

**TITLE: *PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION
PROCESSES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS: A
LITERATURE REVIEW***

TOPIC AREA: *Educational Administration*

**KEY WORDS: *School Administrators, Professional Development,
Leadership Preparation, and Succession
Planning***

AUTHOR: *Anthony H. Normore, Ph.D.*

**MAILING ADDRESS: *Florida International University
College of Education, ZEB (358B)
11200 South West 8th Street
Miami, Florida, 33199***

E-MAIL: normorea@fiu.edu

TELEPHONE: *(305) 348-1515*

FAX: *(305) 348-3418*

**Paper presented at the Hawaii International Conference on Education,
Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, January 7-10, 2003**

***PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION
PROCESSES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS: A LITERATURE
REVIEW***

Schools are resilient institutions that change slowly, even under considerable pressure, but the current unprecedented level of dissatisfaction with the schools and the public's insistence that schools do a better job of preparing students suggest that change is inevitable (Tyack, 1993; Roher & Wormwell, 2000). School administrators are feeling the effects of the public's changing expectations in the push to adopt new and expanded administrative roles, including those of accountable instructional leaders, constructive political leaders, and responsible managers. Administrators are in a vital position to influence the direction of change and must respond to the public's demands without losing sight of the need to protect the children's interests (Roher & al., 2000; Gutherie & al., 2001).

It has been stated that the most crucial ingredient in preparing capable school leaders is individual school districts (Smith & Piele, 1989). Without the emotional and financial support of the central office the prospects for "growing" a healthy crop of new principals who can effectively lead schools during the upcoming decades is highly unlikely. Exemplary training programs will certainly cost money. According to Baltzell & Dentler (1992), the extent to which the school system invests in the preparation of principals is an index to other aspects of system quality. They assert that many school districts are not willing to make such an investment and, consequently, do not have a qualified pool of candidates from which to choose when an opening occurs.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the literature on the various professional and organizational socialization processes of School Administrators. These socialization processes include succession planning activities and professional development opportunities as well as formal and informal experiences of present and future school administrators as they face uncertainty in the changing role of school administration.

In the past, organizations have focused succession planning efforts on the preparation of high leadership potential individuals. However, expectations are changing for the role of administrators. Today, school organizations are learning that the focus must be not only on these high potential individuals, but also on the context of these individuals to the leadership team. Effective succession planning examines how each succession candidate would add value to team performance. According to the Hagberg Consulting Group (1998), succession planning and clear expectations help school districts by: engaging senior management in a disciplined review of leadership talent; guiding development activities of administrative teams; bringing selection systems, rewards systems and leadership development into alignment with the process of leadership renewal; assuring continuity of leadership; avoiding transition problems and; preventing premature promotion of principals through professional development. Normore (2001) supports the notion that clear expectations are essential to school administrators in order for effective succession planning to occur. In a study conducted in two urban school districts in Ontario, Normore (2001) discovered that organizational structures and guiding principles have a profound effect on the effectiveness of school administrators. Moreover, the Principals Qualification Program at various venues was an asset in preparing for the transition from teacher to school administrator and became a major component of the leadership development process.

According to Daresh et al., (1994; 1997) and Darling-Hammond (1995) some of the activities that have been used by some American school districts for leadership development include Administrative Training Programs where potential principals apply for and take a ten-week after-work course on leadership. Graduates then opt for a second eighteen-week, three credit course in administrative leadership, which includes skill development. Candidates are then invited to Administrative Competence Seminars where their interpersonal skills, communication and conceptual skills, and group leadership skills are formally assessed by a panel of senior administrators. Top ranked individuals are then placed in internships as full-time assistant principals for one full year under the guidance of successful administrators where they obtain experience in areas such as instructional leadership, staff development, and pupil personnel management, community involvement, and professional growth (Darling-Hammond,1995).

It is hoped that more school districts will begin to realize that the training of capable leaders must begin long before they are needed. Effective training programs are of course only the first step in hiring capable principals. Effective leadership succession practices that include recruitment, selection, and induction are other essential components in a comprehensive system that train, obtain, and retain the most capable school leaders (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Daresh et al., 1997).

During leadership succession, when the relationships and patterns that shape a principal's impact on the school are formed, the organization and the new principal exert influence on each other. A successor who possesses knowledge about social influencing processes and skill in applying that knowledge can have a substantial impact on the outcomes of his/her own succession experience. District leaders can use the same body of knowledge to plan succession processes and design support activities for principals that make the results they desire more likely to occur. They can use knowledge about the interactions between a new member and the organization to modify principal evaluation processes and refocus principal's attention (Block, 1993; Clark, 1991; Coleman & Laroque, 1990; Walker, 1999; 2000).

