piece, and then all of a sudden they are in their reality and they've got so much coming at them. You've got to have your own system and structures and your own routines that may not work. You know, you have this beautiful plan, and you have to be able to get it all sorted out and prioritized to know how to manage it all. And those that can, along with the administration stuff, do well, and if they can't, they don't.

Question 2: How does the principal support teachers as they develop their own sense of teaching identity?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Give teachers limited autonomy and value their input
- Encourage risk-taking
- Allow them to not be afraid to think
- Develop their skills and sense of identity
- Support them with good role models and mentors
- Build relationships
- Give honest, open feedback

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

I think we need to give them limited autonomy in the classroom. Let them not be afraid to experiment with different teaching styles, with different lessons and activities. Let them know that especially in PLC groups with other teachers that their input is valued. And give them the ability to not be afraid to think about lessons and activities that are going to be engaging.

Dan:

I think also developing their own sense of identity. You want them to be a risk-taker, but I also say with caution. I think somewhat as a principal you have to monitor what teaching is going on, and allow them to take some risks. And I think it also matters as a principal when supporting them in the building, put them with good people. It doesn't necessarily have to be the ones who are on their team. If you can find the right partner and relationship, it's so important that first couple of years for them.

Janet:

They need to have good role models. We had instructional coaches and we had specialists, and with our new teachers, they are in their classrooms all the time. I think that's the kind of support they need. And back to the risk-taking, knowing that everyone has challenges, it's not just them, like they feel like they're all alone, but they're really not.

Robin:

I try to build those informal relationships, so that I can get to know that new teacher, as a personality that can help them to shape their personality to the task itself. Because it's almost like walking in someone else's shoes. So it's a matter of me trying to build that rapport and understand the teacher as a person.

Alan:

Just like kids, new teachers are going to learn and develop different skills at different rates. So really the burden is on us, as far as developing their own sense of identity. The burden is on us to get to know them, not for them to get to know us, because their heads are spinning. It's not a one-size-fits-all.

Teri:

When you see those new teachers starting to 'get it' or hit their stride, whether it be with the relationship building with students and parents, with the pedagogy, with working with their team...that you recognize that and tell them what you're seeing that's doing that; that's helping them hit their stride, not just pick at them, and what

they may be doing wrong, you've got to point those things out, but here is where you are excelling and you're moving on. Letting them spread their wings so to speak.

And sometimes that creates that conflict, but giving them that limited autonomy to be able to do it.

Category 2: The principal's sphere of influence on new teachers and their role in mentoring and teacher retention

In this category, the questions are designed to elicit information from principals regarding their experiences with mentoring programs and the principals' role in developing and providing mentoring opportunities.

Question 3: How do you develop early career teachers?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Given honest, timely feedback
- Give constructive criticism
- Communicate well
- Praise teachers and let them know they are valued
- Give encouragement
- Provide examples
- Provide time for mentor/protégé to meet
- Pair new teachers with the right mentors

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

I think that one of the most important things to do is give feedback to the teachers.

We need to make it a conscious effort to be in their classrooms during instructional time and giving them specific, accurate, timely feedback that they need. You want to kind of even think about where to put them in the building, in terms of their rooms.

You don't want to put them next to somebody who's that downer.

Dan:

When you want to develop teachers, make them feel like they are making a difference.

We really want the kids to feel like 'this is a great teacher.' And we want them to know that. And sometimes you get feedback that is not so positive. And they need to hear it, just so they don't keep doing it. So, good communication I think, is important.

Janet:

Just encouraging them, providing opportunities, not forcing PD down their throats. If they are interested in something, providing those PD opportunities or training. What I've seen is, their mentor, the person you pair them with, that will make or break them, and so you really have to be very specific in who that person is, because that's their go-to person. They would rather go to that person, than me. So my job to support them, is to give them the right person.

Robin:

If you don't communicate frequently, and often, and early, then someone else is going to get into that void, and that space, and you don't want that to go the wrong way.

Because the moment that you don't continually touch base, those energy vampires, so to speak, kind of steal in and fill their minds with 'This is too much work', and 'You're doing it the long way', when the long way is the only way, and the best way, and yes there are short cuts, but then at what expense?

Alan:

Build time in to your mentorship system for the new teachers to meet together with each other, with the principal, or the assistant principal who is in charge of the mentoring program, and really have that ingrained as part of your system. Have those touch points already on the calendar at the beginning of the year, so they are informal, have some food, maybe even meet at a restaurant one day, to just give them a chance to vent, and to talk, and to have fun.

Teri:

I think it goes back to knowing that they are not alone, that they are not experiencing all these firsts, for the first time by themselves. It's about putting them in the right place, at the right time, with the right people.

Question 4: What is the best way to retain teachers in years 1-5?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Create an environment where reality and vision meet
- Give support and feedback
- Truly value teachers
- Listen to them

- Let them take risks
- Make connections and recognize their talents
- Coach and empower

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dan:

Creating an environment of what their vision was supposed to be about. If you can recognize that and work with them, and give them the right supports, the right kind of feedback, and the right environment to work in, I think that retains your people.

You're going to come to work if you're happy where you're working, and who you're working with, and the kids you're working with. I just really go out of my way, to try to value what they do. And let them know that I value what they do. We will always work to make the school better, and you're being a part of that, makes it even better.

It's maintaining that environment that's important.

Janet:

Continue to give them support just because their done with their first year, don't forget about them in their second year. I think that's just as important as their first year. I've had first year teachers at the end of the year, I ask them, if they like what they did, if they want to try something? Some of them will want to try a different grade level, like they've observed something... So I really listen to them. Just listening to them, and allowing them to try those things out. To find their fit, you know, because they don't know when they come in, what they really want to do.

Robin:

I really think it's the level of support that you provide in those first five years. Be the how and the when, because for some brand new teachers, they may not need all the specialists all the time, in all their rooms, and they may not need the help, the way we're providing it. Just knowing what their needs are, and their level of support.

You've got to look at it beyond the first year, and the second year, and so forth. But it goes back to 'How do you support that individual?', and 'In what way?' Again, that connection that you make with them throughout that process, and as they're growing, recognize they are growing, then their talents, and what's going well, and celebrating the milestones with them.

Teri:

I did sum it up in four words, not necessarily in this order of importance, but "recognize", "coach", "empower" and "support." One of my brand new teachers had some struggles at the beginning, so I went in her classroom, not too long ago, and it was almost a different classroom. She had taken all the support and all the advice that her mentor and her team had given her. And I really wanted to make sure that she heard that. I see that you've made these changes; I see that you've implemented, and things are going better. I think that's important.

Category 3: The principal's role in instructional support

In this category, the questions are designed to discover how the principal is involved in providing early career teachers the instructional support that they need.

Question 5: How do you involve yourself in instructional practices on a daily basis?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Empower teacher leader teams in instructional leadership
- Attend planning meetings (PLCs)
- Be intentional about holding instructional conversations
- Implement a team approach to instruction
- Monitor student learning and be visible in classrooms

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dan:

To be personally involved in instruction on a daily basis, is sometimes hard. I mean not only from the perspective of being in your building, but the times you're out of your building. You're out for a whole day, or half a day, and it sort of backs things up, but I have a good staff in place that monitors it. And we work together. We have meetings, once a week that review, 'What's going on instructionally on our campus?' 'What are you seeing in math? ...What do you see in reading? ... what do you see in social studies?' And, 'How are they doing with it?' So, having the right people in place supporting that, helping that, helps me make better decisions, based on what's going on as a leader in the building. It's a daunting task, and I think every principal here would feel the same way. I had a professor once tell me, 'You're really not an instructional leader. Because you can't know everything, but you can be a good instructional manager.' And how you manage people and work with their instruction makes a big difference.

Janet:

So, I attended PLCs every Tuesday. And they knew I was coming, and they wanted me there. In fact, when I would miss, they would say ‘It’s not the same when you’re not there.’ I really love to be in the classroom, and that’s where it’s happening. So I try and get into the classroom as much as possible. You have to have the right people in the right places, and you have to have a good instructional team. I would say that team mentality is going to help with your instructional practices on campus on a daily basis, because they’re out in the field.

Robin:

That ‘daily basis’ is what gets you every time, but ultimately, on the days I’m able to get in the classroom, that’s really where I can do the application work. Ultimately, it’s just being in there and talking with the kids, and not even so much monitoring the teacher, but just looking at how the kids learn. It could be the best instructional strategy, but if it’s not reaching our kids, then it’s not an effective strategy, for that particular group of students.

Teri:

I think it’s that leadership team empowerment and that visibility in classes, PLCs, and PD; being there just to support the teachers, and for them to see that that’s an important piece of what we do. There are times when I just go into classes, and I’ll take my laptop, or if I have some paperwork to do, and sit there. And then, I’ll kind of keep a little tally of what I’ve seen. Then I’ll email those teachers, ‘Thanks for letting me come in and hang out today. Here are some great things that I saw.’

Question 6: Describe how you provide instructional support for new teachers.

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Provide teachers with the resources they need
- Provide strong mentors
- Set aside time for instructional coaching
- Model a lesson
- Serve as the appraiser for the new teachers

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

One of the things that is important is to make sure that they have the resources. It goes back to the mentorship. You need to make sure that the person that you put with them is a strong instructional teacher; that knows the pedagogy, and knows the content of it. Also, the feedback side of it. When you're in there, make sure that you're giving feedback. You're seeing them doing well, and giving them good feedback.

Dan:

We have a system in place where my support staff are involved in their planning meetings. I can't be in every one of those, but it allows me to get feedback from them on how things are going. 'What could we do to support, or help this teacher with what she needs? Is there something that we are missing, is there something that is not working well for them?' I think having key people in those meetings that they are

planning with, or when we have our monthly PLC as well, gives us a good idea of the supports they need.

Janet:

I have 5 brand new teachers this year, and our instructional coaches split their time and so they have a constant model of what it should look like; that's how I support them instructionally. I do walk-throughs and observations and give them feedback. Their coaches and the mentor, the feedback they give them, is much better than mine, because they are in there all the time, and they know the kids. I know the kids, but they're there all the time.

Robin:

Month to month I try to set some time aside just for them. And we'll bring in a special guest of some sort, we'll round it up in terms of technology or a campus field trip, where we'll go to a particular room and look at the resources that are available there. It helps me to know what's on my campus in terms of resources and support. It's easier to get the new teachers to buy into things that veteran teachers are afraid of, in terms of resources and technology, so that goes back to that early and often. Set an example early on, of how we want them to do things. When I do have some time, I'll do a little model lesson. They get to see me in action, so that when I'm talking about something, I can tell them authentically, "This was a struggle, and this was the plan that I did". Letting them know that, even with the best plans, sometimes it doesn't go accordingly, but you can still try and be that risk-taker that we were talking about.

Alan:

I'm the evaluator for all new teachers, and that forces me to be involved with their instruction. As busy as we all are in our buildings, it could very easily happen with a brand new teacher that we don't evaluate, that we won't see them that much, and so then we're just really not that engaged in the instructional side of their life.

Teri:

We pair them with mentors, and they work with their team, but if we do need some other voice, we reach out to the helping teacher and the curriculum and instruction folks, because then it does become this very non-evaluative piece. It's somebody not on the campus, somebody that they can build that relationship with. It's that people piece, and it's that relationship and mentor, and really having those genuine conversations and being authentic about what's going well and what's not going well.

Category 4: The principal's role in teacher empowerment

In this category, the questions are designed to elicit feedback regarding principals' beliefs regarding the importance of teacher empowerment and how this aligns with their own vision for their campus. Included in these questions are items designed to elicit how empowerment looks on campuses and what specific things leaders are doing to empower early career teachers.

Question 7: How do you empower teachers?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Hear their ideas and value their input

- Find teacher leaders early and develop them
- Give potential leaders opportunities for growth
- Support teachers with the resources they need
- Be a “yes” person
- Build trust and a positive climate
- Get to know teachers individually

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

I think it's important to make sure that their input is heard, and you know their ideas are heard. I think the other important thing is, for looking at years 1-5, is to find those teachers that you know are going to be leaders on your campus in the future, and instill that in them early on. That you are going to find a leadership role for them in the future. You identify them and give them the leadership capabilities.

Dan:

I think as principals, we have some ‘instinct-abilities’ to recognize talent; where it is, and where it isn't. As a principal, you look at those teachers and you recognize right away, there's something there. It's sort of like a coach, looking at a ball player. I think that same idea with teachers is, that you give them those right opportunities. You match them up with those right opportunities, so you can build them up. I think, in our role as a principal, you have to have the instinct and ability to understand and recognize those teachers you can empower and move forward.

Janet:

I had a teacher placed on my campus last year. She was amazing, and so I made her team leader this year. She's a second year teacher, and she's outstanding. She really wants to be better and learn as much as she can. I'm going to do my part to support that. I think those are the kinds of things when teachers want to do something, you need to be a 'yes' person, and not say 'no.' That is what empowers them to go further, and that's what creates the trust and the positive climate. Just give them opportunities.

Robin:

I like to create the opportunities for discussion, so that I can get to know that person, so that it's not just looking at their instructional capabilities, but their talents may lie in any other area outside of the classroom. Listening and learning with them, and looking at those skills and those talents and developing those in that area, and then providing the opportunities to go out there in the world and see how the other half lives, so to speak.

Alan:

Try to get them involved in something else besides their classroom. Let's say you need two Student Council sponsors. You have a veteran, and you get that rookie in there, and all of a sudden they see how important the role is. They meet different kids on the campus besides just the ones in their classroom.

