NITZA SCHWABSKY
JUDY GOLDENBERG
ORNA SCHATZ OPPENHEIMER

PRINCIPALS' AND MENTORS'
SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES IN INDUCTION
OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

Given the emergence of shared leadership and responsibility in schools (e.g., Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008) and the beneficial involvement of mentors and principals in preparing beginning teachers (Angelle, 2002; Beutel, Crosswell et al., 2017; Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; van Ginkel, Verloop & Denessen, 2016), principals' and mentors' perceptions of various aspects of induction and their responsibilities are being questioned. Current literature shows an increased support for and interest in the mentoring of beginning teachers (Beutel, Crosswell et al., 2017), and in collaborative professional induction learning (van Ginkel, Verloop & Denessen, 2016) yet, we know little about principals' and

NITZA SCHWABSKY – Director and Senior Lecturer, Gordon College of Education, Management of Education Systems Department; address: 73 Tchernichovsky St., Haifa, 3570503 Israel; e-mail: nitzas@gordon.ac.il

JUDY GOLDENBERG – Senior Lecturer, Talpiot Academic College of Education, Department of Psychology; address: 18 Haalon Street, Moshav Gimzo, 73130 Israel; e-mail: judyg@zahav.net.il

ORNA SCHATZ OPPENHEIMER – David Yellin Academic College of Education, and The Hebrew University, Jerusalem; teacher educator; National Director of Mentoring for Novice Teachers; professor, teacher educator, M.Ed. Department; address: 14 Ozrar St., Nataf, 9080400 Israel; e-mail: schatz@macam.ac.il

mentors' responsibilities during the induction process, and about their shared responsibilities in induction.

The purpose of this study is to examine and expand existing knowledge concerning principals' and mentors' responsibilities in the areas of mentor selection, specific induction tasks, induction success attributes, and their involvement in induction. We believe that understanding principals' and mentors' perceived responsibilities may enable principals and decision makers to reconsider induction and mentoring roles and responsibilities as needed.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Induction and mentoring of beginning teachers

Induction refers to the new teacher's transition from novice to professional; it is a systematic process (embedded in a healthy school climate) that meets new teachers' personal and professional needs (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Bullough, 2012; Cuconato et al., 2015). Induction is aimed at improving the performance of beginning teachers, ensuring that capable novices remain in the teaching profession. Induction preparation programs focus on skills such as teaching, socialization, adjustment, and assessment development (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). As such, induction is too great a task for any one person to perform alone (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010) and has been viewed as a multifaceted process. Multifaceted induction means that the principal and the mentor, as well as other parties, participate in and contribute to a novice's learning in the early stages of his or her teaching career (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010).

The implementation of induction often represents a joint venture of the school, the regional or the national educational authorities, and the academic teacher training institutes (Nasser-Abu Alhija & Fresko, 2010; 2016). Induction success depends largely on the novice's own professional progress as well as on the emotional and professional support that the novice receives from the mentor (Desimone et al., 2014; Hennissen et al., 2011; Hobson et al., 2009; Schatz-Oppenheimer & Dvir, 2014). It also depends on the mentor's professional experience (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011), selection (Nasser-Abu Alhija & Fresko, 2010), and training (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Hennissen et al., 2011), as well as on the principal's positive attitude toward induction (Wynn et. al., 2007) and his or her leadership and involvement (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Nasser-Abu Alhija & Fresko, 2010; Wynn et al., 2007; Watkins, 2005; Youngs, 2007).

Roles and Responsibilities of the principal and the mentor in teacher induction

Role and responsibility are two intertwined concepts. Whereas role refers to the set of activities that represents the potential behaviors to be performed in accordance with a specific job (Shivers-Blackwell, 2004), responsibility refers to the commitment for one's actions and consequences of their role (Inbar, 1983). School principals and mentors play important roles in the preparation of the beginning teachers and their impact on the novices is notable. For example, novices' supportive communication with the principal is associated with reduced likelihood of novices both leaving the profession and moving to another school (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). The mentor's role also impacts the novice teachers' retention in their first real teaching experiences (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Cunningham, 2007; Forsbach-Rothman, 2007; Ganser, 2002; Glenn, 2006; Kajs, 2002; Schatz-Oppenheimer, 2011; Schneider, 2008). An analysis of the roles and responsibilities of mentors and principals yields two main dimensions, administrative-organizational and pedagogical-interpersonal, which are intertwined. Next, we attempt to portray the responsibilities of principals and mentors with respect to both.

The school principal's responsibility

The principal predominantly oversees the administrative and organizational aspects of induction and assumes pedagogical responsibilities to a lesser extent. As an *instructional administrator*, the principal bears responsibility for the organizational-bureaucratic aspects of schooling, such as resource and role distribution (Tschannen-Moran, 2009) and oversight of school affairs, such as realizing the school vision, meeting the goals of the Ministry of Education, observing professional ethics, stating rules and regulations, and applying for grant funding when support is scarce (Roberson & Roberson, 2009).

Specifically, the school principal's role in induction ranges from providing sufficient classroom supplies to providing mentors support (Ingersoll, 2005; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). The principal is responsible for developing and maintaining a healthy climate conducive to induction and providing positive working conditions, collegial structures for induction, and individual interactions with new teachers, as well as supporting teacher autonomy (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Eldar et al., 2003; Wood, 2005).

