1

Changing Principals

When a person holding an influential office in a formal organization (such as a manager or chief executive) is replaced, the effects reverberate throughout the organization. The magnitude of this experience and its impacts on relationships, expectations, and outcomes may vary, but all feel its effects. Succession brings the issue of leadership close to the surface of organizational consciousness at all levels. Those who appoint new leaders, those who work with them, and those whose lives may be affected by them watch for signs that the change will make a positive difference in their work lives and outcomes. The effects are felt by the new manager as well. Before and after succession, newly appointed administrators strive for success under the pressure of personal and professional transition.

Leader succession is a frequent and widespread occurrence in all kinds of organizations. In one study, managers reported averaging between five and six new management assignments in their careers (Gabarro, 1987). The attention given by governing bodies, superiors, and subordinates alike to the selection and integration of new formal leaders and the resources organizations allocate to assure the best possible outcomes illustrate the importance placed on this event. Scholars, too, examine succession. Referring to the long tradition of this work in educational administration, Miklos (1988, p. 63) said: "An assumption underlying the research on administrative succession is that a change of administrators is a significant event in the history of an organization." The interest of scholars springs both from the importance attached to leader succession by participants and from its potential for revealing the role of leaders in organizational outcomes.

From anthropology to political science, writers have chronicled the people, events, processes, and principles associated with succession to leadership roles. Their focus differs, but the core interest remains in the values and processes shaping transition to formal authority.

Copyrighted Material

In anthropology, scholars study the rules of property transfer and ascension to high office. They often focus on hereditary succession and the rules governing interpersonal relationships in small groups that succession reveals in different cultures (Goody, 1966). In political science, scholars examine the methods by which government officials gain high office. Sociologists take advantage of succession to study social groups when relationships are in transition and close to the surface. These transitions reveal important aspects of the stable interaction patterns and underlying structures characterizing the social group.

Succession to high office in organizations has been studied under a number of rubrics: executive succession (Brady & Helmich, 1985; Carlson, 1962); administrative succession (Grusky, 1960, 1964, 1969); managerial succession (Gouldner, 1952); and bureaucratic succession (Grusky, 1964). Each group of studies concerns itself with the replacement of formal leaders at different levels. Each has yielded results that provide important pieces of the succession puzzle. The primary focus of this book, because it concerns itself with the impact of new formal leaders on schools and vice versa, is managerial or administrative succession, but the general term leader succession provides a useful name for the replacement of key officials in formal organizations. Throughout the text, unless studies cited refer to a specific level of succession (such as chief executive officer), leader succession, managerial succession, and principal succession will be used interchangeably, as will formal leader and leader. This decision was made in spite of the realization that "leadership" may be a much more rarified form of social influence than "management" and is not necessarily exerted by all who fill formal leadership roles (Pfeffer, 1978, 1981b).

This chapter is an overview of the literature related to leader succession with a focus on principals. It includes studies primarily concerned with principal succession, leader socialization, principal professional socialization, and organizational socialization. The chapter introduces major issues related to the organizational socialization of new leaders that shape the discussion in subsequent chapters.

Principal Succession

A principal's succession affects all who work in and with a school. It creates a period of "apprehension and fear of the unknown with high expectations being held" by principals, teachers, and

Copyrighted Material

district superiors alike (Weindling & Earley, 1987, p. 67). In addition to the traditional concern over the appointment of principals new to the profession, which is happening at a high rate (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983), researchers find that school leaders are often transferred from one assignment to another. In Great Britain, turnover rates stand at 7 percent per year (Weindling & Earley, 1987). Since the Education Reform Act [1988] passed in that country, bringing with it sweeping changes in the role of the head, a number of heads have expressed the desire to retire (possible at age fifty-five) or leave the profession. Weindling speculates that these turnover rates may consequently increase substantially (Weindling, 1991).

While those responsible for appointing and studying new leaders ponder the important questions that shape the process and its outcomes, scholars interested in effective schools identify the principal as a key figure in school effectiveness—its orchestrator and shepherd—drawing additional attention to the importance of principal succession. Edmonds argued that "one of the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools is strong administrative leadership, without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together" (Edmonds, 1979, p. 32). In a comprehensive review of the literature on effective schools, Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) concurred, concluding that effective principals create conditions for success by providing coherence to instructional programs, conceptualizing instructional goals, setting high and attainable academic standards, staying informed of policies and teachers' problems, making frequent classroom visits, creating incentives for learning, and maintaining student discipline. Other scholars also name the principal as a factor in school goal achievement (Brookover, et al, 1979; Corcoran, 1985; Purkey & Smith, 1983). More recently, Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (in press) found over fifty empirical articles published since the middle 1970s that assert that principals have a substantial impact on schools.