Teri:

A teacher that's in her fourth year now was made team leader because we kind of noticed that 'spark', that thing that says 'team leader.' She kind of struggled a little as team leader, because they do sometimes. We coached her up a little bit, but then we went to a PLC conference this summer, and I took her with us, and her teaching has improved. She has improved as a leader, and like all of a sudden, it was this blossom.

Question 8: Describe the ideal teacher leader.

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Share your goals and vision
- Are team players
- Have passion
- Collaborate and work well with others
- Have good interpersonal skills
- Are professional, and are good role models
- Are problem solvers
- Hold themselves and others accountable

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dan:

They understand and share your goal and vision. They work with all types of personalities and they have a passion for what they teach. And who they teach. I think those are three key items that I look for in a teacher in that leader role. I think

those are instinctive things that you can't fake, and that you can really see through in a person right away and recognize it. So, that's the shared goals, being able to work with multiple types of people, and having a passion for what you do. And who you do it with.

Janet:

They are collaborators and they are team players, so it's not a 'me, me, and me.' It is an 'us', or 'we' mentality. They have interpersonal skills, they can work with any kind of people. They are professional, and they act in a professional way at all times, and they are a role model for their peers. They listen to their peers, and they just have that drive, that internal drive to do better and work together.

Robin:

My ideal teacher leader is a problem solver, not a problem maker or creator. They are able to be creative, and not a blamer or complainer. They can come up with solutions and ideas so when they come to me with any type of concern, they have at least 2-3 solutions on how to make it better, or what to even try. They take the initiative around campus. That's what I look for and crave in a teacher leader.

Teri:

They have high expectations of themselves and of everyone around them, the students and their peers. An ideal teacher leader can then help hold their peers accountable to those high expectations. Teachers don't necessarily like to hold teachers accountable for things, but a good teacher leader can, with those interpersonal skills, in a way that doesn't come off negatively.

Category 5: The Principal's Role in building Relationships, Trust, and Organizational Commitment with Teachers

In this category, the questions detail the importance of the principal in establishing trust and building relationships with teachers.

Question 9: How do you build trust with early career teachers on your campus?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Build trust by coaching
- Spend time getting to know teachers
- Be honest
- Be genuine
- Be authentic
- Show your humanity
- Communicate
- Listen

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

Have a set time to meet with new teachers, where there is no agenda, where it's just 'What are you all concerned with?', 'How are you doing?' It might be right before the end of a term or a grading period. I think it's important early on in the school year, to get into classes, even if it's not in an evaluative type way. Seeing what's going on and dropping them the email afterwards, 'Hey, I really liked the way you did such and

such.’ Just knowing that we’re more in a coaching type relationship than always being evaluative of them.

Dan:

My thing is, you walk the talk with them. It’s really simple, just be honest. There will be situations and circumstances that sometimes are even beyond our control, so we have to be honest with them about it. Sometimes be able to say, ‘I can’t tell you why, but just trust me on it, and we’ll make it work.’ ‘This is the way it is.’ And you know? It may be good, it may be bad, but, straight up.

Janet:

I would say be genuine and authentic. And when they do take risks, don’t get mad if they fail. Admitting your own mistakes. We don’t have it all together, and we’re learning also! Get them together, and allow them to have venting sessions and you can be a part of it. I tell stories of how I was displaced from two different schools, and I had to move after three weeks of teaching in one classroom, and I had to move to another classroom. I’m real, I’m human, and I think that builds trust.

Robin:

You have to really communicate the whole way through. I’ve learned that communication really helps to build that understanding and connection. So for example, I have a new teacher going through orientation; I give them a heads up all the time, ‘Okay, so you’re going to get this, this, and this, and you really want to budget your time, and you’re not going to have a whole lot of time to set up your room. And they say, ‘Okay, you’re looking out for me, and you care about me, and it’s

not just you coming and seeing how I'm teaching.' You care about me as a person, and you're looking out for my best interests.

Alan:

Thinking about new teachers, I'm not sure that there's anything different that I do or would do, to build trust with new teachers versus anybody else. So speaking generally, what I've always found is just extremely important, is to always be yourself. Be yourself, because then you never have to remember, 'Okay, how was I the last time I met with this person?' 'I couldn't live like that, you know?' Just be yourself and follow through. If you make a commitment to somebody, be there for them, and support them.

Teri:

Just listen to what they have to say, and try to see if you can pick up on those nuances that they may not really be saying, but what's really going on. If they come to you with a problem, help them problem solve, instead of telling them how to solve the problem.

Question 10: How do you build relationships with teachers?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Be yourself
- Be genuine
- Take a genuine interest in teachers as people
- Have an open door policy

- Follow-through
- Admit your mistakes
- Never be afraid to laugh at yourself
- Be human

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Tom:

You need to be yourself. You just need to be yourself. Be who you are, be genuine. Take notice of them, and ask them about their life, and what's going on. Just be able to relate to them.

Dan:

I think you build relationships, just like you build relationships with anybody. You give them time, and you try to find the time for each other. You have a true understanding of what they are going through, or what they are feeling. If you have that time and your conversations are genuine, it makes a big difference in building those relationships and that's something you can't fake.

Janet:

Just getting to know them. They want to know that you know them, and remember things about them. People say to me, 'I always appreciate you because you always have an open door, and I feel like I can always come in and ask you questions.' So things like having an open door, and being visible around the building and just being available, creates a relationship.

Robin:

My way of talking to you might be different than someone else. How they talk to me might be different than what I'm used to. But as we get to know each other, now I can at least say one thing about every staff member. And the follow through. People ask me 'Are you busy?' and I say, 'Yeah, I'm busy, but I definitely want to hear from you.' I want you to know that you can come and talk to me at any time.

Alan

There are over 200 adults that work in my building. I don't know all their kids' names, and I'm never going to, but you have to be real, and you have to have fun with people. You have to be willing to laugh at yourself. When you make a mistake, it's the funniest thing to everybody, even if inside you're upset about it. Those social events that we have are so important for us to be there, and to have fun with people.

Teri:

To be human, to be yourself, and to laugh at yourself, or laugh to keep from crying. Even though we want to keep that face, sometimes they know you're having a bad day. All 200 of them want a little bit of your attention at the times when it's probably not the most convenient. You have to be genuine.

At the conclusion of the last question, the primary researcher asked if anyone had any last questions or comments to make, prior to officially ending the focus group. No principal had anything else to contribute, the focus group concluded, and the participants were dismissed.

Focus group for teachers

The primary researcher conducted a focus group with teachers; one teacher who worked for each of the principals who participated in the principals focus group, each in the first five years of their careers. There were only five teacher participants; two elementary school, one middle school, and two high school teachers. Principal Dan did not allow any of his teachers to participate. He stated that he requires a lot from his teachers during the week, and he did not want to burden them with any additional activities to have to participate in. This was listed as a limitation of the study in Chapter III of this research.

At the conclusion of the principals' focus group, each principal, with the exception of Dan, emailed the primary researcher a list of names of the teachers on each of their campuses who were in the first five years of their teaching careers. Using the names of these eligible candidates, the primary researcher sent a recruitment letter, via email, along with the "Consent to Take Part in a Human Research Study" document to each of the individuals named by each campus principal. The first person to volunteer from each campus was selected for participation. The five women who participated were strangers to each other, as well as to the primary researcher. No one, including the primary researcher, knew anyone who participated in the focus group; no one had ever seen or spoken to anyone who attended the focus group prior to the night it was held. The participants did warm up to one quickly however, and seemed to enjoy the conversation. Several participants told the primary researcher that they volunteered because they were excited about the topic of the research, and afterward, stated that they enjoyed participating in the focus group.

The participants were all female. Five were White, and one was African-American. The participants are briefly described below. The names used are pseudonyms in order to maintain the anonymity of the participants.

Dana is a second-year high school teacher. She is a White female between 50-55 years of age, who chose teaching as a second career. She began her teaching career at the high school where she is currently working, and was hired by another principal who is no longer the principal of the school. Dana now works for Principal Tom.

Jessica is a second-year elementary school teacher. She is an African-American female, between 35-40 years of age. She began her teaching career at the elementary school where she is currently working, and she works for Principal Robin.

Rachel is a first-year middle school teacher. She is a white female between 25-30 years of age. This is her first teaching job, and she works for Principal Teri.

Morgan is a fourth-year elementary school teacher. She is a White female between 25-30 years of age. She began her teaching career at the school where she is currently working, and she works for Principal Janet.

Cathy is a second-year high school teacher. She is a white female between 30-35 years of age. She began her teaching career at the high school where she is currently working, and she works for Principal Alan.

This focus group was scheduled for 5:00-7:00 p.m. on a Wednesday evening. It lasted about 1 hour and 56 minutes.

After a brief welcome that included the purpose of the study and introductions of each participant, the primary researcher read the title of the study for the participants: THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN BUILDING POSITIVE TEACHER IDENTITY IN EARLY CAREER PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS. Using the definition of terms listed in Chapter I, the primary researcher defined for the participants, the terms "positive teacher identity" and "teacher efficacy."

A total of ten questions were asked that directly relate to the research questions for this study. Each research question was translated into a category or "theme", and two questions were asked related to each category. The categories are listed below, along with a brief explanation of what the questions are designed to ask, in relation to each category. The question is stated, followed by the responses given by participants. As stated earlier, only those responses that related to the question being asked were transcribed. Off-topic or non-relevant comments were not included.

Theme 1: The principal's role in job satisfaction and new teacher efficacy

In this category, the questions for teachers are designed to probe the attitudes and beliefs of teachers as to their principals' role in helping them create their own personal teaching identity, as well as their role in creating teacher job satisfaction, individually or collectively.

Question 1: How does your principal play a role in creating job satisfaction for teachers?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Providing direct feedback
- Providing resources

- Supporting teachers and their ideas
- Behaving consistently
- Encouraging teachers
- Being positive
- Being visible
- Building trust

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

I think a principal plays a big role in creating job satisfaction. Principals are primary reasons why educators leave. My first year teaching did not go well, and a lot of it was because of the principal. I knew that she did not believe in me, and it really shook my confidence, but through my team, and other teachers, I was able to recover and come back for the second year. So I would say, that they have a very large role.

Jessica:

I know of my principal, she's a very good listener, and she provides direct feedback. And if she has resources available, then she'll provide me with those resources. I also like how she's constantly asking me if I'm okay, if everything is going okay. And she supports my ideas and also my feedback. Another one of the most important things is consistency.

Rachel:

My principal, she is very encouraging. She likes to recognize positive behavior, or positive things that have happened, or people who volunteer, or have done something to help support the environment of our school. She's very encouraging. She attends all of our planning meetings. I don't actually get to see her a lot, except in these meetings, so we don't have a personal relationship, but I do see her around, and I see how she's trying to help us as a whole. As an individual, I don't really feel that connection.

Morgan:

We have high turnover rate at my school. I've been there for four years, and every year, I feel like she's a new person, so it kind of changes, but she's always positive, and really encouraging. She really hates negativity. We do a lot of team building, and she talks about trust all the time. It's her favorite word, besides positive.

Cathy:

I had heard so many horror stories about first-year teachers just being taken advantage of because they don't have a good support system in place. At my school, as demanding an environment as it is, I feel like all principals are there to support me. They are not against me, they are not looking for things to get me in trouble. Whenever, I ask them to help me with a problem, they have very solution oriented responses and really helpful suggestions. I really appreciate that. I don't feel like I'm going to fail, because I know that they're there to support me.

Question 2: How does your principal support teachers in creating their own sense of teaching identity?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Provide structure without micromanaging
- Give praise
- Encourage teachers to “get a life”
- Provide opportunities to learn and grow from others
- Support new teachers
- Provide time and resources
- Encourage teachers to make instruction their own

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

My current principal has provided a structure, but he doesn't micromanage. He praises and acknowledges all different styles of teaching, not one 'golden' teacher that everyone should be like. He doesn't want us to be robots that live up there, that teaching is our only identity. He makes a big point in emails to say, 'Enjoy your weekend.' And so, I really like that about the principal.

Jessica:

She allows me the opportunity to visit other teachers, or work with different people, to get their perspective and their style. And if I like it, then implement it. So, outside of

just me and what I think, she asks questions about that, and what could I do? But then also she allows me to experience it.

Rachel:

I don't have that personal one-on-one kind of thing with my principal. So, I feel like I get more of my teaching identity from my team, than I do from my principal. When it comes to teaching, besides giving me a few pointers and tips here and there, I don't really feel like I've really got support when it comes to creating my own identity, because this is my first year teaching. So, I'm still learning, and I feel like I'm learning much more from my group, than I get from my principal. I'd like more support in that, because I know she has great ideas.

Morgan:

One of my favorite things that my principal does, is she's very much empowering us to be our own teacher, and she says, 'No, I'm not going to tell you how to do it.' 'These are the things that you need to get done, but I'm not going to tell you how to do it.' If we go to her, and we don't understand what we are doing, for her to help us to become better teachers and build our own sense of identity, she'll say, 'Okay, stop. What can I do to help you?' And I really like that she does that, because it does help put your perspective back. She gives us everything that we need, and then she gives us a ton of what we want. I know it sounds really silly, but like, colored notecards or Mr. Sketch markers does make teaching easier. She lets us go to other teachers' rooms to learn from them. Once, she came in and taught a lesson for me. My principal taught a lesson to my kids, so I could go observe another teacher! It was so

nice to see her being a person. She being willing to literally step into our shoes helps us realize, Okay, I can do this.