School district leaders can assess their current practices and design flexible processes that support principals undergoing succession and lead to outcomes that advance district policies and goals. They can re-examine their use of mentors and match the design of their mentor programs to the outcomes appropriate to each school, provide systematic support and time for visits, diagnosis, and planning activities by principals that facilitate their transition to a new school, and consciously work to improve the outcomes of a succession beyond the careful search for and appointment of the best principal for a school. This includes training and support specifically designed to assist principals who are taking charge in a new assignment, recognizing that they face challenges common to major transitions, acknowledging that a unique mix between the principal and the school will give rise to the outcomes of the succession, and preparing the principals for the impact the school will have on them as well as the impact they hope to have on the school (Corbett & Wilson, 1992; Corbett, Wilson, & Webb-Dempsey, 1996).

According to various researchers (Pajak, 1989; Crowson & Morris, 1992; Dimmock & Wildy, 1992; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Fullan, 1993; Weiss, &

Cambone, 1994; Angus, 1998; Elmin, 2000; Normore,2001) district office personnel can also capitalize on the expectations for change that succession brings to implement new programs and work toward the improvement of schools. They can seize the opportunity that this major role transition presents to shape and expand the professional orientation, knowledge, and skills, both moral and technical, of the administrators who lead their schools.

It is essential then, that school administrators understand the expectations of school districts. Districts are encouraged to fully and clearly articulate the specific demands of the position, and expectations of administrators in their districts or schools before embarking onto specific recruitment and selection procedures (Pounder et al.,2000; Normore,2001). Certain recruiting and selection procedures produce the best candidates for particular job vacancies (Anderson,1988; Castallo et al., 1992; Castetter,1992; Herman,1994; Normore,2001).Changing expectations have implications for the selection and training of school administrators. This articulation of expectations and training implications become an integral part of the socialization of the administrator (Pounder & Young, 1996; Normore,2001).

Administrator Socialization

“ It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things.”Machiavelli (Greene,1998, p. 396)

A major component of any succession process involves socialization whereby attention is drawn to the leader and the context simultaneously. The socialization of the administrators to the profession or occupation of school administration begins in training or preparation programs (Sussman,1986; Warren,1989; Hart,1993; Whatley,1994; Normore,2001). This section focuses on three concepts. First, there is a general definition of socialization as outlined in the literature. Second, the professional socialization process of administrators is explored, followed by a discussion of organizational socialization process.

What is Socialization?

The term “socialization” is applied to the processes by which an individual selectively acquires the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to perform a social role effectively (Merton, 1963). Feldman (1989) points out that socialization research has tended to focus most closely on the informal ways by which individuals learn about their work settings, and the impact of others on that learning. Training research, in contrast, has been most concerned with the ability of individuals to perform routine work tasks. He cites Brim’s (1966) definition of socialization as “the manner in which an individual learns that behaviour appropriate to his position in a group through interaction with others who hold normative beliefs about what his role should be and who reward or punish him for correct or incorrect actions” (p. 3).

Bennis (1985) asserts that socialization involves a complex set of human relationships interacting in many ways. He continues that within an organization, the socialization includes all the people in it and their relationships to each other and to the outside world. Hence, the behaviour of one member can have an impact, either directly or indirectly, on the behaviour of others. This means that the social system does not have boundaries. It exchanges goods, ideas, culture, and so forth with the environment around it.

The development and implementation of administrator training programs as a form of professional development for school administrators should help administrators fit into the social system of schools both professionally and organizationally. If training programs are not meeting the needs of school administrators it would seem appropriate that school boards establish better connections between their training programs and their expectations. School administrators need to receive ongoing professional development. There is strong support for training before holding the principal accountable for knowing. These linkages require school boards to examine more closely the most appropriate training models and experiences for aspiring and practicing school leaders (Hart,1993). School boards need to rethink the content, delivery, and outcomes of administration preparation programs as they currently exist. They also need to ensure that upcoming and practicing school administrators have both professional and organizational socialization opportunities.

In the administrative structure of the school system there are two types of socialization processes that are always at the forefront for administrators; *professional socialization* and *organizational socialization*. It may range from both formal and explicit influences such as carefully planned formal training programs or working with a mentor to informal and implicit influences that include unplanned, on-the-job experiences (Hart,1993; Normore,2001).

Professional Socialization

Becoming a school administrator is a major step in the professional life of an educator (Pounder et al.,1996; 2001). School administrators are confronted with a complex array of multi-faceted challenges from “learning the ropes” for the day-to-day operation of the school to enhancing the school culture so that it becomes more educative (Leithwood et al.,1999; Parkay et al.,1992). Perhaps the most difficult challenge that the beginning school administrator faces, however, is the need to develop a professional identity - “an image of the self” as a proactive leader who can make a difference (Ronkowski & Iannaccone,1989).