Major reforms designed to use knowledge about formal leaders' effects on schools to improve the preparation, induction, and professional development of school principals have coincided with the development of succession and effective schools research (Leithwood, Steinbach & Begley, in press; Murphy, 1990). Those committed to the improvement of educational administration as a profession seek new ways to enhance the success of talented aspiring school leaders and improve the means through which they are prepared, inducted, and supported in their professional work (Duke, 1987; Hart, Sorensen & Naylor, 1992; National Policy Board, 1989).

Copyrighted Material

But the dynamics and critical features of an effective principal/school relationship, although tantalizingly close to view and frequently included in testimonials and ideological statements, remain somewhat ephemeral. Students and instructors alike recognize a gap between formal instruction in the practice of administration and the demands of practice. These demands often pressure new school leaders to abandon skills and knowledge acquired in preservice education and conform to existing patterns of practice. Principals taking on their first professional assignments must find ways to connect and integrate their professional knowledge and experience. Principals moving to new assignments must carefully assess what attitudes and behaviors to take with them and what dynamics and unique challenges face them at the new school (Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975). For principals new to administration or new to a particular school, critical relationships and interaction patterns among themselves, their superiors, and the school social system are inchoate at the time of their appointment. They form during the uncertainty preceding succession, throughout selection, and into the succession, when the new administrator is deeply embroiled in a complex social process and when time to reflect on their experiences may be difficult to find. As a principal seeks to become a functioning leader and understand her relationships with others in the group, she ultimately is concerned with seeing her own fit—experience rendered meaningful through insight (McNeil, 1969). For those who appoint new leaders, uncertainty remains long after critical succession events occur. Were their decisions appropriate?

The mix of person and group is unique for each succession. This uniqueness poses dilemmas for those who study succession. If we examine it only from the perspective of the principal, we fail to explain the history of the event or the school and are unable to account for the conduct of people involved. But if we go too far in focusing on outcomes and ignore the dynamic mix of people, processes, and contexts that shape succession (the classic "black box" studies) and the schools and districts in which succession occurs, we lose track of the qualities and power of the individual. We fail to tap the uniqueness and creativity of the single person that stimulates much of our interest in leadership in the first place.

A quick reading of the literature on leader succession reveals that the individual perspective has dominated. Only those who challenge the basic assumption that leaders have any substantive effect (Pfeffer, 1981a, 1981b) have raised alternative voices. One might even argue after reviewing this literature that taking charge of a

Copyrighted Material

school, district, or other formal organization is a lonely, individual experience, and that the new leader should always be the focus of attention (Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985). While this view acknowledges the importance placed on leadership roles in our culture, it leaves much about managerial succession unexamined, unexplained, and superficially understood. It does this by focusing in isolation on only one, albeit important, element in a highly social event. Many who study leader succession focus on the effects of the lone heroic leader who operates as a free agent acting to affect others. Even those who apply contingency perspectives, which attend to environmental favorableness, focus on the leader's actions. This view is flawed, misrepresenting the social nature of the organizations in which formal leaders work. In reality, the social relationships between formal leaders and their hierarchical subordinates and superordinates play an important part in their influence on the school.

> We cannot force others to give us their approval, regardless of how much power we have over them, because coercing them to express their admiration or praise would make these expressions worthless. . . . There are fundamental differences between the dynamics of power in a collective situation and the power of one individual over another. The weakness of the isolated subordinate limits the significance of his approval or disapproval of the superior. The agreement that emerges in a collectivity of subordinates concerning their judgment of the superior, on the other hand, has far-reaching implications for developments in the social structure. (Blau, 1964, p. 17, 23)

Research affirms the need for a multidirectional view of leadership.

> The findings of. . .researchers. . .provide firm evidence for the view that influence-processes between superiors and subordinates are two-way rather than one-way. It might still prove to be the case that leaders influence their subordinates more than subordinates influence their leaders. But the studies make clear the manner in which subordinate actions can cause leaders to perceive subordinates in certain ways and consequently to employ certain behaviors towards them rather than others. (Smith & Peterson, 1988, p. 40)

Firestone (1989) described this organizational reality aptly in a study of the "cultural politics of executive succession" by superintendents.