Cathy:

I think that my principal makes it clear what he's looking for, like on the walk-throughs or the observations, but then really leaves it up to us to decide how we're going to implement that. How can we bring these ideas into the classroom? And really just putting the opportunity in front of us, and letting us decide how we want to digest it, or how we want to mold it to suit our own. Doing what's best for the kids. How can we bring that into the classroom in the most effective way?

Theme 2: The principal's sphere of influence on new teachers and their role in mentoring and teacher retention

In this category, the questions are designed to elicit information from teachers regarding their experiences with mentoring programs and the principals' role in developing and providing mentoring opportunities. The questions allow teachers to respond to the types and quality of the mentoring experiences that they were provided.

Question 3: Describe the efforts of your principal in working to help you build your skills as a teacher.

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Provides resources
- Provides support
- Checks in with teachers to see how they are doing
- Allows teachers to teach teachers
- Provides meaningful professional development

- Allows teacher to do their jobs and minimize hand holding

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

We don't seem to have a copy count, and the budget seems to have opened up, so my skills as a teacher this year, have been so much easier when I can make copies, and I don't have to have class sets. Also, I had a safety concern in my room that ended up not being true. I reported it, and the principal was there as fast as he could walk down the hall, and he took it very seriously. And, never made me afraid that, 'Oh, you wasted my time, it wasn't anything.' He just took it from there, like, 'Thank you teacher, you did your part, you reported, and now...' I really appreciated being supported on that end.

Jessica:

Being a first year teacher there are just so many things that you're building on in reference to your skills, so I love the walk-throughs, and suggestions for improvement, and things like that. Our principal does do check-ins with me, and she'll even check out with me. Just to make sure that everything is going okay, and I appreciate that. If I have questions or anything, that's that quick moment to where I can just let her know everything is okay.

Rachel:

My principal, in our staff development meetings, usually likes to have the teachers teach each other. She finds something that she likes in one of their groups, and then

we teach it to everyone. She suggests to us that that we should take something from what we just learned today, and ‘I want you to apply it to your classroom.’ That way we’re learning from each other, and I think that that’s really helped me skill-wise. I’m learning about how other people do different things, and so that really is a good thing.

Morgan:

I think that my principal is big into professional development. She would send me to conferences, and all of these really great things, and then allow me to buy what I needed there; if they used some tools, or a book or something, and I came back armed with what I learned. That’s something that I feel like has been super helpful. I feel like my principal stays in a walk-through too long...And I have a severe special needs student and he started freaking out. At first, I looked at the principal, like, ‘What are you going to do?’ She just shook her head, and pointed to me like, ‘This is your classroom’, and she watched me diffuse it, and it gave me that confidence again. That’s right, this is my classroom, and I can do this.

Cathy:

The main way that my principals help me build my skills, is by giving me recommendations for other resources. Again with the time factor, they don’t have a lot of time to spend watching me, and like personally coaching me, but they’ve given me a lot of really good recommendations. You know, so I feel like whenever a principal or anybody comes into my room, they have something to offer me.

Question 4: What sort of mentoring experiences were provided to you?

A summary of the themes from the participants’ answers to this question are listed below.

- Mentors should be a good fit for the new teacher
- Mentors should be a good role model
- Mentors should be positive and proactive
- Mentors should maintain confidentiality
- Mentors should have time to meet
- Mentors should help protégé with planning and other tasks
- Mentors should not simply “go through the motions”
- Principals should support mentoring programs on their campuses
- Principals should realize that mentors make or break the program
- Principals should provide mentors at the beginning of the year
- Principals should check in with new teachers to see how they are doing
- Principals should realize that new teachers want feedback from the principal too
- Principals should implement induction and mentoring activities with fidelity
- Principals should be open to constructive criticism regarding mentoring

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

My first year, I had a one-on-one mentor, and it was wonderful! She is one of the reasons I continued on to my second year. She was very proactive and very helpful to me, but she made the mentor program. The program was not strong, she was. Campus-wide, our mentor program was headed by an AP, and it was pretty worthless. I don't know if it was a coincidence, but my mentor experience was made by the mentor, not by the program.

Jessica:

I didn't get my mentor until 2 or three months in, so that was really no fun. And you never really have time with your mentor, so it's like, a catch and miss, but I like how the principal teamed me up with the math specialist... he's been a really good mentor. However, I did have a hiccup with my mentor, because the problem is, when you talk to your mentor, it's supposed to be confidential, when you're talking about things they're supposed to help you with. And apparently it wasn't as confidential, and to me, that broke the trust. Even though we have a relationship, it's strictly more question oriented. Anything else is off limits, because now you've broken the bond of trust. That was hard this year too.

Rachel:

So my mentor, I love her. I love that my principal chose her. She's right next door to me, she's my team leader, and my department head's on my other side, but she's my mentor, and she has supported me in everything I do, she's right there if I need her. The rest of the mentor program, I'm really kind of sour about, because the Associate Principal, who is supposed to be in charge of it? I never hear from her. I've never gotten to observe other classrooms, I've never had to go to any of the meetings. And the principal doesn't check in with us as first year teachers, which kind of bothers me. As a first year teacher, I don't feel like I have the support of the administration at my school. So, having the support of my team, and my actual mentor that they provided, was really all I had.

I feel like there is so much negativity when it comes to teachers, because of the overwhelming amount of work that we have. And the thing is, in college, you're not told all this stuff. As a first year teacher, I walked in, and I'm just like blown out of my mind about how much is expected, and I think the mentorship program needs to include ways to be more efficient so that you're not overwhelmed. You have even these teachers who have been there so many years, they are still feeling overwhelmed. I feel like that needs to be something they support us with, how to be more efficient in our own jobs.

Morgan:

I did have a one-on-one mentor, and she really meant well, and she did wonderful things, but for the most part, it felt like we were checking boxes. 'Hey, this day we need to meet, we're going to talk about these things, these are things you need to do.' Aside from that, I really didn't feel like it was helpful. I felt more like 'we're checking this box, because the district says we have to.' 'If you fail, my butt is covered.' I'm just being honest, it really felt that way. But the mentor program, even if the principal isn't in charge of it, needs to be bolstered, because we don't like feeling like we're not good at things.

My very first year teaching, we did a book club that my principal led, and I was so excited, because as a new teacher, your administration is like the Holy Grail to you, and you really look up to them, and you want to know them, and you want to be accepted. Every month we were supposed to meet, we were going to read these things, and for the first three months, I remember, until about November, we met. It was great and I really enjoyed it. By January, she just cancelled all the events on the

calendar, and it wasn't talked about. By February, I was like, wait, 'When are we going to meet?' And it was, 'Oh, that's over with.' That apparently wasn't very important.

I think what would really help is a multi-year program, to build you up, and every year, it gets less and less; with qualified people to mentor you, and then you can turn into a mentor. It may only be your 6th or 7th year teaching, but you've had four quality years of mentoring, and then a couple quality years of teaching, and then a new teacher comes in, and you start that process again. I think that would be a golden part of the program.

Cathy:

I was really hungry for good leadership, when I started working in education. When I very first got hired, I got introduced to this Special Ed. teacher, and she was great. She was very reliable, and very helpful. We were required to meet every week, and she would observe me from time-to-time, and I could just go to her if I had any questions, and so I felt really supported there. Then she wasn't a very good role model, in terms of not being overwhelmed by the workload. She's kind of a workaholic, and so she was always overwhelmed. My principal gave me recommendations for other teachers to go talk to, based on my observations. So I went to one of those other teachers that he had recommended, and asked her to be my unofficial mentor. I started meeting with another teacher, who has all of these super strategies for doing work more efficiently, and not feeling so overloaded. She doesn't feel overwhelmed at all. That was really good for me to have that as an example. I've talked to my principal about

that, and he said, ‘You know, you’ve just got to stick with the positive people.’ So, he’s always there, he’s always got good advice.

Theme 3: The Principal’s role in instructional support

In this category, the questions are designed to discover how the principal is involved in providing early career teachers the instructional support that they need. The questions are designed to elicit information regarding the teachers’ perceptions of the level of instructional leadership provided by their principal.

Question 5: How is your principal involved in instructional practices on your campus?

A summary of the themes from the participants’ answers to this question are listed below.

- Support teachers with discipline issues so that they can teach
- Be involved
- Guide and lead, don’t micromanage
- Attend planning meetings
- Encourage reading about instruction
- Give helpful advice

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

The principal this year has helped instructional practices by helping with discipline issues, so that those are handled or managed, so that we can teach. And some of the

examples are that tardy's are taken. They are expected to be taken. In-school suspension and detentions are happening.

Jessica:

I think that our principal is involved, I think she's very, very involved. I don't think she's a micromanager. I think that she's involved just enough. When she has time, she'll sit in on the planning. When she does her walk-throughs, she'll give feedback. I think she's involved just enough, not necessarily in the actual planning aspect of it, but she's there to give ideas, feedback, and things like that. She's there to kind of guide you, or lead you if you need it.

Rachel:

She attends our planning meetings. She gives very little input. It's more about listening to see what's going on. And if she feels she needs to give a suggestion, or ask a question to help our thinking, then she'll do that, but she kind of leaves it up to us, because we're the professionals, and she allows that. When it comes to instructional stuff, she's definitely supportive in that; but when it comes to discipline, which inhibits instruction at times, there's not that support. I don't feel like the discipline is fully supported by the principals.

Morgan:

I feel like my principal, as far as instructional practices, reads a lot of articles, and finds a lot of resources. She sends those things to us, and sometimes it's overwhelming. I wish there was a little less reactivity, and more proactivity, because I mean when you send me twelve articles in one week about different instructional

practices that I can employ... I don't have time to read all twelve. Why don't you just give me some bullet points or something?

Cathy:

My principal often leads you to professional development workshops. I just feel like I can always go to any of them, really, for advice. Honestly, I'm really lucky. I feel like I can go to any teacher in my school, and they will give me advice. I would be interested to see a principal teach a class to actual students. How long has it been since you've been in a classroom?

Question 6: How does your principal support you in your daily instructional practices?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Encourage teacher leadership
- Be positive
- Support learning
- Be about more than just "test scores"
- Don't make teachers feel guilty about taking your time
- Listen
- Encourage risk-taking

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

I'm always comparing last years' principal to this one, but my former principal, even before the test was taken, predicted that I could not bring the students to success, and removed students from my class to another teacher who could do her 'miracle work.' I had no idea it was going on, I was a new teacher. 'Oh, your schedules are getting changed'. I was totally oblivious, felt like a total fool when I found out later. Our test scores came back from last year, and overall they were low for the school. And in fact, lower than some schools that we were 'better' than. And the ironic thing is that I was given the task of the lesson plans, to get us prepared for the EOC (end-of-course). So, I find that quite ironic, that I'm entrusted with some of this EOC prep to get us prepared, when last year, there was a principal that clearly thought that I was not capable of 'bringing kids successfully to the EOC.' So the principal, with supporting my daily instructional practices, does not punish us and therefore, we are able to pick ourselves up with positivity and get re-energized without emotion.

Jessica:

I really kind of feel bad for our principal, because this is her second year here. I really hate how they give her such a hard time, for just trying to implement a 'go-forward' type of mentality. She's really doing a good job, and she's very supportive. She's all about data with our PLCs. She really just wants us to dig into the data, implement, whatever is necessary to make sure the students are learning what they need to learn and not staying the same. And, she's very, very positive, in respect to your ideas, and what you're doing on a daily basis.

Rachel:

She visits our meetings and she give us that kind of assistance, but I don't feel like that really helps us on a daily basis. She's very about test scores. When I had my incident at the beginning of the year with the parents, instead of supporting me as a teacher, they didn't look at the data, they just moved the kids to a different class. It really makes you feel like a failure.

Morgan:

I don't feel supported daily. I've said amazing things about my principal as a person, but sometimes as a principal, it's not there. When I feel supported in the big, I don't feel supported in the small. I'm not a very apologetic person, but in the sense that, if I go to her, and I say, 'I'm really sorry for your time, but I had a quick question?' I find myself just apologizing for taking up her precious time. I don't feel supported daily.

Cathy:

The administrators are so busy, they can't be in there every day. So, I enjoy the fact that I get a lot of freedom. I like to take risks in the classroom and see how it plays out. I really appreciate the fact that the administrators take the time to listen. Last year, our team leader was very pushy, and it was a lot of 'us vs. them' and I was in the middle as a new teacher, and so I told my principal that. He said, 'Well the good news is, you know, your team leader got a job in California, she's moving. So based on my feedback, I think he hired a new team leader. She's very "Let's work together...we can solve every problem.'" And so, as a whole, I feel like our

department is coming together a little bit better, based on my principal listening to me. So that's pretty cool!

Theme 4: The principal's role in teacher empowerment

In this section, the questions provide answers as to whether or not teachers feel empowered to do their jobs, and/or if they are empowered to take on leadership roles at their schools.

Question 7: Describe your principal's leadership style.

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are stated below.

- Be ethical
- Lead by example
- Be professional
- Be positive
- Move things forward
- Be encouraging
- Be proactive
- Be sensitive and empathetic

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

I would describe his style as a coach. I feel that he's in the trenches with us, and he has our back as a team. I find him very professional, ethical, leads by example; for example, we are supposed to be out in the halls, so I see him walking the hall. He is

very approachable, respectful of our time, and very transparent. He has so far sent a birthday card to every staff member, and he may write the same thing on everyone's, but I don't care. It's handwritten, and he did it. I think he's very empathetic.