Professional socialization generally begins in the pre-appointment phase of a school leader’s education career and continues into early post-appointment growth and on-going development. Professional socialization is an interactive process used to gain knowledge, skills, and behaviours needed to participate as a member of a profession. It is a dynamic developmental process through which values and norms of the profession are internalized and a professional identity is gained. This socialization requires dialogue, collaboration, and mentoring by an experienced professional to serve as a guide (Greenfield, 1985;Kaye, 1995).

According to Weindling & Earley (1995) pre-appointment professional socialization includes: management courses for certification (mandatory and voluntary), first-hand experience of leadership and management tasks; modeling and social learning (learning by observing both good and bad models, help from a notion of what is good and bad leadership); and deliberate mentoring by some existing school leaders who see importance in their role in preparing future leaders.

Begley & Cambell-Evans (1992) adopted Van Gennep's three-stage model of professional socialization (separation, transition, and incorporation) to explain that individuals progress from being defined by others to being self-defined. According to Van Gennep (1960), at the separation stage people are concerned with comparing themselves with others and how others judge their adequacy. At the transition stage people compare themselves against the standards imposed by the functions of the job and task performance. At the incorporation stage individuals make comparisons between their former and present self (e.g., perceptions of progress made from a previous self toward becoming an instructional leader).

Van Gennep (1960) and Van Maanen (1976) emphasize the importance of *personal* and *cultural* socialization. They assert that culture, in a general sense, provides values, norms and roles that are enforced by positive and negative sanctions. The learning of these values, norms and roles are supported by the agents of socialization (family, peers, school mass media and early life experiences). Merton (1963) suggests that socialization is a process through which culture is learned. Its purpose is to direct social consistency by guiding how a society communicates, evaluates and behaves. The sub-cultural influences can complement or counteract the cultural values and norms (Hagberg, 1984). This would apply to school leaders' ethical behavior as their behavior is always done so within the context of both the overall culture they are part of or any subculture they may belong to. Begley and Cambell-Evans (1992) recognize the influence of internal processes on socialization such as personal and professional values (personal challenge, thirst for knowledge, other people's influence) and the individual's perception of socializing experiences.

According to Hagberg (1984), successful leaders move from lower stages of power to higher stages of power, which are characterized by empowering others. However, such growth comes only through the successful resolution of a crisis of integrity. When a school administrator faces a crisis of integrity, he/she confronts something that goes beyond the challenge of the immediate moment. A crisis of integrity occurs inside the leader and often involves a conflict between two powerful values or principles. For example, the conflict may be between one's core values and the political expectations of the position, or it may involve a conflict of interests or rights. The

leader's response to the crisis will determine to an important degree his or her ability to move into the higher stages of ethical leadership that Bennis (1985) describes as essential to counter a growing inconsistency to educate our young people.

Organizational Socialization

Hart (1993) asserts that organizational socialization begins upon appointment, and is specific to the education context. Each school has a particular context requiring understanding and integration of a complex array of people, policies, processes, and priorities. Guy (1985) asserts that the need to fit into the immediate work environment makes organizational socialization more salient and immediate than the experiences that precede it, no matter how carefully organized. Organizational norms consequently tend to replace those learned during professional socialization. School administrators in schools consequently are interdependent with others who work there. The school administrator has formal leadership power but depends on those in the school for the power of the group to act (Miklos,1988).

Schein (1992) offers compelling arguments that each new manager needs to understand and analyze the particular organizational culture into which she or he is placed, emphasizing that leadership is intertwined with each particular organizational culture. An insider (someone appointed from inside the school) brings past experience and knowledge to this process, as opposed to someone who is brought in from the outside. Socialization to the administrator position in each school is fundamentally unique.

Leithwood et al.,(1992) have described school administrator socialization in a manner consistent with Greenfield (1985a;1985b). They claim that there are mediating influences on principals' socialization such as work setting, culture and relationships with peers, superiors, district policies and procedures, formal training, and outcomes. This last influence incorporates the image of the role of the school administrator, skills, norms and values, and communication networks. The organizational socialization literature (both practice and research oriented) provides educational leaders and policy makers with guidelines for structuring experiences (McCarthy,1999; Leithwood et al.,1992). It suggests that the profession adopt a longer-term view of the preparation and development

of school leaders that extends not only into the induction period but provides planned socialization experiences each time a new leadership assignment is made (Wanous, 1980; Pounder et al.1996).