In addition, the core administrative induction tasks of effective principals include recruiting, hiring, and placing new teachers; assigning a mentor in the teacher's content area, providing site orientation and resource assistance; managing

the school environment; building relationships between principals and teachers; fostering instructional development through formative assessment; providing formative and summative evaluation; and facilitating a supportive school context (Angelle, 2002; Carver, 2003; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004).

From an instructional perspective, the principal bears responsibility for some pedagogical-professional aspects of teaching and learning (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). The principal displays understanding of teachers' professional needs (Roberson & Roberson, 2009), develops the competence of novice teachers (Brown, 2002), and provides affective support by listening to their questions and problems (Sargent, 2003; Wynn et al., 2007). The principal promotes academic success among students and professional development among teachers (Roberson & Roberson, 2009).

The mentor's responsibility

The mentor focuses primarily on pedagogy through direct and continuous contact with the novice, and gives the novice *professional and emotional support* (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Nasser-Abu Alhija, Fresko & Reichenberg, 2011). The mentor assumes administrative functions to a lesser extent when facilitating initiation into the complex teaching profession (Grudnoff, 2011).

The mentor helps with many facets of teaching, including enabling the novice to recognize and name the practical knowledge (Mena, Hennissen & Loughran, 2017), developing collegial relationships among teachers and providing feedback, and evaluation (Schwabsky, 2010). The mentor meets the novice's personal needs through patience and enhancing belonging, competence, and reducing stress (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010). The mentor's main *administrative task* lies in facilitating and guiding the novice in the process of educational and organizational socialization and becoming acclimated to the community of teachers (Hennissen et al., 2011; Rajuan, Tuchin & Zuckerman, 2011). Mentor support benefits novice teachers by reducing their sense of isolation, strengthening their confidence and self-esteem, nurturing their professionalism and teaching skills, and improving their personal reflective capabilities (Hobson et al., 2009). The literature is inconsistent concerning mentor selection. It appears that mentors may be selected cooperatively by a team comprising mentors, principals, the head of the training program, and instructors in education (Odell, Huling & Sweeny, 2000) or individually by the principal, teachers' college induction coordinator, or the novice (Nasser-Abu Alhija & Fresko, 2010; Grossman et al., 2008).

In summary, based on existing literature regarding the induction of beginning teachers, school principals and mentors assume administrative and pedagogic responsibilities interchangeably yet, their perceived responsibilities are unclear. Our study consequently raised the following research question: to what extent do school principals and mentors differ in their perceived responsibilities concerning mentor selection, performance of a variety of tasks, success of the induction and involvement in the induction process? Four hypotheses guide this study:

H1. School principals will perceive mentor selection and criteria differently than mentors, and view themselves solely responsible for mentor selection.

H2. School principals will assume shared responsibilities concerning specific induction tasks to a greater extent than mentors will.

H3. School principals will attribute the induction success to themselves more than to the mentors.

H4. School principals' involvement in the induction in their school will emerge to a lesser degree than would the mentors' involvement.

Research Context

The study reported in this paper is a follow-up of an attempt by the Ministry of Education Director-General's Circular (Ministry of Education, 2009; cited hereafter as "the Circular") regarding induction programs to define and display the roles and expectations of the key parties involved in teachers' induction—here, the principal and the mentor—an attempt uncommon globally at the national level.

Induction programs in Israel are obligatory for all teachers in their first year of teaching, and their successful completion of the one-year program is a prerequisite for obtaining a permanent teaching license. The schools, the national educational authorities and the academic teacher training institutions are jointly responsible for the implementation of induction (Nasser-Abu & Fresko, 2016). Concerning principals' and mentors' roles and responsibilities, according to the Circular, principals are expected to become actively involved in the induction, and to provide the novice with conditions conducive to success by performing a midyear observation, report documentation and feedback discussions with the novice teacher, and formative and summative evaluations. Mentors are expected to serve as the novice's liaison at school, and assists the novice in internalizing the school culture, to provide emotional and professional-pedagogical support and empowerment.

METHODS

This paper is a result of two separate, online, anonymous comprehensive nationwide quantitative studies that examined the principals' and mentors' attitudes toward induction and their responsibility in various tasks.

Participants

In total, 987 principals and mentors, who actively participated in induction programs for three years prior to data collection completed anonymous questionnaires.

Principals. The sample included 222 principals who responded to the questionnaire, constituting approximately 6.5% of the principals who were sent the questionnaire by e-mail. The data were related to inductions that occurred during the past 3 years at the schools they administrated. The average length of experience of the principals in their current schools was approximately 8 years ($M = 8.05$, $SD = 6.0$).

Mentors. The sample included 765 active mentors who responded to the questionnaire. This sample constitutes 25% of the mentors who were sent the questionnaire by e-mail. Of the respondents, 42% had been teachers for more than 20 years ($M = 18.4$, $SD = 8.0$), and a majority had been teaching for 11 years or more. The average number of years of their experience as mentors was 3.4 ($SD = 3.6$), and most mentors (67%) had mentored two or three novice teachers over the years ($M = 3.5$, $SD = 3.4$).

The two separate samples had similar geographic distributions in the country, both samples included approximately 60% public schools, in both samples approximately 70% were working in grade schools serving grades 1 through 8, and both samples were predominantly female (over 90%).