Jessica:

I think that my principal is just very involved. Her expectations are up front, so you don't have to figure out what she's expecting. She's very professional, and she does lead by example; we're on duty, she's on duty. It's just something that she's doing, and I appreciate that very much. The most important thing though, is that with all of the negativity that comes with working with a lot of women, or in an environment where people are kind of fighting against the odds, I love how she's still driven, she's still positive, and she's still trying to take us forward. She's doing everything in her power to make sure that we are headed in that direction, so I appreciate that.

Rachel:

My principal, when I see her, she can be encouraging. She's very open to ideas, she's definitely positive, and very spirited! She's all about the school colors. She's professional, but she's not always as approachable as I would like a principal. She's still a really wonderful lady, she is. She does a really good job, she really does.

Morgan:

I feel like my principal is also super-spirited. The kids really like her. When parents interact with us, she won't let people bully her teachers, which is huge. I mean everybody has positives and negatives. She won't let other people bully us, and if she notices that a parent is being too rude to us, or too volatile, she steps in right away, and she doesn't allow that to happen. I think she's more reactive than proactive, and I

feel like as teachers, and as we get past our third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years of teaching, we learn to be more proactive, and that helps us not to have to be as reactive. I think she's still a relatively new principal, so she's learning. She's pretty hands off until it's necessary.

Cathy:

I think that pretty much all the principals in my school are ready to tell you what you need to do, and then at the same time, they are also very sensitive and empathetic to whatever's going on. You know, so they're professionals in their jobs, but very respectful and understanding that we are all human, and we do human things.

Question 8: How does your principal empower teachers on campus to assume leadership roles?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Let teachers demonstrate their teaching strategies to their colleagues
- Be open and encouraging to teachers
- Empower teachers by listening to their ideas
- Recognize leadership qualities in teachers and develop them
- Hold teachers accountable
- Appreciate a teachers' hard work

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

I've liked in our campus-wide training meetings, he will have pre-selected different teachers to showcase their strategies that they've done, and that lets them assume a

leadership role in the meetings. He's a very big AVID supporter, and I know that he allowed several teachers to go to a conference. So, when you put money toward something, you are really supporting that.

Jessica:

My principal takes the lead when necessary. I think being a first year teacher, it's kind of hard to take the lead on certain things, but I've just had to step in there, and I like that she gave me reign to be able to do so. If someone's not doing it, go ahead and do it. I don't really have a lot of time to add programs, but I just like the fact that she is open to ideas, and I have ideas for the future, so that's really exciting!

Rachel:

When I was in my interview, I told her that my interest was bringing dance to middle schools because that seems to be a progressive thing that's coming along slowly, and she was very encouraging about that idea. She seems to support the teachers, and after-school she's really about getting every kid into some kind of activity that they like. Finding teachers and doing whatever she needs to encourage them, to help them out, to put those in place so that kids feel like they belong and they have a place. She empowers us with the teachers teaching teachers. If you go to a conference, then you show what you learned, or if you have something good, you can show it to everyone, and help them out. Maybe they can pick up that idea. She's doing really well encouraging after school activities, but when it comes to structural stuff, or our departments and everything, we're not really empowered there.

Morgan:

I feel like our principal tells you what you're doing, and there's not a lot of discussion. We are told what we are doing, and then she always backs it up with, 'I can see this in you, I see this quality, I see this ability, and you don't see it yet, but it's there, and I'm going to build it up.' She really gives us leadership, more-so than us asking for it a lot of the times, I think. She capitalizes on our strengths. If there are things that we do well, she wants us to do them even better than we already do. She holds us accountable, and she capitalizes on what we do well.

Cathy:

Anytime that I show leadership qualities, they take the time to appreciate that, and acknowledge it, and make me feel like 'Okay, my hard work is actually being noticed. Something as simple as sending out a staff-wide email inviting them to my room to get valentines, he'll quickly write back, 'Oh, very nice!' You know, just like 'Good job!' And so, I do appreciate that.

Theme 5: The Principal's Role in building Relationships, Trust, and Organizational Commitment with Teachers

In this section, the answers to the questions provide insight into how teachers feel their principal has or has not worked at relationship and trust building.

Question 9: Describe your relationship with your principal.

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are listed below.

- Respectful
- Professional
- Trustworthy

- Open
- Positive
- Visible
- Approachable
- Empathetic
- Honest

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

I would describe it as ‘new’. It is very respectful and professional, and I find him to be very responsive. It’s almost one-sided. He’s reached out to me more than I’ve reached out to him. At the beginning of the year, as we were setting up our rooms, he went into every room, and said, ‘How’s it going? What can I do for you?’ The former principal, had never stepped foot inside my room, so that took me off guard too. So, I said, ‘Nothing! Everything’s fine!’ But he opened that door too.

Jessica:

Even though I think she’s great, sometimes I don’t know how to read her, or how to take her. I love how we do have a lot of trust. We have a pretty good relationship. I could come to her with anything. So she’s very open. I love how she’s positive. If something is wrong, she’s concerned, and she wants to know. I think that she’s really working on creating a more positive environment because I think sometimes she notices the negativity, but she is shifting that, and whenever we have a meeting, it’s about the positive.

Rachel:

My relationship? Minimal. I don't see her a lot. I don't talk to her a lot. I have more relationship with her secretary than I do with her. I don't really know much about her, or how she does things, and she doesn't seem to check. Like the first week she gave me a book and she gave me a card, and she does observations, and that's about it. That's really the contact that we have. There's not that support, because there's not that relationship. She doesn't check in with the new teachers. So I would have liked much more of a relationship to understand 'where she is' and that kind of thing.

Morgan:

My first two years, I would say it was really professional in the way that we interacted. I didn't know her personally, but I felt like we had a wonderfully working, professional relationship. Last year at the end of my second year teaching, when she told me I was looping and moving to a new grade level, a third year teacher going to their third different grade level, staying with the same group of kids, I cried in her office, and it was this **huge** show of emotion; should have been a major red flag to her, and she was angry at me for being upset, and so that super damaged our relationship. So I feel like professionally, we're almost at a stalemate with a lot of things. Personally, and I don't know how this happened, I feel like we have a better personal relationship than we do a professional relationship. I don't know where that flip happened. I don't know if it was because of that incident, but it's really hard to pick that relationship back up.

Cathy:

My principal is respectful, open, honest, door always open. I feel like that goes both ways. I'm very honest about what's going on with me. And I feel like I can, go to them, if, they're available, and talk about whatever I need to, and same thing with me. Any of the principals are welcome in my classroom, because I know that they're going to be professional and respectful. I really appreciate that.

Question 10: How does the principal build trust with teachers?

A summary of the themes from the participants' answers to this question are stated below.

- Respecting teachers' time
- By not being a "gotcha" principal
- Communicating
- Being open and receptive
- Building relationships
- Being supportive
- Having clear expectations
- Allowing teachers to be vulnerable
- Being real

Some of the descriptive responses provided by the participants are stated below.

Dana:

I think principals can build trust by not being a "gotcha" principal. Remembering that they too were once in the classroom, to quickly deal with discipline problems, with

students and teachers, and if they involve teachers, to not talk about it again or reference that.

Jessica:

Well the number one thing for me is ‘Communication. I can’t deal without it. It can hurt or break a relationship, so you can have little communication, or you can over-communicate. It kind of has to be just right. And I like how my principal does her best not to send emails during the day. I think she always checks and I know if my work ethic changes, or if my demeanor changes, then she’s checking in with me. I think that she builds trust with that, and just being open and receptive to different things. And just being supportive. One of the things she mentioned, is having a teacher’s back and I just think that that is a very good way to build trust with your teachers, because in the environment we’re in, kids may say something, parents may say something, and it can be totally misconstrued, or it can be incorrect. So if you know your teachers, and you have that relationship with your teacher, then you should be able to support that teacher.

Rachel:

She tries to build trust with communication. I think one of the things that breaks the trust for me, is when big incidents with parents happen, she is trying to juggle. Instead of saying like, ‘No, you, can’t do this to my teacher’, you don’t always feel that support. She tries to build this trust, but at the same time, there’s this break in it.

Morgan:

I think, my principal used to be very good at drawing a professional line. Knowing that ‘I’m here to be your employee,’ or ‘I’m here as a teacher,’ and ‘You’re here as a

principal,’ that was comforting. I could build off of that foundation, knowing that ‘This is where we stand.’ After a while, it became more like a personal thing, which at first I really liked. ‘This is great, you know! She’s asking about my personal life.’ I think when a principal has very clear expectations, and they revisit those expectations often, and communicate in a way that is relevant, and not just word ‘vomiting’, those things build trust. This then, makes you feel that whole self-efficacy that we were talking about.

Cathy:

My main thing with building trust in any relationship, whether it’s my boss, or my team leaders, is vulnerability. Feeling safe to be vulnerable, feeling safe that I can be open, and be genuine in who I am. And the same thing that they’re sharing with me; stories from their lives that are within the boundaries of whatever is respectable and appropriate; that give me insight into, ‘Oh, yeah. They’ve been through this kind of thing too.’ ‘They’ve struggled with this as well.’ Knowing how to draw that line between personal and professional, but still being allowed to be personal.

At the conclusion of the last question, the primary researcher asked if anyone had any last questions or comments to make, prior to officially ending the focus group. Morgan said that she had something else to add, and that prompted others to share as well. Their comments are stated here:

Morgan:

I wanted to jump at the opportunity to come here, when I was reading about what you had said, if the principal’s role shapes whether teachers stay in the profession or not? I absolutely think it does. I know many teachers from my school who either taught for

many years, or it was their first few years, left because of my principal. And, coming from someone, who I believe that my God-given talent is teaching, I'm stepping away from the profession, at the end of this year, and it is because of my principal. I'm leaving to work with my husband overseas, and I'll be teaching in a different capacity. But my principal is absolutely the reason why I wanted to leave not only the district, but this school. As a person, I love this woman, but as a principal, it doesn't feel like it's her gift, and it hurts so bad, knowing that maybe if I had somebody like some of you guys are talking about, things would have been so different. I cannot consciously go back to my university and champion for teachers.

Dana:

Well, if my principal last year came back, I was not going to come back. So once I learned there was a new principal, I came back, but what principals may not realize, is how much they get into our head, and we bring it home, as new teachers.

Jessica:

If I was to give a principal feedback, one of the things is, don't let the bad apples spoil the bunch. They focus on those that won't, instead of those that will. When you have the ones that are really wanting to do better, and make the school exactly what it needs to be, the focus is not on them. And so, unfortunately, there are those bad apples, and I think sometimes they hold on to them, instead of letting them go. And they have to understand that they don't have to please everyone. Let's work with the people that are really, really willing to do what's right. Willing to take us to the next level, instead of those that are trying to hold us back and keep us back, because ultimately, it's not

helping the school, it's not helping the most important 'being' that's there, which is the student.

At the conclusion of this comment, no teacher had anything else to contribute, the focus group concluded, and the participants were dismissed.

Conclusion

The focus group conversations provided the primary researcher with rich, authentic descriptions of the relationships between teachers and principals that led to good descriptive qualitative data. This data and the conclusions drawn from it are the subject of chapter V and will be analyzed there.

Chapter V

Conclusions

As discussed in chapter one of this research, the need for teachers is great. With more teachers retiring, and about 500,000 additional teachers needed by the year 2018, the need for qualified, dedicated, and well prepared teachers is tremendous. Principals must not only look to hire the best, but provide the best induction and mentoring experiences they can. As the workforce is becoming younger, and “greener” than ever, principals can have a positive impact on the teaching experiences of early career teachers. Not only is the education of the students they teach at stake, but the teaching identity of the early career teachers themselves. The more positive their teaching identity becomes, the more likely teachers are to remain resilient enough to stand up to the rigors of teaching year after year. The more positive experiences they have with their principals, the more likely they are to remain in the teaching profession. One of the ways to determine what types of real-world experiences principals and teachers have is through dialogue and direct conversations with actual practitioners in the field. These conversations provide rich dialogue, and valuable insight into the hearts and minds of the individuals who are doing the work of education on a daily basis.

This research study investigated the role of the principal in building positive teacher identity in early career public school teachers. The primary researcher looked at this problem from the perspective of campus principals and from the perspective of the teachers who work together with them. Important to this study is not only what practitioners believe about this topic, from their own perspectives, but what the teachers think who work for the same principals who gave their insights to the research questions

that were asked. Through the use of focus groups, principals and teachers were able to discuss, in an atmosphere that was conducive to conversation, their true feelings with regard to the areas in which they have personal expertise, and are qualified to talk about. These conversations provided the researcher with a valuable “behind-the-scenes-look” into the daily lives and practices of educators in the public schools. As they talked about their relationships with each other, the information that was gleaned from these conversations was invaluable in providing rich insight into the lives of a small group of educators.

This chapter includes a thorough examination of the results of the data that was collected and reported in Chapter IV. Using the themes that were generated from the data, as listed in Chapter IV, conclusions will be drawn from the beliefs of the campus principals, the beliefs of the teachers, and then comparisons of the two groups, to determine if there are common themes deemed important to both principals and the teachers who work for them. In addition to the results, this chapter will include recommendations for school leaders, and implications for further research. Five research questions guided this study:

1. Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?
2. What role does the Principal play in teacher induction, mentoring and professional development?
3. How does the principal provide instructional support for early career teachers?
4. How does the principal empower teachers in their daily jobs, and to assume leadership positions as they grow in their careers?