In a study conducted by Leithwood, Steinbach, Ross and Hamilton (1991) on the socialization processes of aspiring administrators the findings indicate that administrators' socialization patterns are helpful in contributing to instructional leadership. The study indicates that formal training programs are necessary for the socializing of administrators. Greenfield (1985b) suggests that such programs are an important factor for developing the technical knowledge and skills that administrators require. Devoting more time and energy to programs that focus on meaningful content in a form consistent with good principles of adult education is one promising suggestion for improving socialization experience. Papke (1989) and Normore (2001) claim that on-the-job leadership activities are viewed as the most helpful of all socialization activities. School districts need to develop and implement structured leadership development activities and opportunities for school administrators to enhance school leadership and to help meet expectations.

Structured Induction Opportunities: Expectations for School District

“Organizations need leaders if they want to win, and the only the way to get them is for leaders to consciously mentor and prepare them” (Noel M. Tichy, The Leadership Engine)

Universities and school districts can use a variety of bridging strategies to provide aspiring administrators with practical administrative experience and knowledge to help them succeed in the principal-ship prior to their first position. Pre-service training should not, however, be the only assistance that principals receive (Confrey, 1987; Bredeson, 1996; Daresh, 2000; Daresh, 2001). In fact, according to Daresh (2001) it is naïve to believe that pre-service training or even out-of-district in-service programs will provide aspiring administrators with all they need to know about how to be an effective leader in a particular school district. School districts, therefore, must continue training principals and provide newly hired administrators with a variety of supportive induction activities to help them continue their professional growth as school leaders. In short the school

districts need to ensure there are socialization opportunities provided to administrators in order to prepare for their role. Such opportunities may include: well-thought-out and comprehensive orientation programs; institute a “Buddy System”; structure beginners’ workload; give principals (both new and experienced) feedback; develop a plan for professional growth; and facilitate “reflective” activities: (Lipham et al., 1985; Daresh,1988; Daresh et al., 1992; Riordan & Hildebrandt, 1995; Daresh, 2000; Normore,2001).

Re-socialization: Response to Changing Expectations

Although much has been written about beginning teachers and the accompanying trauma that many vividly recall, little has been written about the beginning principal. Perhaps because, unlike beginning teachers, beginning principals are continuing in their schoolwork, albeit in a new role. However, as teachers make the transition from being a teacher to being a school administrator so does the emergence of new socialization experiences. At the point of preparing for the administrator role, aspiring administrators begin to take on a new and different role as an educator. Consequently, the need to be re-socialized becomes crucial and a new professional identity suddenly is at the fore (Feldman,1989).

Many teachers, at some point in their career, have thought about the possibility of holding a principalship (Fein,1990; Pounder et al.,2001). Those who never do it have thought about how they would do things differently if they were in the position. Becoming a school administrator (vice-principal and/or principal) is for many educators the ultimate point in their career. However, there are more demands on and changing expectations for the position now than ever before. It is because of the position demands and ever changing expectations that someone entering into this role will have new socialization experiences both professionally and organizationally.

In addition to the re-socialization of teachers who aspire to become administrators, there is also a need to re-socialize the practicing administrators, both new and experienced (Fein,1990). The job and working conditions of administrators today are becoming increasingly difficult, complex, and stressful. As Parkay et al., emphasize (1992), “the rise of gangs, the increase of children with diverse needs in the classroom,

the shortage of funds, the decrease in community and public support, the compounding effects of legal threats and decisions, and the never-ending demands for contribution of time, hours, and energy take their toll” (p.x). With changes in policies and procedures and school reform descending on schools, diversity flourishing in student composition and new conceptualization of leadership, the administrators(s) of schools are expected to provide effective leadership and take on a vast array of added responsibilities (Parkay & Hall,1992; Ashby & Krug,1998;OPC, 2001a; OPC, 2001b; Normore,2001).

If school districts wish to retain their administrators in these changing times, they must assert and provide leadership development as well as the professional development and training at district level to keep them fresh and abreast of best practices. Normore(2001) asserts that these expectations are connected to holding administrators accountable for their roles and functions as leaders within the school district who, along with their teachers and students, will be ready for the 21st century.

Professional Development of School Administrators

Part of the impetus for change and accountability in professional development practices comes from recognition that schools generally are not conducive to adult growth and learning. To transform schools into places in which educators can learn, it will be necessary first to identify conditions that promote or constrain educator learning (IPSA, 1989; Hord, Jolley & Mendez-Morse, 1992; IEC, 2000; CCSSO, 2001). Socialization experiences and development of competence through training and interaction with colleagues are among the ways that employees learn and grow. Organizations can support the development of competence by providing training, collegial exchange, and feedback.

