

PERCEIVED INDUCTION NEEDS FOR BEGINNING PRINCIPALS*

Jason Wright
Gerald Siegrist
James Pate
David Monetti
Simmie Raiford

This work is produced by OpenStax-CNX and licensed under the
Creative Commons Attribution License 3.0[†]

Abstract

This study attempted to determine the perceptions of beginning principals regarding their need for induction experiences and the relationship of principal responsibilities to those perceived induction needs. Beginning principals were defined as principals in their first through third years as a principal in a school. The study further examined whether or not there was a difference in the perceived induction needs among elementary, middle, and high school beginning principals. The population consisted of beginning principals in the public schools in Alabama. Of the participants, 27% were elementary principals, 34% were middle school principals, and 39% were high school principals. The methodology was a mixed methods approach. To gather qualitative data, a survey was mailed to 286 beginning principals in Alabama. The first section of the survey included 19 suggested induction needs from the literature which were scored using a five-point Likert scale. The second section asked the respondents to rate the importance of 10 areas of responsibility for principals found to be prevalent in the literature. The third section solicited demographic information about the respondents. To gather qualitative data principals, two from the elementary, two from the middle, and two from the high school level were selected for interviews. The purpose of these was to substantiate the data gathered from the surveys and provide a deeper insight into the perception of beginning principals regarding induction needs. The findings indicated on average, the various groups viewed principal induction needs similarly. Results from the data suggest beginning principals desire a well planned induction program to meet the demands of a very difficult job.



*Version 1.1: Jul 18, 2009 10:36 am -0500

[†]<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

NOTE: This module has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and sanctioned by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of education administration. In addition to publication in the Connexions Content Commons, this module is published in the International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, ¹ Volume 4, Number 3 (July - September, 2009). Formatted and edited in Connexions by Theodore Creighton, Virginia Tech.

1 Introduction

Administrator preparation texts have dealt with teacher induction strategies for many years. According to Anderson (1990), however, there has been little discussion of the types of induction strategies practiced in public schools that ease beginning principals transition to school leadership. If one accepts the belief that an organization is only as good as its leadership, then the early professional growth and development of school leaders is vital. If school systems are to support beginning principals, an understanding of, and a framework for an induction process for beginning principals must be identified and put into place.

The role of the principal is recognized as being critical to the successful achievement of students and to the development of a successful school-wide learning environment (Murphy, 2003). McCarthy (1999) suggested that during the latter part of the 20th century new demands have been placed on principals. Among these McCarthy listed decentralization, pressures toward national and state standards, high-stakes testing. Additional demands have been the result of a market-driven educational system that expected responsiveness to consumer needs (McCarthy, 1999). To this end principals have had to become not only managers, but instructional leaders and change agents.

The principalship today is an exceedingly complex and vital role. The inability to understand all facets of community culture and local school organization can lead to difficulty for beginning principals. It would seem, then, that an induction process for beginning principals is vital to the growth, development, and ultimate success of the entire school program.

Elsberry and Bishop (1996) found that many first year principals undergo a trial and error introductory experience that only serves to increase their anxiety about filling their new responsibilities. While induction programs for first year teachers have become an acceptable means of acclimating new people to the teaching profession, some school districts do much less for first year principals. The literature reveals that the induction or orientation of new principals is not well organized and often non-existent, and few investigators have examined the orientation needs of new principals.

Weingartner (2001) noted that districts across the nation are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain qualified principals. District demands, state and federal mandates, a complex budgeting process, rising numbers of at-risk students, and increased school violence have combined to make the principalship a challenge even for veteran administrators (Weingartner). For the novice principal, making the transition from the classroom or an assistant principalship can be an unnerving experience (Weingartner).

While the difficulty of recruiting teachers has been clearly documented, the difficulty in attracting, retaining and supporting qualified candidates to the job of principal has been not been widely addressed (Smith, 1999). Smith reasons, if new teachers were provided with a training and acclimation period in their new teaching position, would not a similar approach provide needed support for newly appointed principals?

Once principals are placed in leadership roles, it would seem educationally sound for school systems to support and cultivate their investment in these newly appointed principals with resources similar to those devoted to newly employed teachers.