5. How can a principal develop relationships, trust, and organizational commitment with early career teachers?

Discussion of the Results

Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?

Focus group questions 1 and 2 provide the answers to this research question.

From the principal's perspective, the first five years are critical because teachers are developing their skills. In addition to knowing the specific content they are teaching, early career teachers must refine their pedagogical skills as well. In addition to the rigors of teaching, lesson planning, analyzing data (individually and within teams), assessing students and maintaining classroom discipline, there are the administrative tasks of teaching that can often make or break new teachers. Peter Youngs (2007), describes a principal whose leadership, despite the presence of mentors on his campus, “Contributed to a professional culture in which new teachers were expected to take on the same roles and responsibilities as veterans, and many felt their needs were neglected” (Youngs, 2007, p. 125). Principals that participated in the focus group recognized the fact that new and early career teachers are expected to perform the same tasks as veterans, but often perform them with less skill, because they have less on-the-job experience, and less time on task. Principals noted that for most first year teachers, their professional lives are consumed with just surviving. The disconnect that exists between the vision student teachers have of teaching and the actual reality they encounter, makes for an eye-opening first year, as everything they are doing is new and represents a steep learning curve. This feeling is echoed in research by Høigaard, Giske, and Sundsli (2012), as seen in the fact

that “Newly qualified teachers are not adequately prepared, theoretically, practically, or mentally, for the overwhelming newly qualified teacher shock” (Høigaard, et al., 2012, p. 348). The common themes that the principals agreed upon are to give teachers autonomy in the classroom, albeit limited, in order to demonstrate that the principal values them as professionals. Principals feel that they should encourage risk-taking with regards to trying new and innovative things in the classroom, and they, as principals, should build relationships with early career teachers while supporting them with good mentors and teachers who are good role models. Principals did feel that it was their responsibility to help early career teachers develop their skills and teaching identity.

From the teachers’ perspective, principals should provide early career teachers with direct feedback, as well as resources that they need in order to do their jobs. These resources could be in the form of supporting their ideas, to actual curricular materials, to the opportunity to observe other teachers. Resources could come in the form of the opportunity to attend professional development workshops, to something as simple as access to markers and colored paper for use in the classroom. Overall, early career teachers feel the actions of principals that help create their sense of job satisfaction include, being visible in the building, being positive and encouraging to them, and building trust through behaving consistently in the way they work with teachers. The early career teachers in this study indicated that they value structure without micromanagement, and principals who encourage teachers to have a positive work and life balance. They want support from their principals to know that they can make instruction their own.

The across focus groups comparison reveals that there seems to be consensus in that risk-taking should be encouraged; within limits from the principals' perspective, and with the opportunity to make instruction their own, while providing structure without micromanagement. Principal Tom stated, "I think we should give them limited autonomy in the classroom. Let them not be afraid to experiment, with different teaching styles, with different lessons and activities." Another cross group commonality is the fact that principals realize that they are responsible for providing teachers with skill-building and teachers want this in the form of time and resources. Additionally, teachers want opportunities to learn and grow from others. Thus the principals' collective belief that teachers need good role models seems to coincide with teachers' desire to learn from others. "Support" was a word that was used by both teachers and principals in describing what principals can do to impact teacher job satisfaction. As Principal Janet remarked, "We had instructional coaches and we had specialists, and with our new teachers, they are in their classrooms all the time. I think that's the kind of support they need."

What role does the Principal play in teacher induction, mentoring and professional development?

Focus group questions 3 and 4 provide the answers to this research question.

The principals' perspective revealed that principals should pair early career teachers, especially first year teachers, with the right mentors. Elements that they feel should be considered are personality, physical proximity of mentor/protégé to one another in the school building, and time to meet regularly. Tom Ganser (2001) notes, that the principal should make sure, if at all possible, that the mentor and protégé are teaching the same subject, and are even teaching in close proximity to one another (Ganser, 2001, p. 40).

Sonya Vierstraete (2005) also discusses these very issues and notes that principals need to take an active role in the mentoring process, because the success of these programs depends, in large part, on the level of involvement and the commitment the principal makes to mentoring. Principals need to make sure that the mentor/protégé pairings are made appropriately and that the programs are closely monitored (Vierstraete, 2005). In general, principals feel that they can positively influence their new teachers by giving them honest, open feedback, constructive criticism, clear communication, encouragement, and praise when they are doing a good job. Principals feel that they can help better retain early career teachers by giving them the support and feedback that they need, by recognizing their talents, praising them, and giving constructive criticism. Principals see the need to create an environment that helps bridge the gap between the vision of teaching and learning, and the actual realities of the job. It seems from their responses, that this could be done by allowing teachers some autonomy to take risks, and through coaching and empowerment.

The teachers' perspective revealed that in helping teachers build their job skills, principals can make a difference through providing resources and support, providing opportunities for meaningful professional development and letting teachers teach; allowing them to do their jobs, but with minimal hand-holding. Demonstrating confidence in their ability to do the jobs. Teachers also want to hear from their principals and have that personal “check-in” that demonstrates that their principal cares about what they do on a daily basis. The topic of mentoring was clearly one of the subjects that the teachers spoke about most passionately. Principals should work to make sure that mentors are a good “fit” for the new teachers and realize that mentors make or break the

program. This is exactly what is noted by Vierstraete (2005) in that, “Mismatched mentor relationships will tend to fall apart or fizzle out, and this could leave the beginning teacher without support or alone (Vierstraete, 2005, p. 388). Some of the teachers were critical of the way the mentoring programs are delegated to assistant principals who just simply go through the motions and don’t implement the programs with fidelity. Teachers want to hear from the principals for whom they work and not just the campus administrator assigned to mentoring. As noted by Brown and Wynn (2009), “Principals’ support for mentoring and induction programs, particularly those related to collegial support, appear to play a prominent role in beginning teachers’ decisions to quit or to remain on the job” (Brown & Wynn, 2009, p. 43). Teachers also want principals to make a commitment to the mentoring programs on their campuses and support them by hearing their concerns about the program and by being open to receiving constructive criticism about what teachers feel they are, or are not, receiving from their mentors.

From the mentors themselves, teachers want someone who will make the relationship a priority and not just someone who is all about “checking off the boxes” in order to complete the required elements of the program. Teachers want to have sufficient time to meet with their mentors and have someone who is proactive and positive. Working with someone who will maintain confidentiality was a concern that was voiced by Jessica in the conversation with the teachers.

The across focus groups comparison reveals that there were some very important commonalities including principals praising teachers and letting them know that they are valued. Teachers want to know that their principals support what they are doing and value them as individuals. Giving teachers encouragement and checking in with them are

ways that principals could praise and value their teachers. Pairing them with appropriate role models and providing time to meet are two critical components of mentoring programs that are not always met. This sentiment is echoed by Tom Ganser (2001) who notes that mentors should be given time and flexibility, and be freed from other job responsibilities in order to meet with their protégé, even daily, in order for the program to succeed (Ganser, 2001, p. 40). Coaching and empowerment can also be realized by more active involvement in the mentoring process which would align with what the principals feel they should be doing and what teachers state that they want.

The feedback surrounding the induction and mentoring experiences that teachers received was mixed. Several teachers stated that their mentor was great and that this person was very supportive and helpful to them. Jessica stated that she had not been assigned a mentor right away and that that was difficult. Once she was assigned one, there was unfortunately, a breach of confidentiality which led to somewhat of a break in the relationship. The relationship remained professional, but the trust was gone. Dana stated that the program was not good, but her mentor was. Cathy learned some things from her mentor, but she felt like she was paired with someone who was not a good role model for her, as this person was a “workaholic” and tended to become easily overwhelmed. She stated that her second year, she actually went in search of her own mentor, and that Alan, her principal, was very supportive of her choice. Rachel stated that she loves her mentor, and the fact that they are on the same team, makes it that much easier to work together. However, she never hears from the administrator assigned to the program. She wishes that this administrator would check in with her because she doesn’t

feel supported by the administration as a first year teacher. She felt like there was no real support aside from the mentor that she had been assigned.

How does the principal provide instructional support for early career teachers?

Focus group questions 5 and 6 provide the answers to this research question.

The principals' perspective revealed that instruction is best led by involving instructional coaches and specialists (on campuses where they are available) as well as team leaders and other campus teacher leaders. Creating a team approach to instruction and holding regular, intentional conversations regarding instruction are needed in order to support instruction on a daily basis. This philosophy is mirrored by C.M. Neumerski (2012), who discusses ascribing to the instructional leader the idea of a “leader plus” approach which includes the belief that instruction can be led by, and should be led by the principal, but shouldered by all types of campus leaders including teacher leaders and instructional coaches (Neumerski, 2012). Principal Dan noted that a professor told him once that you are not really an instructional “leader,” as much as you are an instructional “manager.” Noting the realities of the demands on a principals’ time, all of the participants agreed that it is very difficult to involve themselves on a *daily* basis, particularly if they are off campus in meetings; however, they noted the importance of never losing touch with instruction by empowering their teacher leaders, attending their instructional planning meetings (PLCs), and by monitoring and being visible in the classroom. As it specifically relates to early career teachers, principals recognize the need to provide teachers with strong mentors, a key element in providing instructional support from their perspectives, and to set aside time for instructional coaching guided by the principal, even including modeling a lesson for teachers, as Principal Robin did on

her campus. This modeling allowed her to relate instruction to her teachers in a way that was more real and authentic than any theoretical conversation about instruction could have. It allowed her the opportunity to articulate to her teachers what went well for her and what did not, and how she (the principal) would adjust instruction in the future. Principal Alan also discussed the importance of the principal serving as the performance appraiser for new teachers to make it possible for the campus principal to keep up with the needs and struggles of their new teachers. This provides principals with a greater opportunity to work with new teachers and coach them.

The teachers' perspective revealed, that they want principals who will guide but not micromanage, support them by being involved in attending planning meetings, encourage reading about instruction, give helpful advice, and support them with discipline issues so that they can teach. These teachers want principals who will encourage risk-taking and listen to them without making them feel guilty for taking the principal's time when they need to ask a question. In a study by Joseph Blase, and Jo Blase (1999), it was noted that when principals provided staff development where attendance was not mandatory, but allowed for teacher input and focused on support for teacher innovativeness, impact was noted on teacher risk-taking, motivation, self-esteem and efficacy (Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 367). They want a supportive, positive leader who encourages teacher leadership and who supports learning but is not just "all about test scores." Rachel indicated that she felt like a failure due to the fact that, even though her principal attends planning meetings, the perception that she places so much emphasis on test scores, led to the movement of struggling students from her classroom to the classroom of a teacher better equipped to

teach them. Rachel indicated that she does not feel adequate instructional support on a daily basis.

The across focus groups comparison reveals that some common themes were the support for instruction that teachers want that involves principals attending planning meetings and being a part of the instructional conversations on campus, as well as, creating a team approach to instruction by encouraging teacher leadership in the area of instruction. Also being visible in classrooms so that principals are aware of what teachers and students are doing and serving as a guide, but not micromanaging and providing the resources that they need. Support with classroom discipline was important to three of the teachers, Dana, Rachel, and Morgan. These teachers are in their second, first and fourth years of teaching respectively. It is interesting to note, that discipline is still a concern and the lack of support can be felt as far forward as the fourth year of teaching. Of the teacher focus group participants, principal support for discipline was apparently, not just apparently a concern of first year teachers only. As noted in Chapter I, of the American teachers studied from 1993-1995, Whitener, Gruber, Lynch, Tingos, Perona, and Fondelier, (1997), reasons cited for leaving the teaching profession included a lack of, or inadequate support from school administrators, and lack of student motivation for learning. Also, noted as a reason for leaving the profession was an increased concern for student discipline problems (as cited in Weiss, 1999, p. 862). None of the principal focus group participants mentioned support with discipline as being something that they could or should provide teachers as a way to support them instructionally. This may be due to the fact, all other things considered, that most campus principals, particularly at the secondary level, are not involved in the day-to-day disciplining of students. The

associate or assistant principal is normally the campus leader that manages student discipline.

How does the principal empower teachers in their daily jobs, and to assume leadership positions as they grow in their careers?

Focus group questions 7 and 8 provided the answers to this research question.

The principals' perspective revealed, that principals empower teachers by listening to their ideas and valuing their input, giving them the support and resources that they need, and giving them opportunities for growth. As noted by S.M. Johnson (2006), "Teachers are more likely to stay in schools where they have the opportunity to contribute to school-wide decision making – such as decisions about scheduling, selection of materials, and selection of professional development experiences" (as cited in Boyd et al., 2011, p. 306). Critical to these empowerment strategies are getting to know teachers individually, building a positive climate based on trust, being a "yes" person, and allowing them to do things that will help them grow. For example, Principal Janet talked about giving teachers opportunities to attend conferences or read more about certain things they want to know about. Essentially, recognizing when someone wants to be better and learn as much as they can. As the principal, be intentional about not always saying "no." Allow teachers to have opportunities that are going to make them better.

When principals develop teachers and identify those who exhibit leadership qualities, the principals noted that they look for teachers who have good interpersonal skills, work well with others, are team players, and have a passion for, and share the principal's vision

and goals for the school. Principals want problem solvers who will collaborate well and who hold themselves and others accountable.