Copyrighted Material

He found that current enthusiasm for dramatic leadership achieved by manipulating organizational culture was not supported by his case studies of superintendent succession. Instead, he questioned the assumption that the superintendent is a free actor when choosing the direction of cultural change in school districts. Roberts (1989a, 1989b) echoed these conclusions in a series of case studies of new high school principals. Adding to the criticisms of leader succession research in education, Ogawa (in press) argued that traditional succession frameworks have failed to add significant insights for almost a decade.

By overemphasizing the study of formal leaders as single, self-conscious, and self-actualized people, one runs the risk of missing major components of the succession process. The new principal misses the mechanisms by which she is shaped by the social forces around her and through which her self-awareness emerges. The group misses opportunities for cooperative action and improved succession outcomes. Research and practice justify a broader view including the complex social context in which succession takes place. "The meaning that organizational members attach to succession merits future study conducted within a broader conceptual framework than that of previous research" (Miklos, 1988, p. 65).

Principal Socialization

Another rich body of theory and research provides a view somewhat different from traditional leader succession perspectives—drawing attention to the leader and the context simultaneously. This view is based in socialization theory and research. Socialization is simply the "learning of social roles" (Merton, Reader & Kendall, 1957). It involves individuals' adjustments and adaptations to the expectations of a group. These adjustments make cooperative effort possible and represent an orientation toward the common needs of the group. Through this process, people come to internalize the values, norms, and beliefs of the groups to which they belong and to accept the meanings these groups ascribe to events, other people, and ideas. In the process, principals come to behave in ways consonant with the expectations of the school but not enslaved by it. Referring to principals, Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (in press, p. 10) said, "The ideal socialization process positions one at the point of sharpest focus: not so close as to render the corporate image a fuzzy blur; nor so far away as to make the detailed features of the image unrecognizable."

As adults, we experience socialization each time we join an existing group. Research on the socialization of first-time principals

Copyrighted Material

investigates the major variables molding the process of becoming a principal (Duke et al., 1984; Greenfield, 1985a, 1985b; MacPherson, 1984; Miklos, 1988; Parkay, et al., 1989; Roberts, 1989b; Wright, in press). This tradition emphasizes the impacts of the existing core of administrators, training, university preparation, and professional associations on the new principal. As Leithwood, Steinbach, and Begley (in press) explain, socialization is "those processes by which an individual selectively acquires the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to adequately perform a social role, in this case the school principalship."

The socialization of principals to the profession or occupation of school administration begins in training or preparation programs. While some writers believe that teacher socialization begins this process, others provide persuasive arguments that educational administration is a distinct profession with its own norms and values in which "aspiring professionals learn the importance of specialized knowledge (expertise), as well as the values and ethics that guide the use of this knowledge" (Duke, 1987, p. 262). As principals secure administrative jobs and interact with other administrators they internalize the norms, values, and behaviors generally accepted as part of their professional role. This process is known as professional socialization, a unique aspect of socialization that will be described in greater detail later in the chapter. Studies explore the professional socialization of principals—in their preservice, during anticipatory socialization as teachers, in their formal training, and as new principals in their first years as administrators (Duke et al., 1984; Greenfield, 1985a; Weindling & Earley, 1987). Writers describe the means by which new principals come to adapt to the expectations attendant to their role, thrive, and prosper.

When principals enter a district and/or school as new members of the social group, they experience another form of socialization—organizational socialization. Organizational socialization differs from professional socialization (Schein, 1986). It teaches a person the knowledge, values, and behaviors required in a particular role within a particular organization. These values and norms may be very different from those the person learned as part of his professional socialization.

Organizational socialization—immediate, salient, and persuasive—often overpowers the effects of carefully structured professional socialization (Bucher & Stelling, 1977; Duke, 1987). Guy (1985) asserted that the need to fit into the immediate work environment makes organizational socialization more salient and immediate

Copyrighted Material

than experiences that precede it. The organization controls a person's evaluation and reward structures and provides social and personal reinforcement for compliance to immediate social norms and expectations. Organizational norms consequently tend to displace those learned during professional socialization.

First-time principals experience a double socialization experience—professional socialization to school administration and organizational socialization to their immediate work setting. They must break into a new social group and a new profession simultaneously (Van Maanen, 1976, 1977a, 1977b). In all kinds of professions including teaching, carefully planned formal study and internship experiences often yield to the immediate press of the organizational context in which work occurs (Blase, 1985; Bullough, 1990). Because of the power of this force, Duke (1987) suggested that principals' superiors can develop specific leadership orientations in new administrators (such as instructional leadership) through organizational socialization. They can do this by fostering changes in orientations and training, evaluation systems, incentives, and sanctions provided by the district.

Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 211) provided a vivid description of what happens during organizational socialization:

> [Experienced members] must . . . find ways to insure that the newcomer does not disrupt the ongoing activity on the scene, embarrass or cast disparaging light on others, or question too many of the established cultural solutions worked out previously. . . . The manner in which this teaching/learning occurs is . . . the *organizational socialization process* [emphasis in the original].

Peter Blau (1964, pp. 275–276) also described the function of this process:

> [T]he process of socialization results in many of the legitimating values of organized community life being passed on to future generations, and these are the institutionalized values that sustain and invigorate the external forms of institutions, which without them would be dead skeletons.

Organizational socialization binds the members of work organizations into communities with far deeper ties than those forged through previous experiences or formal structure.

Copyrighted Material

Although organizational socialization has received limited attention in education literature, important research has been done on the professional socialization of teachers and principals. An established body of research traces the processes through which teachers come to accept expectations for equality, privacy, and cordiality, often overcoming the effects of preservice socialization in norms of collegiality, experimentation, and interaction (Bullough, in press; Little, 1982; Lortie, 1975; Hoy & Rees, 1977; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990).

The Social Context as a Source of Leader Power

The influence of organizational socialization consequently extends to all members of a group, including formal leaders such as principals. By examining the socialization of leaders, one acknowledges that leaders are part of a social context that wields a combined source of power over their beliefs and actions greater than the power of either previous professional socialization or their own formal authority:

> If the . . . qualities of the individual are said to be derived from experience in society, there is no logical sense in beginning serious scientific inquiry into the effect (the role-related, social self), while ignoring the cause (society, and ipso facto, socialization). . . . The nature of the "society" presented in socialization must be described. (Wentworth, 1980, p. 8)

Organizational socialization, then, examines the effects of leaders and organizations from many directions, recognizing that leader successors are newcomers who must be integrated into existing groups, validated by social processes, and granted legitimacy by subordinates and superiors before they can have significant impacts on actions taken by others. Authority granted by the members of the group in this way differs from other forms of influence to which people voluntarily submit. Blau (1964, p. 200) distinguished this socially validated authority as leadership:

> It may be suggested that the distinctive feature of authority is that social norms accepted and enforced by the collectivity of subordinates constrain its individual members to comply with directives of a superior. Compliance is voluntary for the collectivity, but social constraints make it compelling for the individual. In contrast to other forms of influence and power, the

Copyrighted Material

> pressure to follow suggestions and orders does not come from the superior who gives them but from the collectivity of subordinates. These normative constraints may be institutionalized and pervade the entire society, or they may emerge in a group in social interaction. The latter emergent norms define leadership. . . .

Scott (1987) calls this endorsed leadership. In contrast to the authority and power granted by the collective, the authority rooted in formal position is limited in scope to the performance of duties that meet a minimum standard. Only actions required by policy and directive can be controlled by principals relying on formal authority. Effective management, Blau asserted, is impossible on the basis of formal authority alone. Duke and his colleagues (1984) found this to be true for new principals. They found that faculties were the most important source of influence, satisfaction, *and* dissatisfaction new principals experienced during their first year.

In addition to revealing individual power, succession is a good time to study group effects on leaders in schools, for "the influence of the organization upon the individual peaks during passage" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 224). The behavior of newly assigned principals (not just first-time principals) changes as a result of their interactions with people in the school and district (Hartup & Coates, 1972). The authority these principals eventually exert beyond the limited power of office emanates from the people within the social system in which they work.

Group effects on new managers deserve increased attention for a number of reasons. First, interaction on the job may be the most important factor in helping newcomers become effective members of work organizations (Louis, Posner & Powell, 1983). Second, new leaders learn new roles. Providing additional support for the belief that socialization plays a critical part in creating effective leaders in schools, Greenfield (1985b) asserted that the role-learning outcomes of socialization serve as primary criteria for later success. Furthermore, the learning of needed attitudes, values, and beliefs in the school context are central to gaining the acceptance of others in similar and superordinate leadership roles and of the school. He argued that the social structure of the school organization is a powerful mediating force affecting work activities and outcomes. Moral socialization, as well as technical socialization, exerts critical force over the eventual professional identity of principals. Third,

Copyrighted Material

socialization's influences on leaders are well documented (White, 1978). Managers' attitudes, self-concept, and professional identity resulting from socialization experiences have long been a focus of study (Berlew & Hall, 1966–67).