2 Review of Literature

The documented and growing shortage of well-prepared and trained principals continues to plague school systems (Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). The specific causes of the principal shortage vary, but evidence points

¹<http://ijelp.expressacademic.org>

to such issues as changes in society, lack of respect from students and parents, poor discipline, increasing demands, stress, high-stakes testing, and low salaries (Keeton-Strayhorn, 2003). In recent years much criticism has been directed toward educational leadership preparation programs. Preparation programs have been characterized as bankrupt (Murphy, 2001) and slow to change. Farkas (2002) noted typical leadership programs are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's schools. Levine (2005) concluded the overall quality of educational administration programs ranges from inadequate to appalling.

Yet some states have recently begun to train aspiring principals in close cooperation with the school systems in which they work ((Georgia Professional Standards Commission 2008 Certification rules) Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (2008). *Certification rules*). This on-the-job training strategy provides the opportunity for aspiring administrators to engage in real work in real situations with real people before they are state certified and may provide for induction opportunities as trainees move closer to administrative positions. Still, in most districts, induction is a system responsibility and begins when principals are hired, and a key issue to be addressed is the induction experiences provided to newly appointed principals (Wilmore, 2004).

Mentoring has long been known to be a critical element in the development of leaders in all organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Maxwell, 1995; Portner, 2002). As the role of the principal continues to evolve, school organizations must find a way to institutionalize this strategy.

Even under the best of circumstances, induction for a new leadership role is a complex undertaking (Wilmore, 2004). Induction may be defined as the act or process of inducting to provide initial experiences (Agnes, 2001). Castetter (1986) defines induction as a systematic organizational effort to minimize problems confronting new personnel, so that they can contribute maximally to the work of the school. Principal induction fits both of these definitions especially as it deals with leadership skills promoting change. As suggested by Wilmore, being an effective change agent is often difficult to manage. He would probably agree with Hoyle (2002) who noted the only people who like change are wet babies.

Anderson (1998) pointed to the importance of the first year in the career development of teachers. As a result, many states have begun mandating induction activities, such as mentor-teacher programs for first-year teachers (Anderson). With the advent of teacher induction programs, educators have learned that effective induction programs can dramatically impact our ability to attract, train, and retain new teachers (Anderson). Yet, as Cale (1990) notes, school districts have done far less to initiate first-year principals. The induction process for newly hired principals, in many cases, has been a result of chance and not careful planning based upon consideration of the related literature (Cale). In fact, according to Cale, little or no guidance appears to be the norm. This sink-or-swim attitude, along with unrealistic expectations of the job, is one factor that has made it increasingly difficult to fill such positions with effective leaders (Cale).

In searching the literature for induction opportunities provided to newly appointed principals, it was not atypical to find that new principals were handed the keys to their building, asked to sign several forms for health insurance, given a stack of papers and reports and a handbook of district policies, and wished good luck (Langston, McClain, Stewart, & Walseth, 1998). Langston, et al, found that a few beginning principals were assigned mentors or asked to attend special workshops, but they were rarely supervised closely, coached, or counseled.

Langston, et al. further reported that as beginning principals entered their first year, the staff and school went through a series of shifts in their interpretations and expectations about the new principal. Much is expected of new principals. They must be prepared to deal with inevitable changes and conflicts, provide opportunities that assuage people's fears, introduce change in non-threatening ways, and pave the way for building a school culture characterized by instructional excellence (Langston, McClain, Stewart, & Walseth, 1998).

Although the search for a principal ends when one is hired, the process of getting an effective principal is just beginning. Anderson (1990) reported that selection of a leader is only part of the process; the other part is helping the beginning principal succeed and grow in the job after the hire is completed. It would seem that developing a systematic process for inducting principals for their new leadership role is therefore an activity that Human Resource Departments should not leave to chance nor take lightly, but should be seen as a high priority process that will pay future dividends.

3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a difference in perceived induction needs of beginning principals, defined as those in their 1st through 3rd year of service at a school, regardless of prior experience. Additionally, this study attempted to determine beginning principal's perceptions regarding the need for induction experiences as they relate to specific administrative responsibilities for principals as identified in the literature. Finally, this study attempted to determine which topics beginning principals viewed as most important for inclusion in induction programs. To that end, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the induction needs of beginning year elementary, middle, and high school principals as perceived by the principals?
2. Which topics newly appointed elementary, middle, and high school principals ranked as most important for inclusion in an induction program?
3. What induction experiences were most often experienced by beginning elementary, middle, and high school principals?