Professional development is more likely to enhance the growth and integrity of administrators if it is planned with the dynamics of the administrative career and the stages of adult development in mind. Knowledge of career patterns of teachers and the dynamics of administration help central office personnel plan development activities and advise individual teachers and administrators regarding choices of growth options. Staff development activities that are appropriate and useful for teachers at one stage of their careers may not be as suitable for those who have already passed through that stage or

who have yet to enter it (Van Berkum, Richardson, & Lane, 1994; Seyfarth,1999). However, it is not advisable to limit the focus of staff development activities to an individual's current or proximate stage of development. Taking a longer range view has the advantage of introducing teachers to developmental experiences early in their careers that prepare them for more advanced career stages (Leithwood, Begley & Cousins,1993).

Career Patterns and Induction Programs for Administrators

Career development patterns are usually thought of in two stages—exploration and stabilization. The exploration stage involves making a provisional choice of occupation and trying out one or more occupational roles. This is followed by a stabilization stage during which the practitioner defines an area of focus, attempts to master essential aspects of the job, and searches for a situation with a satisfactory mix of opportunities, responsibilities, and rewards (Huberman, 1990). According to Daresh (1988b) and Daresh et al.,(1988; 1992), there are three dimensions needed to be included in any effective approach to preparing and supporting school administrators throughout their career in their roles and functions as administrators: *academic preparation, field-based learning, and personal and professional formation*. These dimensions are part of the professional development needed by administrators.

Pre-service preparation consists of those learning activities and other processes that take place prior to initial job placement. Recruitment, selection, training, licensure, and placement into a first job are all components of the pre-service preparation program phase.

Field-based learning or induction may be defined as the period in a person's career when he or she is in a new position in an organization, under a new role definition. The process of induction is something that is not necessarily concluded after one year in a new job. Induction may take several years to complete, depending on the conditions in the organization, the nature of the role, and the characteristics of the individual (Daresh, 1988a; Daresh et al.,1992; Rogers & Druring, 1988; Sparks, 2000).

In-service education consists of learning opportunities that are provided to individuals while they are actually engaged in the job. These opportunities may be directed specifically at helping an administrator to perform the duties of his or her job

more efficiently or effectively, or it may be directed toward the personal growth and development of the administrator performing his or her job, regardless of the expectations of the job.

According to the National Policy Board on Administrative Preparation (1989) when aspiring administrators enter the field of educational administration they presumably have little basic information concerning the nature of school management. The majority of one's learning in the earliest phases of pre-service preparation might involve heavy emphasis, if not exclusive reliance, on academic preparation. As people progress through the various stages of their careers, learning will occur more frequently from an experiential base otherwise known as "learning by doing". While academic preparation decreases throughout a career and field-based learning increases, there is never a point where either of these dimensions disappear altogether.

The dimension that remains constant throughout an administrator's career is *personal and professional formation*. Daresh et al., (1992) define this formation as "the effort to enable an individual to become more aware of his or her own personal values and assumptions regarding the formal role of a school administrator." (p.54) The need to engage in reflection, to think about one's ethical stances and one's commitment to the profession, is constant, although the issues may differ. Mentoring, for example, might be seen as a consistent activity from pre-service to in-service.

The components of formation include: mentoring, personal reflection, educational platform development, appreciation of alternative styles, and personal professional action planning. By using these component elements of formation as part of a comprehensive professional development program for aspiring and practicing school administrators may lead to more effective leadership in schools (Daresh,1988; Miklos,1996). The three phases are distinct in an administrator's career. Yet they need to be understood in concert. They are interactive in nature, and an appreciation of pre-service leads to discussions of induction concerns, which in turn are related to in-service education. They are not to be considered to be separate and isolated events in a person's career (Daresh, 1988b; Daresh et al., 1992; Miklos, 1988).

The process of effective professional development for school leaders is something that demands serious planning and attention. It does not simply "happen" without any

thought on the part of those responsible for directing such an effort---the district office (Milstein, 1993; McMahan, 2000; Reitzug & Hudson, 2000).

District Planning

The scene of the action for professional development is shifting from university campuses to district offices (Smith & Piele,1989). Now personnel in the school districts are playing an increasingly important role in planning and implementing professional development for teachers and administrators. School districts need to provide special programs designed to support the work of beginning school administrators (Daresh et al., 1992;1994;1997; Normore,2001) This should be done in the planning stage. The novice school leaders will be served well when efforts are made to help them through their first professional duties. The use of mentor-protégé programs is a positive program used in districts for novice administrators (Daresh et al.,1990; 1992; 1994; Normore,2001).