Organizational Socialization: Tapping the Power of the Context

The traditional succession literature relies on methods and assumptions that address the outcomes of succession in general and the traits of the leader and structure that predict these outcomes. This approach is accused of reflecting an exaggerated concern with organizational control, image management, and status quo pattern maintenance (Nicholson, 1984). In contrast, succession studies that add organizational socialization factors advance understanding and practice in three ways: (1) to identify organizational circumstances when the decision to change leaders might be advantageous; (2) to understand the social dynamics of succession across time; and (3) to examine the interaction effects of groups and individuals on succession outcomes.

Case studies go farther toward advancing these purposes than do other forms of succession inquiry that have dominated the last two decades. In fact, complex interactions within the organization were the focus of the earliest succession studies (Gouldner, 1954; Guest, 1962). Occasionally, cases revealing the dynamics of leader succession processes within organizations continue to offer intriguing new insights (Gephart, 1978; Oskarsson & Klein, 1982; Salaman, 1977). In schools, too, studies of principal succession provide a look at dynamics that may trigger or suppress major shifts in ideology and practice (Hart, 1988; Ogawa, 1991; Starbuck, Hedboerg & Greve, 1977).

A principal may adapt and prosper personally, however, without contributing to school improvement. Schools need their new principals to become integrated into the group, but they also need creativity and new ideas. These two needs make the effects of socialization during leader succession critical factors shaping future events in the school. These needs seem contradictory. They do work at cross-purposes if successors fail to find a productive balance between them in each situation. One must not assume that all social learning is positive. The new principal's acceptance of established solutions that have not been productive or are blatantly unproductive is a negative outcome of succession. Although thorough learning and acceptance of the existing culture through socialization may

Copyrighted Material

> always be immediately *adjustive* for an individual in that such learning will reduce the tension associated with entering an unfamiliar situation, such learning, in the long run, may not always be adaptive, since certain cultural forms may persist long after they have ceased to be of individual value. (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, pp. 212–213)

This book aims to use the conceptual insights provided by organizational socialization to expand research on leader succession. It pursues a fourfold purpose: (1) to lay out a conceptual foundation from organizational socialization that can be applied to leader succession; (2) to show how new research on the succession of school leaders can be better understood through the use of this framework; (3) to develop the research implications of this expanded view; and (4) to illustrate how organizational socialization and leader succession research in concert can be used by school districts and by new principals to improve the outcomes of succession. The advantages of this approach are several. First, principals are appointed with the expectation that they will take charge of a specific school. By studying the principal isolated from the school and from her superiors, researchers risk applying a level of analysis that may limit generalizability while misrepresenting the fundamental nature of the experience. Second, socialization, although continuous throughout a career, is most intense and problematic for a person just before and just after a particular boundary passage. Succession may be among the most important professional transitions principals ever make. Third, leader succession affects many people in a school, stimulating interactions and breaking up routines that require people to reestablish shared expectations, work patterns, and relationships. Succession may be one of the most common forms of organizational change accessible to researchers for study. It also may be a unique opportunity to implement important changes in schools.

Research and practice give reasons to believe, therefore, that an understanding of organizational socialization can help shape our understanding of succession and its outcomes. It can do this by helping new principals better understand and respond to the factors shaping their responses to work and the immediate social context, thus cushioning the effects of oversocialization so persuasively criticized by Pfeffer (1978). Taking charge is a powerful experience for which few principals are adequately prepared (Weindling & Earley, 1987). Pfeffer and others contended that the socialization of managers assures a uniformity that suppresses creativity and the diverse

Copyrighted Material

options that might be necessary to address the complex dilemmas and needs of schools—in effect, that managers of all kinds are "oversocialized." Socialization also has been named as an important factor in the seeming intransigence of educational administration to the changes attempted in preservice graduate school education programs (Hart, Sorensen & Naylor, 1992).

This intransigence is a real but not insurmountable challenge. "It is the social context of leadership actions which gives them their meaning and consequently their effect" (Smith & Peterson, 1988, p. 61). Organizational socialization reveals the interactive and group character of leadership. As Schein (1985, p. 197) argued, in a mature group "leadership comes to be seen as a shared set of activities rather than a single person's trait, and a sense of ownership of group outcomes arises." Others assert the social nature of new principals' part in schools more radically: leadership is an attribute not of individuals but of social systems (Dachler, 1984). The knowledge that social groups possess a singular power related to leadership but distinct from individual influence can expand understanding and increase educational leadership. This is the major contribution an organizational socialization perspective can make to leader succession.