4 Methodology

The study used a mixed methods approach. The quantitative research component included a survey to collect demographic and statistical data developed by Dr. Ginger Hogeland. The survey, entitled "Perceptions of First-Year Principals Regarding Induction/Orientation Needs," was divided into three sections. The first contained a series of statements listing possible induction needs for beginning principals. These were scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree based on needs as perceived by the respondents. This section was used to detect differences among the various demographic groupings. Section two of the survey instructed respondents to rate the listed responsibilities from extremely important to not important as a need for inclusion in an induction program for beginning principals. Section three solicited demographic information from the participants.

The survey was mailed to 286 identified potential participants throughout Alabama. Of the 286 surveys mailed, 122 were completed, returned, and usable for the research (43%). Elementary principals accounted for 33 of the usable surveys returned (27%). Middle school principals accounted for 42 of the usable surveys returned (34%). High School principals accounted for 47 of the usable surveys returned (39%).

The qualitative portion of the research included a case study analysis of six beginning principals, two each from the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The six principals interviewed were from school systems across the state. Four were former coaches, four were male, and five were formerly assistant principals. Two were from middle schools, two from high schools, and two from elementary schools. Schools ranged in enrollment from 500 to 1100 students. Respondent education levels ranged from masters to doctoral degrees.

The subjects were identified via a separate identification card mailed with the survey and returned. These cards solicited information including name, school, grade levels served, electronic mail communication address, and telephone number. From these cards, sorted by school level, subjects for the interviews were randomly selected. Interviews were conducted to further explore the perceived needs in induction process; to seek support or rebuttal to the survey analysis data; and to learn the type of induction practices that exist within the state. These structured interviews and recorded dialogue were used as the primary data collection sources.

5 Findings and Discussion

Analysis of the data using descriptive statistics produced a mean score and a standard deviation for all 122 participants for each of the items suggested by the survey for inclusion in a beginning principal induction program. These data addressed the perceived induction needs of the entire sample. The minimum score was 1.61 and the maximum score was 2.39. The mean scores for principal perception of the items in the survey regarding induction needs are presented in Table 1.

Mean Comparison for All Respondents of Induction Items Surveyed (n=122)

Induction Item	M	SD
professional growth plan	1.61	0.79
peer group idea sharing	1.69	0.64
reflective feedback	1.72	0.86
mentor from within system	1.73	0.93
professional association meeting	1.77	0.71
summer induction	1.79	0.78
in-service workshops	1.83	0.56
needs assessment and training	1.86	0.98
intern under another administrator	1.88	0.89
structured work load	1.88	0.51
social activities	1.89	0.71
orientation with outgoing principal	1.98	0.71
shadowing	1.98	0.54
collegial support groups	1.99	0.58
peer group idea sharing	2.07	0.60
consultant services	2.14	0.62
mentor from outside system	2.19	0.63
pairing with retired principal	2.35	0.59
collegial observations	2.39	0.71

Table 1

For all 122 participants the items agreed upon as most needed for inclusion in an induction program were plans for creating professional development and growth (1.61), and peer group problem solving and idea sharing (1.69). The second level of agreed upon items for inclusion in an administrative induction program was: reflective feedback (1.72), pairing with a veteran principal (mentor) from within one's own school system (1.73), and participation in professional association meetings (1.77). The items receiving the highest mean scores or those least agreed upon as a need for inclusion in an induction program are collegial observations (1.96) and pairing with a retired principal (2.03).

Analysis of survey responses disaggregated by elementary, middle school, and high school revealed little difference with regard to importance for inclusion in an induction program. The 33 elementary respondents identified creating a professional growth plan as most important (1.52). The mean score for each item as identified by elementary principals may be found in Table 2.