Measures

The research measures consisted of anonymous, online, self-reporting questionnaires, composed specifically for these studies. They were based on preliminary 15 face-to-face interviews with **7** principals and 8 mentors, sampled according to district and school type. As reported by Schwabsky (2018), this number of interviewees met the expected criterion of 1 to 10 individuals (Starks & Trinidad, 2007), 5-25 individuals (Creswell, 1998), and at least 6 individual interviews (Morse, 1994) for phenomenological studies, who have experienced the phenomenon under study. The interviews spanned between 45-90 minutes each. Questionnaire items were generated from the interview episodes, and underwent content

validation by 15 judges prior to their distribution. Each item was examined, and only items on which the expert judges agreed were included in the questionnaires. Measure content validation by expert judges is a common research practice in social sciences (Polit & Beck, 2006). The study measures included four parts in the following areas: (a) mentor selection, (b) induction tasks, (c) success of the induction, and (d) involvement in the induction process, as follows:

Responsibility for mentor selection and criteria

Mentor selection is of paramount importance and was therefore assessed first. This questionnaire consists of two 5-item parts. In the first, the respondents were asked to identify, from a list of five possibilities, who usually selects the mentors at their school. In the second, respondents were presented with a list of mentor-selection criteria and asked to identify the most central among them. Principals were asked to indicate the five criteria they use most in selecting mentors, and mentors were asked to indicate the four criteria they believed to be key for their own selection. A sample item is: "teaching same grade level as novice teacher."

Responsibility for performing specific induction tasks at the school

This 13-item questionnaire examined the principals' and mentors' perceived responsibility for performing various induction tasks. Respondents were asked to ascribe responsibility for a list of tasks related to induction, which are defined by the Ministry of Education Director-General's Circular (2009) as the principal's responsibility. They were asked to indicate to who they attribute the responsibility for these tasks: to the "principal only," "principal and mentor jointly," or "mentor only." A sample item is: "submits appropriate copy of employment terms to the novice teacher."

Responsibility for the success of induction

This part of the questionnaire assessed the principals' and mentors' responsibility for the induction success. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the success of induction depends on the principal or on the mentor (for mentor respondents only) using a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). A sample item is: "the successful induction depends to a great extent on the principal."

Principal and mentor involvement in the induction process

This questionnaire included two measures of involvement in the induction process: that of mentors and that of principals. For *mentor's involvement,* mentors and principals were asked about the average frequency of mentors' meetings with novice teachers. Mentors were asked to indicate how often they met with novices for induction meetings, and principals were asked to stipulate perceived frequency of meetings between mentors and novice teachers. For *principals' involvement,* principals were asked how frequently, on average, they observed novices throughout the year. Mentors were asked about their *views of the principals' involvement in induction,* by inquiring about the extent to which they believed principals are up to date on the induction process, the extent of their involvement in this process, and how pleased the mentors would be if the principal were to become more involved in induction at school. Participants responded to statements using a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*).

Procedures and Data Collection

Questionnaires were collected from a nationwide population in Israel, designed to be representative of the population on several demographic variables. The questionnaires for the Principals Study were sent by e-mail to all principals in the country (N = 3,415) through an electronic message group, and the questionnaires for the Mentors Study were sent to active mentors in the country (N = 3,057) through a special, dedicated e-mail group prepared for the study. APA ethical regulations were observed, and the respondents were invited to participate voluntarily. Because of the rules governing the number of times prinipals could be contacted via the electronic messaging group, they received only one request to respond, but the mentors received a reminder e-mail after 2 months. Ultimately, the sample is the result of respondents' willingness to complete the questionnaire.

RESULTS

Preliminary analyses of descriptive statistics, such as percentages, means, and standard deviations, as well as chi-square and t tests were performed on the data. The number of responses received for every question was not always equal.

Responsibility for Mentor selection

Hypothesis 1 suggested that school principals perceive mentor selection and criteria differently than mentors, and view themselves solely responsible for the mentor selection. Results show that whereas most of the principals (82%) declared that they appoint mentors, only 55% of mentors concurred; 13% of mentors reported that the novice teachers selected them—an option selected by only 3% of the principals—and 15% mentioned other school functionaries or a combination of several together. A chi-square test assessing the differences between principals and mentors indicates significant differences (Table 1). These results show that most principals do assume exclusive responsibility for mentor selection, whereas mentors ascribe their selection to additional factors, including novice teachers themselves. Hypothesis 1 regarding mentor selection was supported.

Table 1. Results of chi-squared tests of principals' and mentors' selection responsibility

	Percentage						χ^2	df
	Principal	Vice principal	Subject/ grade coordinat or	Teacher volunteeri ng as mentor	Novice teacher	Other		
Principals ($n = 203$)	82	3	6	2	3	3	54.94 *	5
Mentors ($n = 727$)	55	4	8	5	13	15		

$*p < .001$; $df = 1$

Mentor-selection criteria

We next examined principals' and mentors' perceptions of mentor selection. In contrast to the previous finding, we see greater agreement between the principals and the mentors on mentor-selection criteria. Table 2 displays the ranking of the 12 most significant mentor-selection criteria from the point of view of principals and mentors, respectively. The criteria are listed in ascending order, as ranked by principals; a score of 1 indicates the most significant criterion, and 12 the least significant.