The teachers' perspective revealed that they often view their principals in very positive terms. Principals were described as someone who is a coach, who is ethical, and who leads by example. Other words used to describe principals and their leadership styles were: professional, positive, involved, driven, encouraging, open (to ideas), supportive, sensitive and empathetic.

The teachers view their principals as developing leaders by allowing teachers to demonstrate teaching strategies to each other. They note that they would want their principals to recognize leadership qualities and develop them, to be open to ideas and encouraging to teachers, to hold teachers accountable and empower them by listening to their ideas. Dana, Jessica, Rachel and Cathy especially were very positive in the things that they said about the principals they work for. Morgan noted as well, that she really appreciates the fact that her principal, Janet, does not allow parents to bully her teachers when they are meeting. She steps in right away if the parent becomes rude or too volatile.

The across focus groups comparison reveals that principals need to listen to their teachers and value their input, and in so doing, they can actually empower and encourage their teachers to develop their leadership skills. Developing leaders was another common theme and this could be done by providing opportunities for teachers to demonstrate leadership on the campus through sharing instructional strategies and by attending conferences or be given access to activities that will allow them to grow professionally.

There was also an interesting comparison between the qualities that principals look for in their teachers leaders, and in the ways that teachers described their principals' leadership styles. For example, principals were described as being professional, being positive, moving things forward, and leading by example. These align with some of the traits that principals look for in teacher leaders: professionals, passionate, problem solvers, and good role models. Cathy noted that any time she demonstrates leadership, she feels like her principal takes the time to acknowledge it and appreciate it. Rachel stated that she felt empowered to take on additional leadership roles, particularly in after-school programs designed to help kids succeed academically, but that she did not feel as empowered to take on leadership roles within her department, or as a part of her day-to-day teaching responsibilities. Jessica commented that even as a new teacher, her principal had been encouraging of her ideas, and so, now as a second year teacher, who has some ideas for the future, she is excited about the support she feels for being able to pursue them.

How can a principal develop relationships, trust, and organizational commitment with early career teachers?

Focus group questions 9 and 10 provided the answers to this research question.

The principals' perspective revealed that with regard to trust, principals felt that it is built by coaching, and spending time getting to know teachers. In order to do this with fidelity, principals must be individuals who are honest, genuine, and authentic. They must not be afraid to show their humanity, must communicate with, and listen to their teachers. Karpicke and Murphy (1996), believe that by truly listening to staff, a principal can keep from being isolated culturally, and can stay involved in knowing what is truly going on in

the school by enlisting the support of and help from his or her staff members (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996). Colley (2002) notes that the “pace at which novice teachers adapt and develop, and the choice to either stay or leave the profession appear to be related to a principal’s involvement with beginning teachers” (as cited in Gimbert, 2009). Principal Tom talks about coaching teachers and not always interacting with them in an evaluative way. He mentioned truly praising them when they do something well and talked about the importance of setting aside time to get to know teachers and to see what their needs are. Principal Janet talked about being genuine and authentic and to allow teachers to take risks, and not get mad at them when they fail. Letting them know that you, the principal, are human, really builds trust. Principal Dan talked about always being honest. Even though a principal can’t always share with a teacher the “why” behind something, they can at least tell the teacher that they can trust the principal, and assure them that together they can make things work.

The principals’ thoughts on relationship building, go hand-in-hand with their thoughts on building trust. Included in this were being yourself and being genuine, admitting your own mistakes, which shows your humanity, but also having an open door policy which encourages relationship building, as well as taking a genuine interest in people and following through on what you say you are going to do.

The teachers’ perspective revealed that, trust in their principal is built by communicating with teachers and respecting their time, having clear expectations and being supportive, being open and receptive, and building relationships with teachers, allowing teachers to be vulnerable and not being a “gotcha” principal. Dana talked about principals building trust by remembering that they too were once “in the classroom.”

Jessica talked about the importance of communication and of the fact that her principal builds trust by being open and receptive to different things. Morgan also talked about the importance of relevant communication, as a great way to build trust, which she feels, in turn, effects a teachers' self-efficacy. Morgan described the emotion she felt at being moved to another grade level for the third year in a row. Her principal, Janet, described the importance of being authentic, and in a study by Henderson and Hoy (1982), "non-manipulation" is one of three identified components of authentic leadership. Non-manipulation by leaders is described as "they avoid manipulating others as if they were objects – pawns to be moved in a game of chess" (as cited in Hoy & Kipersmith, 1984, p. 80). Morgan felt that she was powerless to do anything about the move, and that when Principal Janet became angry at her display of emotion, she felt that the relationship had been damaged between the two of them, as a result.

Finally, a principals' ability to show humanity, and admit that he has struggled with different things as well, softens the lines between personal and professional, and allows Cathy to feel like she can feel safe to be vulnerable, open, and genuine in who she is.

The across focus groups comparison reveals that it is clear that principals build trust with teachers through the relationships they build with them, the way in which they communicate, and by being real and showing their humanity. Teachers describe their relationships with their principals in ways that, for the most part, mirror the ways in which principals state relationships should be built. Words like honesty, authentic, support, communicate, and real and human, are themes that resonate across both focus groups. Principal Tom remarked, "You just need to be yourself" "Be genuine." As principal Alan said, "You have to be willing to laugh at yourself." As noted by Hoy and

Kupersmith (1984), “As principals let themselves be treated as human beings and as teachers are freed from the fear of authority, teachers will begin to base their behavior on intimacy and trust rather than power and distrust” (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1984, p. 86).

Implications for school leaders

Based on the findings of this research, the role of the principal is critical in determining whether or not teachers develop positive teaching identity. As discussed throughout this study, the teachers who don’t have a high level of support, are dissatisfied with the job, and don’t develop the skills they need to adequately meet the demands of the job are at-risk for leaving the profession. The three main themes that are considered critical by both principals and teachers and that dominate their discussions are communication, support and relationship building. If principals are mindful of these three things, and reflect on how to improve practice in these areas, they can make great strides in positively impacting the formation of positive teaching identities for those early career teachers that are more and more making up the majority of many teaching staffs. With good communication, a principal can demonstrate sensitivity and give praise, can set clear expectations and allow teachers to take risks and do their jobs without micromanaging. They can be positive and genuine and show that they are not afraid to laugh at themselves. Good communication allows principals the ability to be authentic and to communicate to teachers, in very real way, “I’ve been where you are, and I know how it feels.” Good communication allows you to always have an open door which encourages not only relationship building but says to a new teacher, “I’m here for you.” Good communication allows principals to work on their own listening skills, hear their teachers, and truly value what they say. Good communication allows a principal to be

empathetic and extend encouragement to an early career teacher who has had a bad day, as so often happens, particularly in their first or second years.

In providing appropriate support, principals can pair teachers with mentors that can literally make the difference between a successful and not-so-successful first year of teaching. Principals can follow-through, and check in personally with new teachers to see how they are doing, and may even want to serve as their appraisers in order to have a better idea of how to best meet their needs. Principals can encourage life-long learning and should be open to allowing teachers who want to learn and improve, the opportunities to do so. Through professional development and the ability to observe other teachers, principals can impact an early career teachers' ability to grow professionally. Supporting teachers by helping them build both their teaching and administrative skills is a huge part of the support principals can and should provide early career teachers. Principals can support instruction by just being visible in classrooms, supporting teachers in handling those discipline problems that cause teachers to become distracted and make it difficult to teach. Principals can create an environment where teachers have the ability to take instructional leadership in their teams, and can show their support by attending their instructional planning meetings.

In building relationships, principals may also realize that they are building trust in early career teachers as they get to know them. Being a principal who keeps their word, who respects the professionalism of their teachers by valuing their time, and by investing their own time in them, helps build trust. Principals who make connections with their teachers are able to empower them to excel and to build on strengths they already possess. As principals identify those teachers that they want to develop as leaders, the

relationship building allows a principal to better recognize the talents of early career teachers and makes it easier to encourage them to do more. It may be hard to develop authentic relationships without having created a climate and culture that allows for those relationships to be built. Therefore, principals should consider what elements are needed in order to create a climate of trust that will then allow for the development of positive relationships. Building positive relationships involves the development of good interpersonal skills and it is these skills that make someone approachable. When someone is approachable, there is a higher likelihood that a positive relationship will be developed.

Implications for further research

There are many elements of this research study that could be explored further. For example, practitioners and researchers could conduct a longitudinal study that follows a group of teachers and the principals they work for, during the first five years of the teachers' careers. This would allow a researcher to analyze the relationships between principals and teachers and the teachers' teaching identity formation over time.

Teacher morale, as it relates to overall job satisfaction could also be investigated. The principal's role in mentoring of teachers in years 2 and beyond could be explored along with the idea of implementing a multi-year mentoring program that would begin with focused, intense supervision and gradually taper off each year after, as the teacher moved toward their fifth year of teaching.

Of the teacher participants, the two high school teachers, both of whom worked for male principals, repeatedly spoke the most positively about their principals and about the support that they overall feel they receive. There was no teacher present from Principal

Dan's campus, the third male focus group participant, but it is possible, that the feelings might have been positive as well. Whether or not gender makes a difference could be investigated to determine if there are differences perceived by teachers. For example, comparing teachers' perceptions of the principals' role in building their positive teaching identities based on whether they work for a male or a female principal.

Conclusion

This study examined the principal's role in building positive teacher identity in early career teachers. The formation of a teaching identity is a complex one, and this study has attempted to shed some light on this subject. The principal of a school is responsible for so many different things that impact not only students, but the learning that they receive. Without strong teachers who are committed to what they do, and who are willing to teach year in and year out, the future of the next generation is literally at stake. Many teachers leave the profession for a variety of reasons; some of which include low pay, lack of support, feelings of isolation and lack of empowerment, poor climate and culture, and lack of trust for the administrators who are charged with leading them. As principals struggle to hire the best and brightest to teach the diverse public school children of the 21st century, they must also pay attention to retaining those teachers that are committed, that do want to improve their skills, and who are eager and willing to work alongside their leaders. Principals can impact teacher commitment if teachers are merely given the respect, trust, and empowerment they so need and crave. Without a strong vision and sense of who they are, principals may struggle with providing meaningful induction and mentoring programs that are implemented with fidelity. Mentoring and induction programs must be robust enough to help early career teachers develop the needed skills

and resiliency to stand up to the day-to-day pressures of the job. Part of the job satisfaction that teachers derive from teaching is connected in large part to the relationships that they have with their principal. As a principal, you must know yourself and have a vision. You must lead with courage and conviction and lead consistently. As noted by Karpicke and Murphy (1996), “If you have no vision, leadership will be assumed by those who do. If your vision is unclear or poorly articulated, confusion – even chaos – will result. You must have well-developed ‘people skills’ and be able to use them wisely” (Karpicke & Murphy, 1996, p. 34).

Leadership is not easy, and it should never be assumed that just anyone can lead well. As with every relationship in life, the relationship between a principal and teacher is an important one, and should be valued. This relationship should be based on communication, support, and trust that is built as an integral part of any true relationship. Without trust, there may be little hope that schools will improve and complete the work of teaching and learning that is so desperately needed in the 21st century.

References

- 2U, Inc. (2015). Teach: Make A Difference. Retrieved from <http://teach.com/why-teach/the-demand-for-great-teachers/>
- Allport, G. Vernon, P. E. & Lindzey, G. (1960). *A study of values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ashton, P.T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York: Longman.
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio, & Associates.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Mindgarden, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory, Prentice-Hall series in social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Barth, R. S. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Educational Leadership*, 63, 8-13.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14, 21-27.

- Bass, Bernard M., & Riggio, Ronald E. (2005). *Transformational Leadership*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Bickmore, S. T., & Bickmore, D. L. (2010). Revealing the principal's role in the induction process: Novice Teachers telling their stories. *Journal of School Leadership* (20), 445-469.
- Bidwell, C.E. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J. March (Ed.), *The Handbook of Organizations*, J. March (Ed.) 972-1022. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally
- Bidwell, C. E. & J. D. Kasarda. (1980). Conceptualizing and Measuring the Effects of School and Schooling. *American Journal of Education*, 89, 401-31.
- Black, P. Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & William, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Blase, Joseph, & Blase, Jo (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 349-378.
- Blase, J., & Kirby, P. C. (2000). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Blumberg, A., Greenfield, W. D., Jr., & Nason, D. (1975). The substance of trust between teachers and principals. Paper presented at *the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association* (60th, Washington, D. C., March 31-April 4, 1975).
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. D. (1980). *The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bobbitt, S. A., Leich, M. C., Whitener, S. D., & Lynch H. F. (1994). *Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the teacher follow up survey: 1991-92*. Washington, DC: NCES, U.S. Department of Education.
- Bogler, Ronit. (1999). Reassessing the behavior of principals as a multiple-factor in teachers' job satisfaction. Paper presented at *the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association* (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
- Boreen, J., Johnson, M. K., Niday, D., & Potts, J. (2000). *Mentoring beginning teachers: Guiding, reflecting, coaching*. York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 34-64.
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H. Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48, 303-333.
- Brewster, C., & Railsback, J. (2003). Building Trusting Relationships For School Improvement: Implications for Principals and Teachers. *Office of Planning and Service Coordination, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, By Request Series*, 1-52.
- Bridges, E. M. & M. T. Hallinan. (1978). Subunit Size, Work System Interdependence, and Employee Absenteeism. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14, 24-42.
- Brock, B. L. (1999). The Principals' role in mentor programs. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 12, 18-21.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The Experimental Ecology of Education. *Educational Researcher*, 5, 5-15.

- Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.
- Brossoit, K. B. (2000). Understanding employee empowerment in the workplace: Exploring the relationships between transformational leadership, employee perceptions of empowerment, and key work outcomes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA.
- Brown, Kathleen M. & Wynn, Susan R. (2009). Finding, Supporting, and Keeping: The Role of the Principal in Teacher Retention Issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 8, 37- 63.
- Bryk, A., Sebring, P., Allensworth, E., Luppescu S., & Easton, J. (2010). *Organizing school for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bryk, A. S. & M. E. Driscoll. (1988). *The school as community: Theoretical foundations, contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, University of Wisconsin.
- Bryk, A. S. & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in Schools: A Core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A. S. & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in Schools: A core resource for improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 40-45.
- Bulach, C. R., Boothe, D., & Pickett, W. (1998). "Should nots" for school principals: Teachers share their views. *ERS SPECTRUM: Journal of School Research and Information*, 16, 16-20.

- Bulach, C., & Peterson, T. (1999). Levels of openness and trust: Do Principals walk the talk? Paper presented at *the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association* (Hilton Head, NC, February 1999).
- Burch, P., & Spillane, J. P. (2003). Elementary school leadership strategies and subject matter: Reforming mathematics and literacy instruction. *Elementary School Journal*, 103, 519-535.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bussey, L. H. (2006,). Measuring the instructional leadership values and beliefs of school leaders. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, 4:3, pp. 1-7.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Carnoy, M., & DeAngelis, Karen (2016). Chapter 4 teachers' pay and conditions. (OECD) Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 55-65.
Retrieved from www.oecd.org/edu/school/1840245.pdf
- Carver, C. L. (2003). *Principals and mentors working together: A case of distributed expertise*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2007). Improving Teacher Retention with supportive workplace conditions. *Newsletter retrieved from* www.centerforcsri.org April 10, 2016.
- Ceyanes, J., & MacNeil, A. (1998). Developing trust between principal and teachers. Paper presented at the *University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA Convention)*, (October 30-November 1, 1998).

- Chin, Robert, & Benne, Kenneth D. *General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems* (1969). Holt, Rinehart & Winston: New York, NY.
- Cohen, D., & Crabtree, B. (2008). Semi-structured interviews. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Qualitative Research Guidelines Project/Focus Groups.
- Colley, A.C. (2002). What can principals do about new teacher attrition? *Principal*, 81 (4), 22-24.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N., (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cooper, H.M., J. M. Burger, & G. E. Seymour. (1979). Classroom Context and Student Ability Influences on Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Control. *American Educational Research Journal*, 16, 189-96.
- Crane, D., & Green, R. L. (2013). Exploring leader behavior informed by the thirteen core competencies and their influence on teacher job satisfaction. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 26, 33-54.
- Creswell, John W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. E. (2001). Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in success for all schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 219-249.
- Davis, J., & Wilson, S.M., (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House*, 73, 349-353.

- DePaul, A. (2000). *Survival guide for new teachers: How new teachers can work effectively with veteran teachers, parents, principals, and teacher educators*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Duke, D. (2010). *Differentiating school leadership: Facing the challenges of practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Edmonds, R. R., & Frederikson, J. R. (1978). *Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally, effective for poor children*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Urban Studies.
- Elangovan, A. R., & Shapiro, D. L. (1998). Betrayal of Trust in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 547-566.
- Fairholm, G.W. (1994). *Leadership and the culture of trust*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L.S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman
- Forsythe, P. B. & W. K. Hoy. (1978). Isolation and alienation in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14, 80-96.
- Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond contract: Work, power and trust relations*. London: Farber & Farber.
- Fuller, B. & J. A. Izu. (1986). Explaining school cohesion: What shapes the organizational beliefs of teachers? *American Journal of Education*, 95, 501-35.
- FultzBelinda Gimbert, D. (2009). Effective principal leadership for beginning teachers' development. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 4.

- Galman, S. (2009). Doth the lady protest too much? Pre-service teachers and the experience of dissonance as a catalyst for development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 468-481.
- Ganser, T. (2001). The principal as new teacher mentor: Leader's active support keeps the wheels turning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22, 39-41.
- Gill, P., Stewart, K. Treasure, E. & Chadwick, B. (March 2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interview and focus groups. *British Dental Journal*, 204, 291-295.
- Glickman, C. D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goddard, Y. L., Neumerski, C., Goddard, R. D., Salloum, S. & Berebitsky, D. (2010). A multilevel exploratory study of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional support and group norms for instruction in elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 111, 336-357.
- Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support: Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In J.P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (2nd ed., pp. 548-594). New York: Macmillan.
- Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Newberry Park, CA: Corwin.
- Goleman, Daniel (2004, January). What Makes a Leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 1-22.

- Gonzales, F., & Sosa, A. S. (1993). How do we keep teachers in classrooms? The TNT response. *IDRA Newsletter*, 1, 6-9.
- Goodlad, J. I. (2004). *A place called school: Twentieth anniversary edition*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Gordon, S. G. (1991). *How to help beginning teachers succeed*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Guarino, C., Santibanez, L., & Daley, G. (2006). Teacher Recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76, 2, 173-208.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1988). Do inquiry paradigms imply inquiry methodologies? In D.M. Fetterman (Ed.), *Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education* (pp. 89-115). New York: Praeger.
- Halpin, A.W. *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: MacMillan, 1966.
- Hallam, Pamela R., & Mathews, Joseph L. (2008). Principal Leadership: Building Trust to Support School Improvement. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 29, 210-236.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-248.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 221-239.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (2011). Conceptual and methodological issues in studying school leadership effects as a reciprocal process. *School Effectiveness School Improvement*, 22, 149-173.
- Hardy, L. (1999). Why teachers leave. *American School Board Journal*, 186, 12-17.

- Harris, A. (2003). Successful leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances. In J.H. Chrispeels (Ed.), *Learning to lead together: The promise and challenge of sharing leadership* (pp. 282-304). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional Leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 94-125.
- Heller, H.W., Clay, R. and Perkins, C. (1993). The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3, 74-86.
- Henderson, J. E. and Hoy, W. K. "Leader authenticity: The development and test on an operational measure." *Educational and Psychological Research*, 3, 1982, 63-75.
- Hertzberg, F. Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.
- Hipp, Kristine A. (1997). *Documenting the Effects of Transformational Leadership Behavior on Teacher Efficacy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Høigaard, R., Giske, R., & Sundsli, K. (2012). Newly qualified teachers' work engagement and teacher efficacy influences on job satisfaction, burnout, and the intention to quit. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, 347-357.
- Hollingworth, L. (2012). Why leadership matters: Empowering teachers to implement formative assessment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50, 365-379.
- Hord, S. M. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

- House, R.J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspective and Directions* (pp. 81-107). New York: Academic Press.
- Howard, A., & Wellins, H. (1994). *High-involvement leadership: Changing roles for changing times*. Tenafly, NJ: Leadership Research Institute, Developmental Dimensions International.
- Hoy, W. K. & J. Ferguson. (1985). A Theoretical Framework and Exploration of Organizational Effectiveness of Schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21, 117-34.
- Hoy, W.K. and Henderson, J. E. "Principal authenticity, school climate, and trust." *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 1983, 123-130.
- Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. (1984). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior. *Planning & Changing*, 15, 80-88.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 184-208.
- Hoy, W.K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-Scale. In W. K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel (Eds.) *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 181-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2000). The status of teaching as a profession. In J. Ballentine & J. Spade (Eds.) *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education* (pp. 106-118). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Press.

- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 499-534.
- Ingersoll, Richard M., Phi Delta Kappan. (May 16, 2012). Beginning Teacher Induction: What the Data Tell Us. *Education Week*, 1-6. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/05/16/kappan_ingersoll.h31.html
- Ingersoll, R., & Perda D. (2013). *How high is teacher turnover and is it a problem?* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Johnson, S. M. (2006). *The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention and effectiveness*. Washington, DC: National Education Association. Retrieved June 14, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED495822.pdf>
- Jung, D.I. & Sosik, J.J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33, 313-336.
- Jung, D. I., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). Effects of leadership style, anonymity, and rewards on creativity-relevant processes and outcomes in an electronic meeting system context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 499-524.
- Karpicke, H., & Murphy, M. E. (1996). Productive school culture: Principals working from the inside. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP Bulletin*, 80, 26-34.
- Kass, Efrat. (2013). "A compliment is all I need" – Teachers telling principals how to promote their staff's self-efficacy. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 208-225.

- Kaufman, R., & Herman, J. (1991). *Strategic Planning in Education*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Kirby, P. C., Wimpelberg, R., & Keaster, R. (1992). Teacher Empowerment depends on needs, expectations of principals, schools, districts. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP Bulletin*, 76, 89-95.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lazzaro, K. (2009). *The Relationship Between Principal Transformational Leadership Practices and Teacher Retention*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from UMI Microform. (3367255)
- Lee, V., Dedrick R., Smith, J. (1991). The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction Lee, V., Dedrick R., Smith, J. (1991). . *Sociology of Education*, 64, 190-208.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 498-515.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore, L. K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
- Leung, D.Y.P., & Lee, W.W.S. (2006). Predicting intention to quit among Chinese teachers: Differential predictability of the components of burnout. *Anxiety Stress and Coping*, 19, 129-41.

- Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.). *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114-139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 325-40.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Louis, K. S. (2007). Trust and improvement in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 1-24.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S. D., & Marks H. M. (1996). School-wide professional community: Teachers' work, intellectual quality, and commitment. In F. M. Newmann & Associates (Eds.), *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality* (pp. 179-203). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lumby, J. & Foskett, N. (2011). Power, Risk, and Utility: Interpreting the Landscape of Culture in Educational Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47, 446-461.
- Maehr, M. L. (1987). *Advances in motivation and achievement: Enhancing motivation*. (Vol. 5). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). Blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 472-477.
- Maeroff, G. (1988). *The Empowerment of Teachers*, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.
- Manz, C.C. & Sims, H.P. (1995). *Business without bosses: How self-managing teams are building high performing companies*. New York: Wiley

- Manz, C.C. & Sims, H.P. (2001). *The new Superleadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Marlow, Leslie, Inman, Duane, & Betancourt-Smith, Maria. (1996). Teacher Job Satisfaction. Retrieved from ERIC (ED393802), 1-12.
- Marks, E., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An Integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39, 370-397.
- McNeil, L. M. (1986). *Contradictions of Control: School Structure and School Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Menon, S.T. (2001). Employee empowerment: An integrative psychological approach. *Applied Psychology*, 50, 153-80.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In: M. W. Meyer, et al. (Eds.), *Environments and Organizations*, (pp. 78-109). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers.
- Mitchell, R. M., Ripley, J., Adams, C., & Raju, D. (2011). Trust an Essential Ingredient in Collaborative Decision Making. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 32, 145-170.
- Moir, E. (2003). *Launching the next generation of teachers through quality instruction*. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teachers Center, University of California at Santa Cruz.
- Morse, N. C. (1953). *Satisfaction in the white collar job*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center.
- Neumerski, C.M. (2012). Rethinking instructional leadership, a review: What do we know about principal, teacher, and coach instructional leadership, and where should we go from here? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49, 310-347.

- Newton, A., Bergstrom, K., Dunne, K., Brennan, N., Gilbert, C., Ibaruen, N. et al. (1994). *Mentoring: A resource and training guide for educators*. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement.
- Nickols, Fred (2010, November 5). Four Change Management Strategies. Retrieved from www.nickols.us
- Nir, Adam E., & Kranot, Nati. (2006). School Principal's Leadership Style And Teachers' Self-Efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 37, 205-218.
- O'Dell, S. J., & Ferraro, D. P. (1992). Teacher mentoring and teacher retention. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 200-204.
- Ouchi, W. *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1981.
- Pajak, E. (1989). *Identification of supervisory proficiencies project*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Pearce, J., & Morrison, C. (2011). Teacher Identity and Early Career Resilience: Exploring the Links. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36, 48-59.
- Peterson, D. W. (2001). On the road: In search of excellence in middle level education. Paper presented at the *Annual Winter Workshop of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals*, (January 25, 2001).
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C.A., & Williams, E.S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25, 897-933.
- Podsen, I. J., & Denmark, V. M (2000). *Coaching and mentoring first-year and student teachers*. New York: Eye on Education.

- Printy, S. M. (2008). Leadership for teacher learning: A community of practice perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 187-226.
- Protheroe, Nancy. (2006). Maintaining high teacher morale. *Principal*, 85, pp. 46-49.
- Purkey, S. C. & M. S. Smith. (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. *Elementary School Journal*, 83, 427-54.
- Ramsey, Michael C., Ph.D., Research Specialist (May 2016). Employed Teacher Demographics 2011-2015. *TEA PEIMS data*, Retrieved from <http://www.tea.texas.gov/Educatorreportsanddata>
- Ramsey, Michael C., Ph.D., Research Specialist (October 2015). Employed Teacher Attrition and New Hires 2008-2015. *TEA PEIMS data*, Retrieved from <http://www.tea.texas.gov/Educatorreportsanddata>
- Reitzug, U. C., & Cross, B. (1993, October). *Deconstructing principal instructional leadership: From "super" vision to critical collaboration*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Roberts, K. H., & O'Reilly, C. O. (1974). Failure in upward communication in organizations: three possible culprits. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 205-215.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. *American Journal of Education*, 93, 352-388.
- Rosenholtz, S.J., & Bassler, O., & Hoover-Dempsey, K.H. (1986). Organizational conditions of teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2, 91-104.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. 1987. Education Reform Strategies: Will They Increase Teacher Commitment? *American Journal of Education*, 96, 534-62.