Time must be provided as part of the training exercise to address the issue of “who, when, what, and how” things get done in particular districts (Daresh et al.,1992; Normore,2001). Mentors need to receive general orientations to the goals of their districts, important policies, and procedures that are particularly important in each district. In this way, proteges will learn about committees, personnel, and the general structure of the organization in which they will work. But there are limitations to formal induction programs. For example, entry-year programs can never serve to repair total incompetence (Daresh et al.,1992). School districts need to be careful about finding and selecting only the most talented individuals for administrative roles. No induction programs can be designed to correct bad choices. In the planning for succession, professional development entry-year programs should be part of the comprehensive professional development efforts. Induction programs for beginning educators will likely fail to reach their full positive potential if they are developed solely as a way to comply with minimal performance expectations. Entry-year efforts will be successful only if they are viewed as a foundation on which school districts set out to build total professional development programs that are designed to meet the needs of not only beginning administrators but of all district administrators.

Reflections

Whatever our idealized view of leaders and despite calls for school administrators who shape the fundamental culture, structure, and goals of schools, research and practice support a more complex, interactive view of administrator succession. Researchers and practitioners need to understand the succession process and manage its outcomes. School administrators, their superiors, and school policy makers can use an organizational socialization perspective on principal succession to enhance the practice of school administration and their professional development.

References

- Anderson, M. E. (1988). *Hiring capable principals: How school districts recruit, groom, and select the best candidates*. Oregon School Study Council, 31 (9), 1-37.
- Anderson, M.E.(1989). "Training and Selecting School Leaders". In Smith, S., & Piele, P.K. (Eds.), *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.
- Anderson, M. E. (1991). *Principals: How to Train, Recruit, Select, Induct, and Evaluate Leaders for America's Schools*. University of Oregon, Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse of Educational Management.
- Angus, M.(1998).*The Rules of School Reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Ashby, D.E., & Krug, S.E. (1998). *Thinking Through The Principalship*. Larchmount, NY: Eye On Education.
- Baltzell, D. C., & Dentler, R. A. (1992). Five paths to principalship. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *Women as School Administrators* (p. 5-9). Indianapolis, IN: *Phi Delta Kappan*.
- Begley, P. T. & Cambell-Evans, G. (1992). Socializing Experiences of Aspiring Principals. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 38 (4), p. 285-299.
- Bennis, W. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing Service Over Self-Interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Bredeson, P.V. (1996). "New Directions In The Preparation of Educational Leaders". In Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P., & Hart, A. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. p. 251-274.
- Brim, O.G. (1966). Socialization through the life cycle. In O.G. Brim & S. Wheeler (Eds.), *Socialization after Childhood* (p. 1-49). New York: Wiley
- Caffarella, R. (1985). A Checklist for Planning Successful Training Programs. *Training and Development Journal*, March, p. 81-83.
- Carnegie, D. (1932). *Lincoln the Unknown*. New York: Carnegie and Associates.

- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.(1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Castallo, R. T., Fletcher, M. R., Rossetti, A. D., & Sekowski, R. W. (1992). *School Personnel Administration: A Practitioners Guide*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Castetter, W. B. (1992). *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration* (5th Ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Coleman, P., & Laroque, L. (1990). *Struggling to be 'Good Enough': Administrative Practices and School District Ethos*. London: Falmer Press.
- Confrey, J. (1987). Bridging research and practice. *Educational Theory*, 37, p. 383-394.
- Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (1992). The central office role in instructional improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 3(1), p. 45-68.
- Corbett, D., Wilson, B., & Webb-Dempsey, J. (1996). "Decentralization, Collaboration, And Normative Leadership: Implications for Central Office Practice and Research". In Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P., & Hart, A. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. p. 921-943.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (September, 2000). *Creating a Professional Pathway for the Texas Principalship, 1999*. State Board for Educator Certification, Texas. Website: [www.ccsso.org]
- Crowson, R. (1989). Managerial Ethics in Educational Administration: The Rational Choice Approach. *Urban Education* 23 (4): p 412-35.
- Crowson, R., & Morris, V. (1992) The superintendency and school effectiveness: An organizational hierarchy perspective. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 3 (1), p. 69-88.
- Daresh, J. C. (1988, April). *The role of Mentors in Preparing Future Principals*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Daresh, J. C. (1988, October). *Professional Formation and a Tridimensional Approach to the Pre-Service Preparation of School Administrators*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Daresh, J. C. (1994). Restructuring educational leadership preparation: Identifying needed conditions. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4 (1), p. 28-38.