Table 2. Key mentor-selection criteria as a percentage of the sample, by principals' rankings

Criterion	Ranking by principals[a] (n = 202)		Ranking by mentors[b] (n = 765)	
	Rank	%	Rank	%
Willingness to exert effort and contribute	1	80	1	65
Ability to serve as a role model	2	77	2	53
Expertise in novice teacher's subject matter	3	75	4	46
Good communicative skills	4	58	5	43
Teaching same grade level as novice teacher	5	53	7	27
Teaching experience	6	44	3	47
Ability to provide constructive feedback	7	37	6	32
Completed mentor training course	8	31	9	14
Volunteered as mentor	9	14	12	10
Grade-level coordinator	10	12	11	13
Selected by novice teacher	11	10	8	24
Graduate academic degree or higher	12	2	10	13

[a] Principals were asked to choose 5 selection criteria from a list of 15 possibilities
[b] Mentors were asked to choose 4 selection criteria from a list of 15 possibilities

The most important criteria in selecting a mentor, according to both groups, are willingness to exert effort and contribute, ability to serve as a personal role model, and expertise in the novice teacher's discipline, all of which are personal-professional criteria. Apparently, principals and mentors both consider personality and knowledge of the designated area of specialization to be leading considerations in selecting a mentor. It is interesting that neither principals nor mentors considered structural-procedural characteristics, such as formal education and position at school, to be important among selection criteria. Table 2 shows that personal-professional characteristics affect choice more than formal certification and training do. The results also show that both mentors and principals find seniority preferable to completion of a mentor training course or formal education (graduate degree or higher). These results show that although principals and mentors differ on their perceived responsibility of mentor selection, they see eye to eye on selection criteria.

Responsibility for performing specific induction tasks at the school

Hypothesis 2 suggested that school principals would report shared responsibilities concerning specific induction tasks to a greater extent than mentors would. Table 3 displays the four top and three bottom items of the tasks that were examined, in ascending order according to mentors' ranking of tasks as the principal's exclusive responsibility. Cells shaded in gray reflect significant disparities between principals' and mentors' responses.

Table 3. Results of chi-squared tests on principal and mentor responsibility for induction tasks

At your school, who carries out the following activities ...	"Principal only"				"Principal and mentor jointly"				"Mentor only"				Significance of difference between principals and mentors (χ^2)
	Principals		Mentors		Principals		Mentors		Principals		Mentors		
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Submits appropriate copy of employment terms to the novice teacher	2	(2)	85	(359)	83	(115)	11	(44)	15	(21)	4	(21)	$p < .000$
Sends supervisor reports and details of personal conversation with the novice teacher and the intake procedure	3	(4)	83	(340)	80	(107)	11	(47)	11	(15)	6	(24)	$p < .000$
Documents intake and places copy of report in novice teacher's personal file	3	(4)	79	(313)	84	(116)	15	(61)	13	(18)	6	(24)	$p < .000$
Assigns teaching hours to novice teacher	1	(1)	78	(396)	88	(146)	18	(89)	11	(18)	5	(24)	$p < .000$
Presents novice teacher with school regulations[a]	18	(30)	24	(117)	43	(74)	43	(210)	39	(66)	33	(163)	$p < .000$
Ensures that the novice teacher tours school and meets its officials[a]	18	(30)	23	(114)	37	(59)	36	(173)	45	(72)	41	(201)	$p < .000$
Conducts personal meetings with novice teacher to coordinate expectations[a]	19	(34)	14	(80)	37	(66)	36	(203)	44	(79)	49	(276)	$p < .008$

[a] Tasks defined in the Ministry of Education Director-General's Circular as related to both principals and mentors (Ministry of Education, 2009)

A chi-square test assessing differences between principals and mentors indicates that for all tasks, some of which are listed in Table 3, the differences in perceptions of overall responsibility were significant (χ^2(2,613), $p < .01$). According to mentors, the "principal only" is responsible for carrying out most *organizational activities,* such as setting the terms of novice teachers' employment, reporting to supervisors, documenting the process, inviting novices to preparatory activities, assigning teaching hours, placing novices within the system, conducting discussions with novices, and introducing them to teachers. This evaluation is vastly different from the scores given by the principals, who rated all of these responsibilities as belonging to "principal and mentor jointly."

Despite the significant differences between principals and mentors, both groups tend to claim that responsibility for *interpersonal tasks* is to be assumed by the mentor. Nearly half the principals and mentors reported that the mentor is responsible for conducting personal meetings with novice teachers to coordinate expectations, and a similar percentage of respondents maintained that it is the mentor alone who ensures that novice teachers tour schools and meet with officials. About a third of mentors noted that they—and not principals—are responsible for presenting school regulations to novices, and a little less than a third indicated that they were exclusively responsible for presenting the school vision. Furthermore, there is no apparent consensus between principals and mentors regarding mentoring activities in which the principal is expected to participate. Principals consider themselves and mentors to be jointly responsible for most tasks. In practice, principals do not assume exclusive responsibility for the managerial-organizational or interpersonal tasks assigned them by the Ministry of Education.

Responsibility for the success of induction

Hypothesis 3 suggested that school principals attribute the induction success to themselves more than to the mentors. Results show that 55% of principals claimed that successful induction depends primarily on the principal, whereas only 17% of the mentors concurred with this statement. Answers to this question showed significant differences, with a mean score of 3.6 ($SD = 1.0$) for the principals and 2.1 ($SD = 1.1$) for the mentors (t(876) = 17.35, $p < .001$, $d = 1.39$). In response to a similar question posed only to mentors, 68% claimed that successful induction depends primarily on the mentor.

Principals' and mentors' involvement in the induction process

Hypothesis 4 suggested that school principals are involved in the induction in their school to a lesser degree than are the mentors. Observation and monitoring of the novice teacher's work attests to principals' awareness of, perceived responsibility for, and involvement in the year-long induction. Here we present the mentors' results first.