- Rosenholtz, S. J. 1989. *Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Longman.
- Ross, J. A. (1994). The impact of an in-service to promote cooperative learning on the stability of teacher efficacy. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 10, 381-394.
- Rossmiller, R.A. (1992). The secondary school principal and teachers' quality of work life. *Educational Management and Administration*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 132-146.
- Rutter, R. A. 1986. *Facilitating Teacher Engagement*. Madison: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, University of Wisconsin.
- Saxl, E. R., Miles, M. B., & Lieberman, A. (1989). *Assisting Change in Education*. Alexandria Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1-5.
- Schlechty, P. C., & Vance, V. S. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *Elementary School Journal*, 83, 469-487.
- Sebring, P.B., & Bryk, A.S. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81, 440-443.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 66-81.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Serpell, Z., & Bozeman, L. A. (1999). *Beginning teacher induction: A report on beginning teacher effectiveness and retention*. Washington, DC: National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching.
- Shann, Mary H. (1998). Professional Commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92 (2), 67-73.

- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42, 325-344.
- Shin, H. S., & Reyes, P. (1995). Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: A causal analysis. *Journal of School Leadership*, 5 (1), 22-39.
- Short, P. M., & Johnson, P. E. (1994). Exploring the links among teacher empowerment, leader power, and conflict. Reports-Research/Technical (143). Retrieved from ERIC (ED 372 044), 1-28.
- Short, P., & Rinehart, J. (1992). School Participant Empowerment Scale: Assessment of the level of participant empowerment in the school. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 951-960.
- Simons, T.L. (1999). Behavioral integrity as a critical ingredient for transformational leadership. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 89-104.
- Sitkin, S. B., & Stickel, D. (1996). The road to hell: The dynamics of distrust in an era of quality. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 196-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feelings of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1029-1038.
- Smith, W., & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional Leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). Reducing teacher turnover: What are the components of effective induction: *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 681-714.
- Solomon, R. C., & Flores, F. (2001). *Building Trust in business, politics, relationships, and life*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Spark, Jane. (2016). How to increase job satisfaction and employee morale. Retrieved from <http://myventurepad.com/increase-job-satisfaction-employee-morale/>
- Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30, 23-28.
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 483-504.
- Steffy, B. E., & Wolfe, M. P. (1998). The lifecycle of the career teacher; maintaining excellence for a lifetime (Spotlight on Student Success No. 313). Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success. Retrieved from <http://www.temple.edu/LSS/htmlpublications/spotlights/300/spot313.htm>
- Stein, M. K., & D'Amico, L. (2002). Inquiry at the crossroads of policy and learning: A study of a district-wide literacy initiative. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 1313-1344.
- Stipek, D. & Weisz, J. (1981). Perceived personal control and academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 101-137.
- Swymer, S. (1986). Perspectives from the principal: Creating a positive school atmosphere-the principal's responsibility. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP Bulletin*, 70, 89-91.

- Tarter, C. J., Sabo, D. & Hoy, W.K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust, and effectiveness: A path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29, 41-49.
- Taylor, Dianne L., & Tashakkori, A. (1995). Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 63, 217-230.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B.A. (1986). *Cognitive elements of empowerment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.
- Tillman, L. C. (2005). Mentoring new teachers: Implications for leadership practice in an urban school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(4), 609-629.
- Tobin, Timothy J., Muller, Ralph O., & Turner, Lauren M. (2006). *Social Psychology of Education* 9, 301-319.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 334-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W.K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 547-593.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944-956.

- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the Need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39, 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). Fostering organizational citizenship in schools: Transformational leadership and trust. In W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (p. 157-179). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering Teacher Professionalism in Schools: The Role of Leadership Orientation and Trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45, 217-247.
- Tye, B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession: *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84, 24-33.
- Urick, Angela, & Bowers, Alex J. (2014). What Are the Different Types of Principals Across the United States? A Latent Class Analysis of Principal Perception of Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50, 96-134.
- Valentine, J. W., Trimble, S., & Whitaker, T. (1997). The middle level principalship. In J. L. Irvin (ed.) *What current research says to the middle level practitioner* (pp. 337-347). Columbus: National Middle School Association.
- Vierstraete, S. (2005). Mentorship: Toward success in teacher induction and retention. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 8, 381-392.
- Wallis, C. Healy, R. Hylton, H. & Klarreich, K. (2008). How to make great teachers. *Time* 171 (8).

- Watkins, P. (2005). The principal's role in attracting, retaining, and developing new teachers: Three strategies for collaboration and support. *The Clearing House*, 79, 83-87.
- Weick, K. E. 1976. Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1-19.
- Weiss, Eileen Mary. (1999). Perceived workplace conditions and first-year teachers' morale, career choice commitment, and planned retention: A secondary analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 861-879.
- Whitener, S.D., Gruber, K. J., Lynch, H., Tingos, K. Perona, M., & Fondelier, S. (1997). *Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the teacher follow up survey: 1994-95*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, OERI. (NCES, 97-450).
- Young, M. D. (1998, April). *Importance of trust in increasing parental involvement and student achievement in Mexican American communities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED423587)
- Youngs, Peter. (2007). How Elementary Principals' Beliefs and Actions Influence New Teachers' Experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 101-137.
- Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38, 643-670.

APPENDIX A

APPROVAL FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON HUMAN SUBJECT
RESEARCH COMMITTEE

DIVISION OF RESEARCH
Institutional Review Boards

APPROVAL OF SUBMISSION

November 29, 2016 Gregory

Foulds gafoulds@uh.edu

Dear Gregory Foulds:

On 11/29/2016, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title of Study:	The principal's role in building positive teacher identity in early career public school teachers.
Investigator:	Gregory Foulds
IRB ID:	STUDY00000095
Funding/ Proposed Funding:	Name: 1. Unfunded
Award ID:	
Award Title:	
IND, IDE, or HDE:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITI Completion Report, Category: Other; • Follow-Up Recruitment Letter - Teachers.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • HRP-502a (3).pdf, Category: Consent Form; • HRP - 503, Category: IRB Protocol; • Research Recruitment Letter - Principals.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Questions for Focus Groups, Category: Study tools (ex: surveys, interview/focus group questions, data collection forms, etc.); • Research Recruitment Letter - Teachers.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • IRB Approval - FBISD, Category: Additional IRB approval letters; • Follow-Up Recruitment Letter - Principals.pdf, Category: Consent Form;
Review Category:	Expedited
Committee Name:	Not Applicable

DIVISION OF RESEARCH
Institutional Review Boards

IRB Coordinator:	Danielle Griffin
------------------	----------------------------------

Page 1 of 2

The IRB approved the study from 11/29/2016 to 11/28/2017 inclusive. Before 11/28/2017 or within 30 days of study closure, whichever is earlier, you are to submit a continuing review with required explanations. You can submit a continuing review by navigating to the active study and clicking Create Modification / CR.

If continuing review approval is not granted on or before 11/28/2017, approval of this study expires after that date. To document consent, use the consent documents that were approved and stamped by the IRB. Go to the Documents tab to download them.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within the IRB system.

Sincerely,

Office of Research Policies, Compliance and Committees (ORPCC)
University of Houston, Division of Research
713 743 9204 cphs@central.uh.edu
<http://www.uh.edu/research/compliance/irb-cphs/>

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Principal Interview Questions

1. Why are the first five years so critical for new teachers?
2. How does the principal support teachers as they develop their own sense of teaching identity?
3. How do you develop early career teachers?
4. What is the best way to retain teachers in years 1-5?
5. How do you involve yourself in instructional practices on a daily basis?
6. Describe how you provide instructional support for new teachers.
7. How do you empower teachers?
8. Describe the ideal teacher leader.
9. How do you build trust with early career teachers on your campus?
10. How do you build relationships with teachers?

APPENDIX C

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Teacher Interview Questions

1. How does your principal play a role in creating job satisfaction for teachers?
2. How does your principal support teachers in creating their own sense of teaching identity?
3. Describe the efforts of your principal in working to help you build your skills as a teacher.
4. What sort of mentoring experiences were provided to you?
5. How is your principal involved in instructional practices on your campus?
6. How does your principal support you in your daily instructional practices?
7. Describe your principal's leadership style.
8. How does your principal empower teachers on campus to assume leadership roles?
9. Describe your relationship with your principal.
10. How does the principal build trust with teachers?

APPENDIX D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH FORMS



Consent to Take Part in a Human Research Study

Title of research study: The Principal's role in building positive teacher identity in early career public school teachers.

Investigator: Greg Foulds

Why am I being invited to take part in a research study?

We invite you to take part in a research study because you are a campus building principal or K-12 teacher in Fort Bend ISD and have experience with the subject of this research.

What should I know about a research study?

- Greg Foulds will explain this research study to you.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You can choose not to take part.
- You can agree to take part and later change your mind.
- Your decision will not be held against you.
- You can ask all the questions you want before you decide, and can ask questions at any time during the study.

Why is this research being done?

As teacher retention is an on-going concern in public schools, it is believed that principals have an important role in working with early career teachers and can impact their decision to remain in teaching or not. The extent to which principals help teachers create positive teaching identities is the focus of this research. Specifically, this research wants to investigate how the principal can positively impact early career teachers in the areas of job satisfaction and teacher efficacy, mentoring, instructional support, teacher empowerment, climate and culture, building relationships, trust, and organizational commitment.

How long will the research last?

We expect that you will be in this research study for one visit of approximately two hours.

How many people will be studied?

We expect to enroll about 12 people in this research study.

What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?

The researcher plans to conduct two focus groups, each lasting for a duration of approximately two (2) hours. The first focus group will include six (6) FBISD campus principals from either elementary, middle or high schools. The second focus group will consist of six (6) teachers, one from each campus who work for the principals that participated in the first focus group. The primary researcher will lead a discussion by asking questions related to the topics above. Each focus group will convene one time only on a particular day, in the late afternoon or early evening. Participants will take part in one focus group session only, not both, depending on their job title. The participants will interact with the primary researcher, Greg Foulds, who will ask the questions, and moderate the discussion. The research will be conducted in the front office conference room at Dulles Middle School, 500 Dulles Avenue, Sugar Land, TX 77478. The focus group will be conducted in January 2017, after school, during non-instructional hours. The principal investigator, Greg Foulds will ask a series of questions that the group may respond to individually and/or comment on to the group as a whole.

This research study includes the following component(s) where we plan to *audio record* you as the research subject:

- ☐ I agree to be *audio recorded* during the research study.
 - ☐ I agree that the *audio recording* can be used in publication/presentations.
 - ☐ I do not agree that the *audio recording* can be used in publication/presentations.
- ☐ I do not agree to be *audio recorded* during the research study.

If you do not agree to be audio recorded you will not be able to participate in this study. Answers to questions will be transcribed for the purposes of this research study. Only responses that pertain to the study will be transcribed. Off-topic or side comments will not be transcribed. The identity of individual responders will remain anonymous, and the audio recording will be stored in a locked cabinet, accessible only by the primary researcher, for at least three years after the completion of the research. Responses to questions will not be shared outside of the parameters of this research.

What happens if I do not want to be in this research?

You can choose not to take part in the research and it will not be held against you. Choosing not to take part will involve no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are otherwise entitled.

What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?

You can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you.

If you decide to withdraw, you will not be asked to explain the extent of your withdrawal and will not be asked for permission to collect data through other means. The data up to the point of your withdrawal may be used. If you stop being in the research, already collected data may not be removed from the study record.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?

There are no foreseeable risks related to the procedures conducted as part of this study. If you choose to take part and undergo a negative event you feel is related to the study, please inform your study team.

Will I get anything for being in this study?

As gratitude for your participation in this study, a gift card will be awarded to you at the conclusion of your participation in the focus group.

Will being in this study help me in any way?

We cannot promise any benefits to you or others from your taking part in this research. However, possible benefits include additional insights to improving professional practice as a result of reflecting on and taking part in this focus group.

What happens to the information collected for the research?

Efforts will be made to limit the use and disclosure of your personal information, including research study records, to people who have a need to review this information. Each subject's name will be paired with a code number, which will appear on all written study materials. The list pairing the subject's name to the assigned code number will be kept separate from these materials. We cannot promise complete secrecy. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the IRB and other representatives of this organization, as well as collaborating institutions and federal agencies that oversee human subjects' research. We may publish the results of this research. However, unless otherwise detailed in this document, we will keep your name and other identifying information confidential.

The audio-taped recordings will be kept for three calendar years from the completion date of the focus groups, in a locked cabinet, accessible only by the primary researcher.

Who can I talk to?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, you should talk to the research team at gafoulds@uh.edu

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Houston Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may also talk to them at (713) 743-9204 or cphs@central.uh.edu if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.

- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You have questions about your rights as a research subject.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

Signature Block for Capable Adult

Your signature documents your consent to take part in this research.

Signature of subject

Date

Printed name of subject

Signature of person obtaining consent

Date

Printed name of person obtaining consent

In the future, our research team may be interested in contacting you for other research studies we undertake, or to conduct a follow-up study to this one. There is never any obligation to take part in additional research. Do we have permission to contact you to provide additional information?

☐ *Yes*

☐ *No*

Copyright

by

Gregory A. Foulds

May 2017