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ABSTRACT

In order to better understand the realities of principal succession (an interactive sequencing process for changing school administrators) it was the purpose of this study to examine the relationship between four organizational frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997) and three traits noted in the literature as evident during school principal succession (predecessor leave-taking, succession source, and experience). There is little research regarding school principal succession, and concern exists regarding the adequacy of transition practices within organizations. A questionnaire was employed to survey all school principals in the state of Kansas who succeeded during the 1997-98 or 1998-99 school years.

Three rationalizations for the study were: (a) an information base for successor principals, (b) an information base for school districts to access during the hiring process, and (c) an information base for institutions of higher education as they design training programs. Recommendations and suggestions for further research are given for each area of rationalization.

The research questions explored and the conclusions for each are as follows:

1. As a function of the predecessor's reason for leaving, what differences will there be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)? Conclusions were (a) successors value all frames regarding Predecessor Status less when their predecessors left to go to a different district, and (b) the inevitable conflict within a group because of enduring differences and scarce resources as well as understanding the symbolism surrounding "why we do what we do"
here" outweighs the necessity of organizational configurations and the role principals’ competencies play within organizations.

2. What differences will there be between successors from outside the district and successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic)? Conclusions were that (a) inside successors valued the Political frame more than outside successors, and (b) contingencies within the Political frame such as power, competency and influence, whether the stakeholders had a say in hiring, and the personality of the predecessor were the issues that most likely influenced decisions to hire from inside or outside the district.

3. How is the perceived importance of each of the four frames (Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic) related to the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position? Conclusions were that (a) respondents (a majority of whom had the least experience) valued symbolism more than they did the other frames regarding experience and (b) their valuing of symbolism increased with years of experience.

4. What are the relationships among the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)? Conclusions were that (a) all the frames were statistically significantly correlated, (b) the Structural, Political, and Symbolic frames were positively correlated with each other, and (c) the Human Resource frame was negatively correlated with the other three, suggesting that successors consciously attend to specific competencies considered vital within the Human Resource frame.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

School principal succession is an interactive sequencing process for changing school administrators and integrating new principals (administrators) into schools' organizational memberships (Grusky, 1961; Whatley, 1994). When school principals assume new administrative positions, they must evaluate which of their attitudes and behaviors to retain and must determine the dynamics and realities unique to the new setting (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975). As they face change, they must understand its importance: “An assumption underlying research on administrator succession is that a change of administrators is a significant event in the history of an organization” (Miklos, 1988, p. 630). At the same time they must accept the difficulty of the process before them. Thiemann (1968) referred to this process of replacing leaders within an organization as “the drama of succession” (p. 2), and noted its myriad consequences, both expected and unexpected.

The need for research into school principal succession is evident in the following statement by Louis (1980): “There is growing concern that current organizational entry practices do not adequately ease the transition of new members into work organizations” (p. 226). Hart (1991) endorsed this statement when she said: “In the face of demands for more creative leadership from principals and for school restructuring . . . education scholars need to expand inquiry into deliberate strategies to promote desired outcomes during succession when expectations for change are high” (p. 469). Gordon and Rosen (1981) agreed:
The leader’s role, in our judgment, continues to deserve special theoretical and research attention . . . for several reasons. For one thing, formal organizations are highly sensitized to leadership phenomena and are structured accordingly. For another, society has a right to place greater ethical and social role demands on people occupying leadership positions than on rank-and-file members . . . . The evidence clearly shows that leaders can, and often do, make a difference. The task is to discover why and under what circumstances. (p. 240)

Such factors demand that school principals today obtain and maintain a high level of competence and proficiency. Miskel and Cosgrove (1984) affirmed that “astute leaders quickly learn how those around them expect them to function” (p. 10).