Principal Professional Socialization Research

I noted earlier that principal professional socialization research is well developed when compared with organizational socialization. An understanding of professional socialization, which builds on research on the professions (Schein, 1971a), helps set the stage for its expansion to include organizational socialization.

The principal professional socialization literature yields a number of important insights into the development of school management professionals (Duke et al., 1984; Greenfield, 1985a, 1985b; MacPherson, 1984; Miklos, 1988). Among the most noted studies are those completed by Duke and Greenfield.

Duke and his colleagues (1984) identified in the literature four features of professional socialization to the principalship role that they applied to a reflective study of successful veteran principals' first years. These features were (1) duration of the socialization period; (2) mechanisms of socialization; (3) relationships between expectations and the realities of the job; and (4) formal and informal preparation for school administration. They found that the principals in their sample generally marked the end of their professional socialization

Copyrighted Material

period around the completion of their *first year* as principals. Principals viewed all their professional experiences, including those as teachers, as part of their overall socialization. Thus, Duke, et al. began with anticipatory socialization, moving through entry into the principalship, and concluding with a period of development or "metamorphosis" (Van Maanen, 1976). The researchers concluded that the induction period can be of varying length, but the vast majority of their subjects no longer felt like rookies at the end of the first year.

Socialization mechanisms identified by principals in the Duke study were both formal and informal. Only two of thirty-two veterans participating and two of fourteen novices described receiving any formal orientation to the principalship by their employing districts. The researchers labeled this practice "sink or swim" socialization. While half were given written job descriptions, many were vague and offered little guidance about the districts' expectations. Principals argued that informal processes dominated their experience. They learned about the norms and expectations of the principalship and of their district (sometimes solicited, sometimes by chance) from a variety of sources: former principals under whom they had worked; predecessors, secretaries, and teachers in the school; central office administrators. The dominant source of information was other principals in the district.

The critical factor shaping the all-important informal socialization process for these principals was other people. "Consistent with the general literature on socialization, first year principals seem to be very concerned about their acceptance by others and gratified when it occurs" (Duke et al., 1984, p. 23). The faculty, in fact, was the most important source of influence on new principals, followed by assistant principals and students.

> Clearly the people within the school building where one is principal serve as the most important influences on one's performance as principal. For second year principals there are additional important influences: other principals in the district, central office personnel and the principal with whom one had worked as a teacher or intern. (Duke et al., 1984, p. 19)

However, major sources of *support* and major sources of *influence* were not necessarily the same. Teachers constituted the primary source of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction for new principals.

Copyrighted Material

Differences between principals' expectations and the job they experienced—surprises (Louis, 1980b)—elicited strong emotional responses from the principals in the Duke study. "Subjects conveyed considerable emotion as they described the unexpected loneliness of the principalship, the unanticipated time pressure, and the disconcerting feelings of unpreparedness. . . ." The researchers concluded that the principals apparently had lacked "an appreciation of the complexity of the principalship" (p. 26).

Finally, formal and informal preparation for administrative work during the anticipatory (training and aspiration) stage of professional socialization shaped principals' experiences. However, the principals placed far less emphasis on the importance of their formal course work in universities than on informal factors in shaping even this phase.

Greenfield (1985a, 1985b, 1977a, 1977b) also inquired into the professional socialization of principals. In his early studies (1977a & b), Greenfield examined the phases of candidacy to administrative positions and argued that interpersonal, social process, and organizational context variables led to an administrative perspective. Greenfield (1985a) found that socialization to administration is informal and largely random, It occurs over a variable time frame, requires candidates to gradually divest themselves of their identities as teachers, and depends to a large measure on the context, which shapes both role-learning and role-enactment for candidates and novices.

In later studies, Greenfield (1985b) revealed dynamics influencing the transition to administrative work in schools, asserting that professional socialization has two primary objectives: moral socialization and technical socialization. Moral socialization is concerned with values, norms, and attitudes attendant to the career group. Technical socialization focuses on knowledge, skills, and techniques needed to perform adequately as a school administrator. He pointed out that "different socialization responses are a function of differences in organizational socialization tactics, contexts, and conditions" (Greenfield, 1985a, p. 3).

Recent research in Canada adds to the work of Duke and Greenfield. Leithwood, Steinbach, and Begley (in press) studied a group of new Canadian school administrators, attending primarily to less formal socialization in search of evidence linking socialization (both prior to and after appointment to a principalship) with instructional leadership. The researchers applied a stage framework that conceptualized professional socialization as initiation, transition,

Copyrighted Material

and incorporation in four major areas—relationships; experience with the formal organization; formal training; and outcomes (image of the principal's role; skills and knowledge; and norms and values). They found that both preservice and serving principals valued most those experiences that related directly to their work and occurred *in schools*. They also found that socialization experiences thought to promote and develop instructional leadership had no impact on the value and importance principals placed on instructional leadership tasks in their work. These findings raise questions about the causal relationship among professional socialization experiences, psychological development, and actual work behaviors and values (Frese, 1982, 1984).