- Daresh, J. C. (1997). Improving principal preparation: A review of common strategies. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81 (585), p. 3-8.
- Daresh, J. C. (2000). *New Principals: New Induction Programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1990, September). Characteristics of administrative mentors for principal development. *NASSP Bulletin*.
- Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1992). *The Professional Development of School Administrators*. Toronto: Allyn & Bacon.
- Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1994). Aspiring and practicing principals' perceptions of critical skills for beginning leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (3), p. 35-45.
- Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1996). *Lessons for Educational Leadership from Career Preparation in Law, Medicine, and Training for the Priesthood*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Leadership for Creating Innovative Schools. *In Making Schools Work: A View from the Firing Lines*. Milken Family Foundation, Westview Press, San Francisco.
- Dimmock, C., & Wildy, H. (1992). The district superintendent and school improvement: A Western Australia perspective. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 3 (2), p. 150-172.
- Elmen, G.W. (2000). Leader's top job: Molding. *Journal of Staff Development*, Summer, p. 67.
- Fein, M. L. (1990). *Role Change: A Rre-Socialization Perspective*. New York: Praeger .
- Feldman, D.C. (1989). "Socialization, resocialization and training: reframing the research agenda". In I.L. Goldstein & Associates (Eds.), *Training and Development in Organizations* (p. 376-416)
- Fullan, M. (1993). Coordinating school and district development in restructuring. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Restructuring Schooling: Learning from Ongoing Efforts*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

- Green, R. (2001) *Practicing the art of leadership: a problem - based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice - Hall
- Greenfield, W. (1985a). *Being and Becoming a Principal: Responses to Work Contexts and Socialization Processes*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Greenfield, W. (1985b). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21. Guest, R. H. (1962). Managerial succession in complex organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 68, p. 47-54.
- Gutherie, J. W., & Saunders, T. (2001). Who Will Lead The Public Schools? *Education Supplement, The New York Times* (January 7, 2001).
- Guy, M. E. (1985). *Professionals in Organizations: Debunking a Myth*. New York: Praeger.
- Hagberg Consulting Group (1998). Foster City, CA.
- Hallinger, P., & Edwards, M.A. (1992). The paradox of superintendent leadership in school restructuring. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 3(2), p. 131-149.
- Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal Succession: Establishing Leadership in Schools*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Herman, S. (1994). *Hiring Right*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hord, S.M., Jolley, D.V., & Mendez-Morse, S.E. (1992). The superintendent's leadership in school improvement: A rural perspective. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 3 (2), p. 110-130.
- Huberman, M. (1990). Linkage between research and practitioners: A qualitative study. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27 (2), Summer, p. 363-391.
- Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform* (1989). National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Charlottesville, VA.
- Institute of Educational Leadership (October, 2000). *Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalship*. School leadership for the 21st Century Initiative, A Report of the task Force on the Principalship. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

- Kaye, M. J. (1995). *Measuring Professional Socialization In A Distant Program*. [Online]: Available: <http://www.nu.edu/nuri/llconf/conf11995/kaye.html>
- Leithwood, K. (1999). *Indicators of Effective Leadership*. Prepared for EQAO's EQUIP Project, Centre for Leadership Development, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Cousins, B. (1993). *Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Begley, P. (1992). Socialization Experiences: Becoming a Principal in Canada. In F. Parkay & G. Hall *Becoming A Principal: Challenges of Leadership*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., Ross, P. N. & Hamilton, D. N. (1991). *The Nature and Role of Socialization Experiences in the Development of Administrator Expertise*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for Studies in Educational Administration. Kingston, ON.
- Lipham, J.M, Rankin, R.E., & Hoeh, J.A. (1985). *The Principalship: Concepts, Competencies, and Cases*, New York, NY: Longman Inc.
- MacMillan, R. (1996). *The Relationship Between School Culture and Principal's Practices at the Time of Succession*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, OISE/University of Toronto.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1999). "The Evolution of Educational Leadership Preparation Programs". In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis, *Handbook Of Research On Educational Leadership*. New York, NY: Longman Inc.
- McMahan, D. (December, 2000). FAT: Future Administrator Training program is Good. *Principal Leadership, High School Edition*. NASSP. P. 70-71
- Merton, R. K. (1963). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Miklos, E. (1988). "Administrator Selection, Career Patterns, Succession and Socialization,". In N. J. Boyan (Ed), *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration*. Longman, New York. (p. 53-76).
- Milstein, M. M. (1993). Restructuring Schools: Doing it Right. In Herman, J.J., & Herman, J.L. (Eds.), *The Practicing Administrator's Leadership Series*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Milstein, M. M. (1993). *Changing the Way we Prepare Educational Leaders: The Danforth Experience*, Corwin Press Inc., Newbury Park, CA.
- National Leadership Network Study Group on Restructuring Schools. (1991). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