Mean Comparison for Elementary Respondents Surveyed (n = 33)

Induction Item	M	SD
professional growth plan	1.52	0.51
professional association meeting	1.56	0.53
peer group idea sharing	1.62	0.44
mentor from within system	1.65	0.61
social activities	1.71	0.66
structured work load	1.73	0.62
needs assessment and training	1.75	0.64
reflective feedback	1.76	0.69
in-service workshops	1.77	0.75
intern under another administrator	1.78	0.72
orientation with outgoing principal	1.78	0.67
summer induction	1.82	0.81
shadowing	1.89	0.63
orientation with district administration	1.92	0.74
collegial support groups	1.96	0.81
pairing with retired principal	2.03	0.82
consultant services	2.16	0.88
mentor from outside system	2.21	0.92
collegial observations	2.22	0.71

Table 2

The 42 middle school respondents and the 47 high school respondents both identified the same three items as most important for inclusion in an induction program. Peer group problem solving (1.61 middle school, 1.67 high school) and creating a plan for professional growth (1.63 middle school, 1.57 high school) matched the items identified by the elementary group. The third item listed by secondary respondents was pairing with a veteran principal from within one's own district (1.66). Middle school principal responses are outlined in Table 3, and high school principal responses are outlined in Table 4.

Mean Comparison for Middle School Respondents Surveyed (n = 42)

Induction Item	M	SD
peer group idea sharing	1.61	0.49
professional growth plan	1.63	0.49
mentor from within system	1.66	0.59
professional association meeting	1.69	0.57
orientation with outgoing principal	1.71	0.67
social activities	1.77	0.73
reflective feedback	1.79	0.78
structured work load	1.79	0.72
summer induction	1.81	0.77
needs assessment and training	1.85	0.74
in-service workshops	1.87	0.75
orientation with district administration	1.87	0.77
pairing with retired principal	1.93	0.62
shadowing	1.93	0.68
collegial support groups	1.94	0.71
intern under another administrator	1.95	0.71
collegial observations	2.02	0.79
consultant services	2.05	0.74
mentor from outside system	2.11	0.84

Table 3

Mean Comparison for High School Respondents Surveyed (n = 47)

Induction Item	M	SD
professional growth plan	1.57	0.47
mentor from within system	1.66	0.56
peer group idea sharing	1.67	0.46
orientation with outgoing principal	1.69	0.76
intern under another administrator	1.75	0.69
professional association meeting	1.76	0.65
reflective feedback	1.78	0.67
in-service workshops	1.81	0.68
social activities	1.81	0.61
structured work load	1.83	0.61
needs assessment and training	1.85	0.69
orientation with district administration	1.88	0.69
shadowing	1.88	0.62
summer induction	1.88	0.79
pairing with retired principal	1.93	0.67
collegial support groups	1.97	0.83
collegial observations	1.98	0.72
mentor from outside system	2.01	0.88
consultant services	2.05	0.79

Table 4

These results are supported by literature including Martin (2003) who found there was no need for categorical differences in the training of elementary, middle, or high school principals as their roles and responsibilities were closely intertwined. Principal induction needs seemed to relate to the job surroundings and unique problems affiliated with the school regardless of elementary or secondary level.

Participants in the survey were also asked to rank the ten professional responsibilities of principals listed on the survey as extremely important (1), somewhat important (2), or not important (3) if addressed in an induction program. The mean score for each item may be found in Table 5.

Mean Score of Importance for Induction Components (n = 122)

Responsibility	M	SD
Following policy and legal mandates	1.12	0.34
Conflict management	1.26	0.44
Instruction and curriculum development	1.33	0.47
School finance and business	1.34	0.47
Faculty/staff supervision and evaluation	1.38	0.48
Time management	1.38	0.48
Managing student discipline	1.40	0.49
Working with parents	1.45	0.49
Goal setting and planning	1.51	0.50
Building and plant management	1.57	0.51

Table 5

Participants were also asked to identify the one item considered as most important for inclusion in an induction program. This rank order and number of respondents identifying each can be seen in Table 6.

Items Considered as Most Important for Induction Program (n=122)

Responsibility	n
instruction and curriculum development	28
school finance and business	24
faculty/staff supervision and evaluation	19
time management	16
goal setting and planning	15
maintaining student discipline	12
following policy and legal mandates	7
working with parents	1
building and plant management	0
conflict management	0

Table 6

As noted in Table 5, the two items with the lowest mean when analyzed for all respondents were following policy and legal mandates (1.12) and conflict management (1.26). When compared to the data in Table 6, those same two items ranked seventh and ninth respectively in the same list of responsibilities. This seemed to indicate that following policy and legal mandates and conflict management are relevant issues to most newly appointed administrators who responded to the survey, but not necessarily the most important. The two items respondents indicated to be most important to an induction program were instruction and curriculum development with 28 respondents listing it as most important, and school finance and business with 24 respondents who listed it as most important. Instruction and curriculum development had the third lowest mean (1.33) for all respondents while school finance and business had the fourth lowest mean (1.34).