A number of other studies contributed to professional socialization knowledge in educational administration. MacPherson (1984) criticized this work, asserting that studies of anticipatory, preservice socialization yield scant knowledge of the early years of an administrative career when organizational socialization and professional socialization occur simultaneously. Others added to the criticism. They pointed out that site level factors shape professional socialization; task specific learning; the mastery of practical, routine tasks (DuBose, 1986); feelings of isolation; the need for technical assistance from the district (Alvey, 1983; Marrion, 1983); and the influence of assistant principals and office staff. These factors mold the way principals "learn the ropes."

These studies of entry into the profession of school administration reveal means through which newcomers become functioning school administrators. A major gap in knowledge remains, however. We know very little about the relative advantages of thorough socialization, which can suppress personal qualities, creativity, and originality. This dampening effect can result in failure. The two extremes along the continuum from total internalization to alienation highlight the need to understand the relationship between uniqueness and continuity in leader succession experiences. The optimum socialization level along this continuum may depend on the needs of the school in each succession. Organizational socialization literature, with its emphasis on the interaction between the new member and the group, provides an apt framework for exploring this continuum. An overview of major issues stimulating thought and research in organizational socialization provides important clues to factors deserving renewed attention from researchers and practitioners in schools.

Copyrighted Material

Summarizing Organizational Socialization for Succession Research

Four key themes dominate the discourse on organizational socialization applicable to school leader succession inquiry: (1) tactics used in the socialization process; (2) socialization stages through which new members pass; (3) the personal and social contexts that shape the entire process; and (4) the outcomes or effects of socialization practices likely to result from these factors.

Organizational Socialization Tactics

People in transition from one role to another in organizations experience organizational socialization (Van Maanen, 1978). Both deliberately and unconsciously, organizations apply a number of tactics to integrate new members. The decision to leave the socialization of newcomers to chance, dependent on the mix of people, issues, power, and events that happen to coincide, is of itself a tactic. Writers describe a number of categories of socialization tactics likely to affect new members. This list of tactics is by no means exhaustive, and districts may change their tactics continually, depending on developing circumstances.

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) provided one of the most quoted and tested set of categories for analyzing socialization tactics. Using paired comparisons, they suggested that tactics are collective or individual; formal or informal; sequential or random; fixed in time or variable; serial or disjunctive; and demanding investiture or divestiture. Definitions of these categories follow.

Jones (1986) modified the classification of these characteristics. He argued that socialization occurs in three areas: context, content, and sociality. By context, Jones meant that socialization is either collective or individual and formal or informal. The content (what a new member learns) is either sequential or random and fixed or variable. And the sociality of socialization is either serial (with role models) or disjunctive and involves investiture or divestiture.

Although their labels seem overly technical at first glance, these categories are useful when looking at the tactics organizations use to socialize new members. The *context* a person encounters can involve him alone or in a group of other new members (collective or individual). It also may be carefully planned and formalized by the organization. The *content*—what is learned—may be set up in sequence, much like a set of courses in mathematics that build one upon another and must be taken in order. It also may constitute a body of knowledge requiring no particular sequence, and this can be

Copyrighted Material

acquired in random order, depending on chance or convenience. Additionally, a new member may be given a fixed amount of time to master the content or allowed to set her own time frame. Finally, the context can be used as a socialization tactic. *Socialization* can occur under the strong influence of role models (serial) or free of role models (disjunctive). The whole experience can also be designed to require that the new member divest himself of old identities and concepts of self (divestiture) or that she reaffirm and reinforce her existing professional self-concept (investiture).

Interest in socialization includes the interaction of all these tactics and their effect on the new member and the group. Scholars also examine substantive changes in new members (Wentworth, 1980). What core social beliefs and values might have to be adopted before new members can function as an accepted part of the group? How completely must these core values or behaviors be adopted? How dependent or independent is the new member?