Mentors' involvement. Mentors and principals were asked to list the average frequency of *mentors'* meetings with novice teachers. The results indicate relative consensus between mentors and principals: both groups indicated that most mentors meet with novice teachers once a week (principals, 64%; mentors, 65%) or once every 2 weeks (principals, 19%; mentors, 17%); yet, responses to this question on the 5-point scale showed a significant mean difference (principals, $M = 4.46$, $SD = .97$; mentors, $M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.25$, $[t(936) = 2.06, p < .05, d = 1.34]$).

Principals' involvement. The involvement of principals in induction was also measured from principals' and mentors' viewpoints. Principals' involvement was measured as the frequency with which *they themselves* observe novice teachers throughout the school year. Some 55% observed novices' lessons twice or more per semester, 40% once a semester, 4% once a year, and 5% did not observe such lessons at all ($M = 2.50$, $SD = .601$). Furthermore, more than half of the mentors (57%) agreed that principals were *up to date* ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.26$) and *involved* ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.27$) in the induction process. However, 49% of the mentors declared that principals ought to be more involved in mentoring at their school ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.35$). The percentage of mentors who would be pleased if principals were to intensify their involvement (36%) resembled that of those who would not (38%), perhaps attesting to the willingness of these mentors to accept the joint responsibility that the principals accord them.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which principals and mentors differ from one another in their perceived responsibilities in aspects of mentor selection, performance of a variety of tasks, success of the induction and involvement in the induction of beginning teachers. The study results provide some unique information concerning these issues in time of educational systems' attempts to delegate and share responsibilities.

The first hypothesis which suggested that School principals would perceive mentor selection and criteria differently than mentors, and view themselves solely responsible for mentor selection was confirmed. A significant difference between principals and mentors emerged regarding mentor selection and acceptance of responsibility. Principals considered themselves central figures in selecting mentors, but just over half the mentors credited their principal with selecting them, claiming that another person was also involved in their selection, including the novice teacher. This difference may originate in variations in interpretation between principals and mentors: it might be that even if the mentor is chosen by some other person at the school, principals consider themselves responsible for the decision by virtue of their position and their desire to remain in control of their schools, at least formally. A study conducted in New York City (Grossman et al., 2008) fits the assumption that even if other persons were involved in mentor selection, the school principal is the functionary who makes the final decision. In addition, we found a *general agreement* between principals and mentors on the top selection criteria. For example, principals see eye to eye with mentors on mentor's attributes and accord the greatest significance to mentors' personal-professional characteristics, such as willingness to contribute and exert effort and ability to serve as a role model. These characteristics confirm results of previous studies that personal-professional characteristics are central to the mentor's role (Hobson et al., 2009).

Our second hypothesis which suggested that school principals assume shared responsibilities concerning specific induction tasks to a greater extent than mentors was confirmed. A significant difference emerged between principals' and mentors' acceptance of responsibility in implementing induction tasks—mentors accorded principals exclusive responsibility for all formal issues of induction, except for providing personal guidance to novices, a task for which mentors accepted exclusive responsibility. By contrast, principals claimed that all tasks on the list presented to them were shared by mentors and principals and avoided assuming full responsibility for them, even though the responsibility is defined in the Circular (Ministry of Education, 2009) as theirs alone. This difference may be explained by Inbar's (1983) model, according to which mentors adopt a model of divided authority, and thus view the principal as the responsible and guiding authority at school, granted exclusive responsibility to execute most formal tasks related to mentoring. By contrast, it may be that principals adopt the partial responsibility approach, whereby, according to Inbar's (1983) model, the principal maintains a kind of "contributory responsibility" for induction tasks together with the mentor, and there is no clearly defined division of tasks.

Our third hypothesis which suggested that school principals attribute the induction success to themselves more than to mentors was confirmed. A disagreement emerged between principals' estimation that the success of induction depends on them and mentors' lack of attributing the success of induction to the principal. It may not be a great surprise that perceptual disparities exist between principals and mentors; however, it is surprising to realize that principals take credit for most of the success of induction even though they do not consider themselves responsible for a major share of induction tasks. The disparities between principals and mentors conform to literature on role theories, according to which role conflicts and ambiguity in social environments are anticipated (Schmidt, 2000).

Finally, our fourth hypothesis which suggested that school principals are involved in the induction in their school to a lesser degree than are the mentors was not confirmed. A partial additional disagreement emerged concerning principals' active involvement in induction. It appeared that mentors and principals are adequately involved in the process—mentors are involved weekly and principals are involved at least once or twice a semester. However, a third of the mentors wished that their principal would be more involved in induction, and a third did not. These results coincide with literature that indicates the importance of principals' and mentors' involvement with and support of novice teachers during induction (Cunningham, 2007; Hobson et al., 2009; Wood 2005; Wynn, Carboni & Patall, 2007). The results also conform to literature indicating that all parties involved in the preparation of the novice teacher must collaborate to enhance their mutual mentoring experience (Forsbach-Rothman, 2007).

Theoretical and Practical Implications and Recommendations

The results presented in this paper show that principals and mentors agreed primarily on the desired and the idyllic aspects of induction but disagreed on issues of perceived task performance and responsibilities. Principals may wish to provide designated space and time to define and discuss the extent of principals' and mentors' roles and involvement, as well as their responsibilities in induction programs, taking into account the potential outcomes, and aiming to improve novices' teaching experiences. Such regulations and ongoing discourse at the individual and the organizational levels might both be definitive in suggesting milestones for action and offer a flexible view of induction, which would allow principals and mentors to arrive at a model that best fits the induction needs of their school.