The topics for inclusion in an induction program varied only slightly between elementary, middle, and high school principals. Opportunities to devise a professional growth plan, as well as creating an avenue for peers to share ideas and communicate with one another were the most significant topics to all groups. Interview data supported the idea of an induction program to include multiple avenues for establishing relationships. The manner for establishing these relationships varied somewhat with respondents choosing mentors within a system, mentors outside the district, mentors within professional organizations, or within orientation sessions with local system personnel. According to this study providing newly appointed principals the access to support structures would seem to be one key to an effective induction program.

The qualitative data gathered through the interviews with six beginning principals revealed that the induction experiences for beginning principals within the state of Alabama varied greatly. The one consistent finding was most school systems do not have a formal induction structure in place.

The six principals interviewed were from school systems scattered across the state. Four were former coaches, four were male, and five were formerly assistant principals. The first of two elementary principals selected was a male serving in a rural east Alabama school district with 14 schools. He was serving in his 3rd year as a principal of a school housing over 500 students in 4th through 6th grades. He completed his Ed.S. Degree in educational leadership while in his current role. Prior to his present appointment he served as an assistant principal in a high school within the same district for five years. The second was a female serving in year two of her first principlaship. She has an Ed.D. in educational leadership, and serves in a city school system located in central Alabama. Her 1st through 5th grade school houses just over 500 students. She served as an assistant principal of the same school two years prior to being appointed as principal.

The two middle school principals selected were located in opposite regions of the state. The first was a male middle school principal serving in his 1st year. His 7th and 8th grade school located in the northeast portion of the state served almost 1000 students. He holds an M. Ed. and served three years as a high school assistant principal. His school is one of 14 in the rural school district. The second middle school principal served in the state's largest school district located in the southwest corner of Alabama. She completed her Ed. D. in educational leadership in 2005 just prior to her first appointment as a school principal. She was housed at a 6th through 8th grade school serving just over 700 students. The first high school principal selected was a 24-year veteran of public schools at the time of the interview. He was serving in his 3rd year as principal of a kindergarten through 12th grade school in north central Alabama. His school was one of 22 in the district. Prior to this assignment as principal he served as an assistant principal at a high school for six years in a neighboring district. Holding a M. Ed. Degree in educational leadership since 1997, he now serves a school of 650 students. The second high school principal held an Ed. S. and was serving in his 2nd year as a principal at high school in east Alabama housing 1100 students in grades 9th through 12th. This principal was the only one selected for the interview who had no experience as an assistant principal. His leadership experience came in the form of head football coach and athletic director in a number of schools throughout Alabama during his 20-year educational career.

Common responses from the discussions with coaches who became principals included several of the same responsibilities outlined in the induction needs for principals identified in this research. These participants specifically paralleled the need or ability to organize a practice plan or game plan as a coach to that of organizing an initiative in a school. Other common responses among this group included budget management, communication, problem solving, and advocating for the organization. Budget and financial management is a significant skill needed by building level principals and was ranked second most important by all survey respondents.

Communication skills were one of the most common responses for all interview participants. Each of the participants referenced in some capacity how they learned to communicate to a variety of stakeholder groups. These skills helped them transition to the principalship.

Problem solving skills and conflict resolution abilities were also referenced by all of the male interview participants. While conflict management was not indicated on any of the survey responses as the single most important responsibility of a principal, the category did have a mean score of 1.26 indicating it was a skill that was seen as having a high degree of importance. Multiple examples were provided by each participant as the need for implementing conflict resolution skills.

Commonalities were discovered between the two female principals who were interviewed as well. Just as the four male participants had a common path through coaching to their respective principal assignments, the two females had each served as lead teacher or team leader in their respective schools during their teaching career. Each referenced valuable experience as assistant principals, which helped prepare them for the principal role. In the discussions with the females, two common job requirements were brought to the forefront. Experiences as a lead teacher and as an assistant principal seemed to prepare them both for daily interactions with parents and the ability to support teachers with curriculum decisions.