> The novice can be relatively powerless in an ultimate way, yet actively influence the face-to-face process of socialization. The novice then may also inject control and power into the socialization relationship. This is to say, the members' culture is not presented in a vacuum. It is presented *to* someone so that its precise quality is historically and concurrently modified in the interaction between member and novice. The content of socializing activity is thus modified by the very structure of the interaction situation. Socialization is then related to the context of its presentation. (Wentworth, 1980, p. 69)

When the new member is also the functional leader of the group, this influence clearly is enhanced. As a new leader enters the group, "socialization not only presents a world, it constructs one" (Wentworth, 1980, p. 134).

Context. Collective socialization tactics require specific choices; *individual* socialization can be structured deliberately or result from benign neglect. During collective socialization, new principals go through a series of activities together (perhaps training in instructional supervision). Individual processing takes new principals through their experiences alone. While those socialized independently tend to be less homogeneous than members of a cohort, the newcomer is more likely to feel lonely, and the quality of the experience can be highly varied. The continuity of experience a collective process

Copyrighted Material

promotes is no guarantee of predictable outcomes, however. Even though newcomers may be "processed" in the same way, they will experience that process differently. Past experiences and personal characteristics exert tremendous influence.

Each context tactic has advantages and disadvantages. Individual socialization leads to relatively high levels of role conflict and ambiguity, but it also enhances innovation. Collective and highly structured activities promote commitment and job satisfaction (Jones, 1986), but they suppress creativity and change. None of the studies in education surveyed for this review applied institutionalized, planned processes to any great extent. For principals and other managers, "individual socialization" (Van Maanen, 1978) is most likely. This seems also to be the case for teacher mentors and leaders (Little, 1990). It is

> most likely to be associated with hierarchical boundaries where preparation for promotion requires the complex learning of skills, attitudes, and values, and where specific judgments of a given individual must be made by certain others in the organization as to the person's "fitness" for promotion (or demotion). (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 235)

The context in which principals undergo socialization may also be more or less *formal*. Formal socialization, designed to incubate specific norms and expectations, can be used by schools, although it rarely is. Others depend on informal arrangements. Mentors play a large part in formal and informal socialization tactics. Sometimes a new principal works almost exclusively with an assigned mentor (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975; Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Hunt & Michael, 1983). These arrangements receive considerable praise (Daresh & Playko, 1989). Other times, mentor relationships develop informally. Reliance on mentors leaves the quality of the working relationship between mentors and newcomers to chance. Outcomes are highly vulnerable to quality control problems, particularly when mentors receive little or no guidance about their role or the goals the district wants them to pursue. These problems appear repeatedly in studies of teacher mentor programs, for example (Little, 1990).

Mentors also constrain innovation. By turning the socialization of newcomers over to long-time members of the group, organizations virtually guarantee the reproduction of existing roles (Van Maanen, 1978). Even when mentors and new principals have a good working relationship, the results may be undesirable.

Copyrighted Material

A study in the insurance industry illustrates this vulnerability to personal relationships (Blau, 1988). The quality of the relationship between mentors and management interns had direct and moderating effects on outcomes for the interns. It affected feelings that interns met expectations, the clarity of roles, commitment to the organization, and performance. Relationships also affected the interaction of role clarity and intern performance, despite the managers' abilities. These findings raise important questions about the wholesale, unstructured use of mentors in education to socialize new principals, teachers, and teacher leaders.

Formalization has its advantages and disadvantages. Some researchers find that a highly formalized socialization process produces a custodial orientation (recreation of the existing order). Newcomers try to play the established part exactly as it was designed and filled by others. Informal socialization may stimulate more creativity and innovation, but it also produces "more extreme responses in either the custodial or innovative directions than formal socialization" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 240).

Earlier in this review, I reported the conclusions of Duke et al. (1984) and Greenfield (1985a, 1985b) that formal socialization is rarely employed by school districts to develop new principals. Weindling and Earley (1987) confirmed this conclusion, finding a paucity of formal socialization procedures in their British sample. Only 26 percent of their sample of secondary heads experienced any formal induction lasting more than one day. Most induction occurred during the first part of the year, and even introductions at the school were cursory and superficial. They took place so soon after the formal appointment that heads had forgotten the people to whom they were introduced by the time they actually took over their positions. Weindling and Earley found one major exception, a district with plans for a seminar for new heads, senior advisers, and experienced heads. Time and resource constraints limited this program. One of the major findings of their five-year study was that districts should "have a planned program of induction for new heads" including a number of features: (1) more time for newly appointed managers to visit their new schools; (2) arrangements for outgoing heads to produce full written reports for their successors; (3) carefully planned introductory visits to the new assignment; (4) an induction course; (5) a handbook for new heads; and (6) the assignment of experienced mentors (Weindling & Earley, 1987, p. 190).

Copyrighted Material