The present study yields several specific implications and recommendations; these are presented in the order of the hypotheses, with recommendations first. For *Mentor selection:* we recommend that school principals in shared discussion with mentors and policy makers reexamine mentors' selection criteria, with a goal of devising a plan that best fits the needs of schools, including employing large-scale school mentoring training programs. We agree that effective selection of mentors and their preparation are key to maximizing the benefits associated with mentoring (Hobson et al., 2009).

For *Principals' and mentors' perceived responsibilities for specific induction tasks:* we recommend that principals and policy makers reexamine, along with other practitioners, the desired and actual degrees of shared leadership and responsibility between principals and mentors in induction, related tasks, and the degree of expected performance. Additionally, the boundaries of principals' and mentors' shared responsibilities should be reconsidered. We agree with Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) that the principal and school administrators as well as the support provided by principals personally and professionally to teachers are key to the development and maintenance of a healthy climate and collegial leadership. According to the multifaceted model, it might be beneficial for principals to attempt to collaborate with mentors as needed for improved induction. This recommendation is based on literature that notes the importance and the benefits of shared leadership (e.g., Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Marks & Printy, 2003; Scribner et al., 2007).

For both *Principals' perceived success and involvement in induction:* policy makers should consider ways to increase principals' awareness and involvement with induction, which can greatly benefit the school and the novice's success, as well as to create a supportive culture, which greatly benefits novices' development and morale (Aitken & Harford, 2011). Shared and collaborative efforts on behalf of all those involved in induction programs are likely to improve the quality and the success of induction, and the retention of novice teachers (Aitken & Harford, 2011; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).

Pros. And cons. of shared responsibilities in induction tasks

We attempted to understand the meaning of shared tasks and responsibilities of induction. We posit that shared leadership and responsibilities are important and valuable (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Marks & Printy, 2003; Scribner, 2007) The principals' possible aspiration to collaborate with mentors conforms to the results of studies that management stability and a supportive school atmosphere are im-

portant to novices (Aitken & Harford, 2011) and that instructional leadership is based on cooperation, discourse with teachers, and replication (Blasé & Blasé, 2000). Aitken and Harford (2011) suggested that positive cultures and collaboration have the greatest impact on teacher development and morale.

Critics of shared leadership, however, warn that the neoliberal reforms instituted at schools in the past few years preclude cooperation and render the principal more of a hierarchical figure and hence as less likely to share responsibility. It is claimed that these reforms accord principals more authority than in the past, exacerbate their functional burden, and alter their reciprocal relations with teachers (Blackmore, 2004). In addition, heavy workloads and the pressure of frequent and rapid decision making may adversely affect cooperation between principals and teachers and thus increase the disparity between principals and teaching staff (Blackmore, 2004).

Analogous to Blackmore's (2004) view, ostensible cooperative responsibility may characterize the behavior of some school principals in Western countries, following the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reform in the United States or the New Horizon and Strength for Change reforms in Israel, similar to NCLB, which might inadvertently increase the principal's less-cooperative hierarchy. Under such circumstances, principals' reports might be interpreted as ostensible cooperation and reflect an ideal situation rather than a real one, especially when shared leadership is performed to a lesser degree. In practice, the "scepter" of leadership remains with the principal, while responsibility for teacher induction might be delegated at times to the mentor.

The differences in perception between principals and mentors regarding their responsibility for tasks may have far-reaching consequences for the induction process and, by extension, the entire education system. Varying perceptions of responsibility may lead to a situation in which matters "fall through the cracks" and are not addressed promptly, even risking the engendering of conflicts between principals and mentors. We believe that shared responsibility as reported by principals can take place only after the various spheres of exclusive and shared responsibilities are defined for principal and mentor alike. When responsibility is shared, *overall responsibility* should be monitored to ensure that a task is indeed performed.

Limitations and future research

The design of this study, although adequate for the purpose of exploring principals' and mentors' perceptions regarding induction, dictated some limitations

that need to be addressed when interpreting the results. Although the current study design did not allow for direct examination of roles and responsibility or for comparison of principals and mentors in several of the cases, it does shed some unique light on the disparities in respondents' perceptions of induction and mentoring, as well as their roles and responsibilities. In addition, the use of two separate studies, one of principals and one of mentors, limited our ability to directly compare the groups; however, our results provide good-enough support and justification for the purpose of preliminary discussion of the role and responsibility of mentors in induction. In times of increasing principal and mentor workloads, and the need to comply with ongoing regulations and standardization, this study provides a glimpse into principals' and mentors' perceptions regarding induction and mentoring, as well as their perceived responsibilities.

Finally, this study is but another step in examining induction and mentoring. We recommend that *future research* focus on such issues as professional rules and regulations related to induction. We also recommend examining the existing regulations, as well as the roles and responsibilities of all those involved in multi-faceted induction to improve induction and increase novices' retention in the profession. We further join Bickmore and Bickmore's (2010) recommendation for conducting research studies of multifaceted systematic induction programs to better understand effective teacher induction. Such studies may employ various research methods, in areas of principal–mentor shared leadership and induction effectiveness, and how these may affect novices' experiences and preparation and decrease their likelihood of leaving the teaching profession. In addition, examining the differing perspectives of mentors regarding the levels of principal involvement may benefit the field. Further studies in these lines would provide a better understanding of effective induction which is based on shared responsibilities and leadership, and with the aim of retaining novice teachers in the teaching profession.