Five of the six interview participants served time in the role of assistant principal. All five stated that the assistant principal experience was beneficial with regard to preparing them to serve as principal.

Another emphasized area was the importance of newly appointed principals in understanding the dynamics of the community. The political element was an element for which several admitted they were not fully prepared to address.

Participants were asked to describe the major responsibilities of their role as principal, a number of items were discussed. There were three job responsibilities referenced by all six participants. One was budget analysis. A second was the autonomy of a site-based budget, and a third, financial accountability. Each was described as a high need area by all six participants.

Other areas referenced by all respondents was the responsibility for hiring and evaluating faculty and staff, the need to serve as the instructional leader and having a working knowledge of all curriculum, programs, and assessment data. All referred to adequate yearly progress reports and the need for knowledge of data collection and analysis of standardized tests. They also noted a much greater emphasis on the principal's role of leading instruction since the No Child Left Behind Act was implemented.

Most induction experiences were described as a “learn as you go” system. One interviewee worked with the outgoing principal at the beginning of the school year. Another described a network of strong professional relationships that provided support and guidance from peers. Only one “formal” induction process was discussed in the interviews and consisted of pairing with a veteran principal from another school within the district and the assignment of a transition mentor. A theme running through all discussions was that of providing an avenue for newly appointed principals to establish relationships. Professional relationships were needed for dialogue on professional responsibilities and as a vehicle for seeking advice.

6 Summary

The survey data revealed little difference between the perceptions of elementary, middle school, or high principals with regard to induction programs. As previously discussed two of the top three items identified for all groups were the same. Peer group problem solving and idea sharing along with creating a plan for professional growth were common in all the groups. Elementary principals listed professional association meetings as a high need, while the middle school and high school respondents believed a mentor within one's own system to be more important.

Evidence from the interview data reinforced the survey in suggesting there is little difference in the perceptions of elementary, middle, and high school principals. Each interview respondent identified a variety of items deemed as important for inclusion in an induction program. As an example, survey data indicated elementary principals felt strongly that professional association meetings should be part of an induction process. Yet, the only interview respondent who mentioned professional association meetings was a high school principal. Also supporting the survey was the lack of many formal induction procedures reported through the interviews. The survey data indicated middle and high school principals felt more strongly about the need for mentors with only one of elementary principal referring to the importance of a strong mentor. The data suggested all areas of responsibility outlined in this study are relevant to the principal at elementary, middle, or high school settings.

In the continually evolving educational arena, it may be noted that one constant exists for school leaders. That constant is change, and it continues to occur in multiple forms such as No Child Left Behind, changing student demographics, 21st century technology, and instructional accountability. Principals must be prepared to adapt to ever-changing expectations. Meaningful principal induction opportunities may be one way to

prepare beginning principals for constant change by assisting them in establishing relationships and acquiring skills to effectively lead.

7 Recommendations for Practice

Based upon a review of relevant literature and findings of this study, several recommendations are noted.

When universities examine what to teach, they should also rethink delivery systems, perhaps similar to the recent revisions Georgia has enacted in which virtually all degree work takes place at the candidate's work place in partnership with local school systems. In turn, school systems could form partnerships with local universities to establish a preparation program for prospective principals.

Jacobson, O'Neill, Fry, Hill, and Bottoms (2002) suggest that a system is needed to identify recruit, and develop people who have proven records of raising student performance. The primary responsibility for this task rests with school systems.

School systems should take advantage of professional organizations who offer periodic conferences and workshops for beginning principals.

Weingartner (2001) reported that districts across America are finding it harder to recruit and retain qualified principals. Elmore and Burney (1998) indicate that recruitment and retention is a matter of finding and growing a pool of talent for instructional leadership. Identifying potential talent and promoting from within while providing induction experiences would broaden the number of applicants for leadership positions.

Local systems should evaluate the climate of schools and seek principal who fits. The selection process to determine the best fit should be well planned.