- National Policy Board on Administrative Preparation. (1989). *Executive Summary of the Report of the Policy Board*. Charlottesville, VA: The Board.
- Normore, A. H.(2001) *Recruitment, Socialization, and Accountability of School Administrators in Two School Districts*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto,
- Ontario Principals' Council Centre for Leadership (March, 2001). *School Safety: A Comprehensive School and Community Approach*. Professional Principal Series in Partnership with Ministry of Education. Ontario principals' Council Exemplary Leadership in Public Education.
- Ontario Principals' Council Centre for Leadership (April, 2001). *Legal Issues in Administration*. Professional Principal Series in Partnership with Ministry of Education. Ontario principals' Council Exemplary Leadership in Public Education.
- Pajak, E. (1989). *The Central Office Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction: Setting the Stage for Success*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Papke, D. (1989). *The Socialization of the Elementary School Vice-Principal: Making the Transition from Teaching to Administration*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto.
- Parkay, F. W., & Hall, G. E. (1992). *Becoming a Principal: The Challenges of Beginning Leadership*. Simon & Shuster.
- Parkay, F. W., & Currie, G. (1992). Sources of support for the beginning principal. In Parkay, F. W., & Hall, G. E. (Eds.), *Becoming a School Principal: The Challenges of Beginning Leadership*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pounder, D. G., & Young, P. (1996). "Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators: Priorities for Today's Schools." In Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P., & Hart, A. W. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers (p. 279-308).
- Reitzug, U.C., & Hudson, M. (2000). Preparing Educational Leaders: Insights from Multiple Perspectives in One Department. *Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations*, University of North Carolina.
- Riordan, G., & Hildebrandt, L.B. (1995). A mentorship program for new administrators. *The Canadian School Executive: The Magazine for Leaders in Education*, Vol. 15 (5), p. 9-15.

- Roher, E.M., Wormwell, S.A. (2000). *An Educator's Guide to The Role Of The Principal*. Aurora, Ontario: Aurora Professional Press, A Division of Canada Law Book Inc.
- Ronkowski, S., & Iannaccone, L. (1989). *Socialization Research in Administration, Graduate Schools and Other Professions: The Heuristic Power of Van Gennepe and Becker Models*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Ross, P. N. (1989). *Socialization in the Preparation of Principals*. Unpublished manuscript, York region Board of Education, Ontario.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 2nd Ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seyfarth, J.T.(1999). *The Principal: New Leadership for New Challenges*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Smith, S., & Piele, P. (1989). *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence*, 2nd Edition. *ERIC Clearing House on Educational Management*, College of Education.
- Sparks, D. (2000). High-Powered Professional Development for High-Poverty Schools. *Principal Leadership*, Vol 1 (4). P. 26-29.
- Sussman, L. (April, 1986). *The Principal's First Year: The Mutual Process of Developing Leadership*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L.(1995). *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Van Berkum, D. W., Richardson, M. D., & Lane, K. E. (1994). *Professional Development in Educational Administration Programs: Where Does it Exist?*. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) 026 260.
- Van Gennepe, A. (1960). *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, J. (1976). "Breaking in: socialization to work" In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society* (p.67-130). Skokie,IL: Rand-McNally.
- Walker, K., & Shakatko, D. (1999b). "The Canadian Superintendency: Value-Based Challenges and Pressures". In P. T. Begley, *Values of Educational Administration*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

- Walker, N. (2000). "The conversation: a seat at management's table". In *The Ontario Principals Council Register: Magazine for Ontario's Principals and Vice-Principals*. Vol. 2 (5).
- Walker, N. (1999). Principals: alive on the edge of chaos (An interview with Michael Fullan). *The Ontario Principals Council Register: Magazine for Ontario's Principals and Vice-Principals*. Vol. 1 (6).
- Wanous, J. P. (1980). *Organizational Entry: Recruitment, Selection and Socialization of School Administration*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Warren, P. (1989). *The First Year of Four Elementary Principals*. Unpublished M. Ed. thesis at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.
- Weindling, D., & Earley, P. (1987). *Secondary Headships: The First Years*. Windsor, England.: NFER-Nelson.
- Weindling, D., & Earley, P. (1994-95.). "Keeping the raft afloat: Secondary headships ten years on". Slough, England: NFER. A series of ten articles in *Managing Schools Today*. 4 (p. 1-8).
- Weiss, C.H., & Cambone, J. (1994). Principals, shared decision-making, and school reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16 (3), p. 287-301.
- Whatley, W. (1994). The extent to which teachers' impressions of new principals are influenced by experiences with and reactions to previous principals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 9508178.