REFERENCES

AITKEN, R. & HARFORD, J. (2011). Induction needs of a group of teachers at different career stages in a school in the Republic of Ireland: Challenges and expectations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 350–356. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.09.003.

ANGELLE, P. (2002). *T.O.S.S. it to the new teacher: The principal's role in the induction process.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, February 14–16, Austin, TX.

BEUTEL, D., CROSSWELL, L., WILLIS, J., SPOONER-LANE, R., CURTIS, E. & CHURCHWARD, P. (2017). Preparing teachers to mentor beginning teachers: an Australian case study. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 6(3), 164–177.

BICKMORE, D.L. & BICKMORE, S.T. (2010). A multifaceted approach to teacher induction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1005–1014.

BLACKMORE, J. (2004). Restructuring educational leadership in changing contexts: A local/global account of restructuring in Australia. *Journal of Educational Change*, 5(3), 267–288.

BLASÉ, J. & BLASÉ, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130–141.

BROWN, K. (2002). Acclimating induction teachers to low-performing schooling: Administrators' role. *Education*, 123(2), 422–426.

BULLOUGH, R.V.Jr. (2012). Mentoring and new teacher induction in the United States: A review and analysis of current practices. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 20(1), 57–74.

BULLOUGH, R. & DRAPER, R. (2004). Making sense of the failed triad: Mentors, university supervisors and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 407–420.

CARVER, C.L. (2003). The principal's role in new teacher induction. In M. SCHERER (ed.), *Keeping good teachers* (chap. 4). Retrieved November 28, 2015, from http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/104138/chapters/The-Principal's-Role-in-New-Teacher-Induction.aspx

CHERIAN, F. & DANIEL, Y. (2008). Principal leadership in new teacher induction: Becoming agents of change. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 3(2), 1–11.

CRESWELL, J. (1998), *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

CUCONATO, M., DU BOIS-REYMOND, M. & LUNABBA, H. (2015). Between gate-keeping and support: Teachers' perception of their role in transition. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28(3), 311–328.

CUNNINGHAM, B. (2007). All the right features: Towards an "architecture" for mentoring trainee teachers in UK further education colleges. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33(1), 83–97.

DESIMONE, L.M., HOCHBERG, E.D., PORTER, A.C., POLIKOFF, M.S., SCHWARTZ, R. & JOHNSON, L.J. (2014). Formal and informal mentoring: Complementary, compensatory, or consistent? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 88–110.

ELDAR, E., NABEL, N., SCHECHTER, C., TALMOR, R. & MAZIN, K. (2003). Anatomy of success and failure: The story of three novice teachers. *Educational Research*, 45(1), 29–48.

FEIMAN-NEMSER, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 25–29.

FORSBACH-ROTHMAN, T. (2007). The mentor role: Is training necessary? *Journal of In-Service Education*, 33(2), 245–247.

GANSER, T. (2002). How teachers compare the roles of cooperating teacher and mentor. *Educational Forum*, 66(4), 380–385.

GLENN, W.J. (2006). Model versus mentor: Defining the necessary qualities of the effective cooperating teacher. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(1), 85–95.

GROSSMAN, P., HAMMERNESS, K.M., MCDONALD, M. & RONFELDT, M. (2008). Constructing coherence: Structural predictors of perceptions of coherence in NYC teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 273–287.

GRUDNOFF, L. (2011). Rethinking the practicum: Limitations and possibilities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(3), 223–234.

HALLINGER, P. & HECK, R.H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(2), 95–110.

HENNISSEN, P., CRASBORN, F., BROUWER, N., KORTHAGEN, F. & BERGEN, T. (2011). Clarifying pre-service teacher perceptions of mentor teachers' developing use of mentoring skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1049–1058.

HOBSON, A.J., ASHBY, P., MALDEREZ, A. & TOMLINSON, P.D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 207–216.

INBAR, D. (1983). *Responsibility.* Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim [Hebrew].

INGERSOLL, R.M. (2005). The problem of underqualified teachers: A sociological perspective. *Sociology of Education*, 78(2), 175–178.

INGERSOLL, R.M. & SMITH, T.M. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(638), 28–40.

INGERSOLL, R.M. & STRONG, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201–233, doi:10.3102/0034654311403323.

KAJS, L.T. (2002). Framework for designing a mentoring program for novice teachers. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 10(1), 57–69.

MARKS, H.M. & PRINTY, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370–397.

MENA, J., HENNISSEN, P. & LOUGHRAN, J. (2017). Developing pre-service teachers' professional knowledge of teaching: The influence of mentoring. *Teaching and teacher education*, 66, 47–59.

Ministry of Education. (2009). *Integrating interns and new educational employees at schools.* Director-General's Circular, Permanent Regulations, 2010/1(B). Israel [Hebrew].

Morse, J.M. (1994), "Designing funded qualitative research." In: N.K. DENZIN. AND Y.S. LINCOLN (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (p. 220–235). Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2nd ed.

NASSER-ABU ALHIJA, F. & FRESKO, B. (2010). Socialization of new teachers: Does induction matter? *Teaching and teacher education*, 26(8), 1592–1597.

NASSER-ABU ALHIJA, F. & FRESKO, B. (2016). A retrospective appraisal of teacher induction. *Australian Journal of Education* (Online), 41(2), 16–31.