State and local policy makers should consider establishing a mentor program. This study supported Veto, Nugent, and Kruse (2001) who found dialogue with more experienced professionals broadened the professional network to increase self-confidence in the new principal. Daresh (1997), too, found that the single most powerful thing a beginning principal can do to enhance survival and effectiveness was to find another experienced educational leader to assist in their individual transition to the role of principal.

Finally, research should be conducted to assess the extent to which experiences as an assistant principal impact the effective performance of the beginning principal, and research should be conducted to determine if induction practices currently in use may be improved to better prepare beginning principals.

8 References

- Agnes, M. (2001). *Webster's new world college dictionary* (4th edition). Foster City, CA:IDG Books.
- Anderson, M. E. (1990). *Helping Beginning Principals Succeed*. Oregon School Study Report, Eugene OR: Oregon School study Council, University of Oregon, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED316939)
- Anderson, M.E. (1998). Training and selecting school leaders. In *Schoolleadership: Handbook for excellence*. Washington, D.C. Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (2002). *Reframing the path to school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cale, J.H. (1990). *A study of induction strategies and their application among newly hired school principals in the state of Missouri*. Dissertation abstracts.
- Castetter, W.B. (1986). *The personnel function in educational administration* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Daresh, J. C. (1997). *Research on beginning school leaders: Where do we go next?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408678)
- Elmore, R. ,& Burney, D. (1998). *Improving instruction through professional development in New York City's Community District 2*. Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education Policy Briefs.
- Elsberry, C. C., & Bishop, H.L. (1996). A new deal for new principals. *Principal* 75, No. 3 (32).

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffet, A., Foleno, T., & Foley, P. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. Washington D.C.: Public Agenda.

Fenwick, L., & Pierce, M. (2001). The principal shortage, crisis or opportunity. *Principal*, 80, 24-28.

(Georgia Professional Standards Commission 2008 Certification rules) Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (2008). *Certification rules*. Retrieved April 28, 2008, from <http://www.gapsc.com/TeacherCertification/Documents/>

Jacobson, A., O'Neill, K., Fry, B., & Hill, D., & Bottoms, G. (2002) Retrieved March 1, 2006, from [www.ecs.org/html/IssueSection.asp?issueid=158&³ubissueid=95&s=Selected+Research+%26+Readings -22k -](http://www.ecs.org/html/IssueSection.asp?issueid=158&3ubissueid=95&s=Selected+Research+%26+Readings-22k-)

Keeton-Strayhorn, C. (2003). Alleviate the Texas teacher shortage. Referenced in *Principal Induction* by Elaine Wilmore.

Langston, R., McClain, G., Stewart, B., & Walseth, J. (1998). *An exploration of strategies which elementary principals new to their schools use to learn about school culture*. A paper presented at the University of Northern Colorado in 1998.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. The education schools project. Retrieved March 1, 2006, from <http://www.edschools.org/pdf/final/313.pdf>⁴

Martin, T.P. (2003). What to expect and how to prepare for the assistant principalship in middle level schools: A brief overview. In *Transition: Journal of the New York State Middle School Association* (20), 1, 17.

Maxwell, J. (1995). *Developing the leaders around you*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

McCarthy, M. (1999). *The evolution of school leadership programs*. *Handbook of Research on educational administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J. (2001). The changing face of leadership preparation. *The School Administrator Web Edition*. Retrieved March 1, 2006, from http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2001_11/murphy.htm⁵

Murphy, J., & Dantrow, A. (2003). *Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reforms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murray, M. (1991). *Beyond the myth and magic of mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, W. (1999). Leadership for educational renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80, (8), 602-605.

Veto, M., Nugent, P., & Kruse, S. (2001). That feeling of being on the edge: Six case studies of stress in Catholic school administrators. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 4(3), 301-318.

Weingartner, C. (2001). *Principals Have ESP*. Retrieved March 9, 2004 from <http://www.naesp.org/comm/p0301f.htm>⁶

Wilmore, E. (2004). *Principal induction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

²http://www.gapsc.com/TeacherCertification/Documents/cert_rules.asp

³<http://www.ecs.org/html/IssueSection.asp?issueid=158&>

⁴<http://www.edschools.org/pdf/final/313.pdf>

⁵http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2001_11/murphy.htm

⁶<http://www.naesp.org/comm/p0301f.htm>