NASSER-ABU ALHIJA, F., FRESKO, B. & REICHENBERG, R. (2011). The induction process in education–overview. In: O. SCHATZ-OPPENHEIMER, D. MASKIT & S. ZILBERSHTROM (eds.), *Being a teacher: The entry path to education* (pp. 55–87). Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute & Ministry's Teacher Induction Division [Hebrew].

ODELL, S.J., HULING, L. & SWEENY, B.W. (2000). Conceptualizing quality mentoring: Background information. In: S.J. ODELL & L. HULING (eds.), *Quality mentoring for novice teachers* (pp. 3–14). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

POLIT, D.F. & BECK, C.T. (2006). The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(5), 489–497, doi: 10.1002/nur.20147.

RAJUAN, M., TUCHIN, I. & ZUCKERMAN, T. (2011). Mentoring the mentors: First-order description of experience in context. *The New Educator*, 7(2), 172–190.

ROBERSON, S. & ROBERSON, R. (2009). The role and practice of the principal in developing novice first-year teachers. *Clearing House*, 82(3), 113–118.

SARGENT, B. (2003). Finding good teachers—And keeping them. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 47–44.

SCHATZ-OPPENHEIMER, O. (2011). Conflict tension and complexity in the job of mentoring. In: O. SCHATZ-OPPENHEIMER, D. MASKIT & S. ZILBERSHTROM (eds.), *Being a teacher: The entry path to education* (pp. 183–199). Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute and Israel Ministry of Education — Teacher Induction (Induction) Division [Hebrew].

SCHATZ-OPPENHEIMER, O. & DVIR, N. (2014). From ugly duckling to swan: Stories of novice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 37(1) 140–149.

Schneider, R. (2008). Mentoring new mentors: Learning to mentor preservice science teachers. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 19(2), 113–116.

Schwabsky, N. (2010). Opinions and forecasts for change in teacher training: Opportunities and risks. *Dapim*, 50, 17–47 [Hebrew].

Schwabsky, N. (2018). Factors affecting principals' adoption of and satisfaction with market-driven externally developed reforms. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(3), 342–358.

Schmidt, M. (2000). Role theory, emotions, and identity in the department headship in secondary schooling. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(8), 827–842.

Scribner, J.P., Sawyer, R.K., Watson, S.T. & Myers, V.L. (2007). Teacher Teams and Distributed Leadership: A Study of Group Discourse and Collaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 67–100.

Shivers-Blackwell, S.L. (2004). Using role theory to examine determinants of transformational and transactional leader behavior. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(3), 41–50.

Smith, T.M. & Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681–714.

Starks, H. & Trinidad, S.B. (2007), Choose your method: a comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1372–1380.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217–247.

van Ginkel, G., Verloop, N. & Denessen, E. (2016). Why mentor? Linking mentor teachers' motivations to their mentoring conceptions. *Teachers and teaching*, 22(1), 101-116.

Wahlstrom, K.L. & Louis, K.S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458–495.

Watkins, P. (2005). The principal's role in attracting, retaining, and developing new teachers. *Clearing House*, 79(2), 83–87.

Wood, A. (2005). The importance of principals: Site administrators' roles in novice teacher induction. *American Secondary Education*, 33(2), 39–62.

Wynn, S., Carboni, L. & Patall, E. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentoring, climate, and leadership: Promoting retention through a learning communities perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(3), 209–229.

Youngs, P. (2007). How elementary principals' beliefs and actions influence new teachers' experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 101–137.

WSPÓLNE OBOWIĄZKI DYREKTORÓW I MENTORÓW W ZAKRESIE WDRAŻANIA POCZĄTKUJĄCYCH NAUCZYCIELI

Streszczenie

Badaniami objęto wspólne obowiązki postrzegane przez izraelskich dyrektorów i mentorów w zakresie doboru mentora, ich zaangażowanie względem konkretnych zadań oraz atrybutów sukcesu wdrożenia początkujących nauczycieli. W baniach wzięło udział 222 dyrektorów oraz 765 mentorów, którzy wypełnili dwa anonimowe kwestionariusze online badające ich perspektywę na powyższe zmienne. Wyniki pokazują, że dyrektorzy i mentorzy różnią się pod względem postrzeganych obowiązków związanych z wyborem mentora, odpowiedzialności za zadania i atrybutów sukcesu wdrożenia początkującego nauczyciela. Zbieżność perspektyw dotyczy

kryteriów wyboru mentora i ich zaangażowania we wdrażanie. W dobie złożoności środowisk edukacyjnych, istnieje potrzeba ponownego przeanalizowania wspólnych obowiązków dyrektorów i mentorów w zakresie przygotowania początkujących nauczycieli.

Słowa kluczowe: dyrektorzy; mentorzy; wdrażanie początkujących nauczycieli; mentoring; obowiązki.

PRINCIPALS' AND MENTORS'
SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES IN INDUCTION
OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

S u m m a r y

This study examined Israeli principals' and mentors' perceived shared responsibilities concerning mentor selection, specific induction tasks, induction success attributes, and their involvement in induction. A total sample of 222 principals and 765 mentors completed two separate online, anonymous questionnaires assessing their perceptions of these aspects. Results show that principals and mentors differ in their perceived responsibilities concerning mentor selection, task responsibilities, and induction success attributes. They coincide on mentor selection criteria and their involvement in induction. Today's complex, multifaceted induction environments require a reexamination of the principals' and mentors' shared responsibilities in the preparation of beginning teachers. The concept of shared responsibilities is discussed.

Keywords: principals; mentors; beginning teachers' induction; mentoring; responsibilities.