While administrator succession in general has been studied extensively (Argyris, 1964, Ashforth & Fried, 1988, Brown, 1982a, 1982b, 1985; Cosgrove, 1986; Fauske & Ogawa, 1987, Gephart, 1978; Hart, 1988, in press; Louis, 1980, 1985; Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985; Van Manen, 1990), few studies have dealt with school principal succession. According to Fauske and Ogawa (1987), succession studies in education circles are sparse when compared to succession studies in other institutions. Furthermore, few studies deal with the influence of communities, faculty, central office administrators, and parents on school principal succession.

Given that we can expect half of the nation’s practicing principals to be retired by the end of the century (Whatley, 1994),

The next generation of principals will be faced with unprecedented opportunities and exceptional new challenges. Using these opportunities and meeting these challenges will call for a deeper understanding of the role of the principal, along with the skills needed to carry out that role effectively. (p. 8)

LeGore (1995) asserted,

It is important that principal succession continue to be a focus of examination. Each study on this topic appears to reveal more and more of the intricacies involved in the process. The stages are found to be comprised of more discrete
substages, and it also has been discovered that each phase is marked by very obvious emotional responses. (p. 43)

Purpose of the Study

In order to better understand realities of principal succession it was the purpose of this study to examine the relationship between four organizational frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997; structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) and three traits noted in the literature as evident during school principal succession (predecessor status, succession source, and experience). Both a thorough search of authoritative literature and a formal quantitative research project were conducted.

Four Organizational Frames

The four organizational frames of Bolman and Deal (1997), described by the authors as “a varied assortment of lenses for viewing organizations” (p. 38), provide a procedure “for gaining entry into subject matter and for raising relevant questions” (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973, p. 43) regarding school principal succession. Hart (1985) substantiated the prudence in using these frames when she referred to Bolman and Deal’s argument that “four conceptual frames offer unique multiply useful perspectives on life and work in organizations useful to researchers and practitioners” (p. 11). The following paragraphs provide a succinct description of these frames and a brief explanation of how they guided the study.

The structural frame in organizations “both enhances or constrains what organizations can accomplish” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 39). Although the term “structure” is often perceived as being limiting in nature or as a mere organizational chart, “machine-like and inflexible” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 39), many structures are
designed to emphasize “flexibility, participation, and quality” (p. 39). The authors define structure as “a blueprint for the pattern of expectations and exchanges among internal players (executives, managers, employees) and external constituencies (such as customers and clients)” (p. 38). According to Bolman and Deal (1997), “Every group will evolve structure as its members work together, but the design may or may not be effective” (p. 96). Structural imperatives that affect the design of an organization include size, age, core process, environment, goals or strategies, information technology, and the characteristics of its people.

“Administrative succession is common in all kinds of organizations” (Hart, 1993, p. 5), and school principals in succession situations do not face unique circumstances. The significance of structure in succession has been studied for some time, and in regard to principals Smith, Maehr, and Midgley (1992) stated,

Considerable research has documented that principals are largely actors inside a social setting responding to situational and contextual characteristics. That research suggests the structure of the school, as well as the social context of the beliefs and attitudes of the district, largely determine what types of behaviors are necessary and appropriate for principals within the context of their schools. (p. 112)

The human resource frame focuses on the interplay between organizations and people, and advocates that “organizations can . . . be energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 102). The principal’s role as a human resource is strongly supported in the literature (Austin, 1981; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Elmaleh, 1989; Goodlad, 1987; McCurdy, 1983; Melton & Stanavage, 1970; Miskel & Cosgrove, 1984, Ogawa & Hart, 1985). For example, McCurdy (1983) thought that “the principalship holds one of the most important keys to excellence in schools” (p. 6).
Elmaleh (1989) claimed that “The school principalship has developed into one of the most important positions in our society. Few, if any, people in other professions discharge a role that has a greater impact upon the development of individuals in our society” (p. 5). Referring to the convictions of Sergiovanni, Elmaleh (1989) also asserted, “It is clear that no single person is more key to school effectiveness than the principal, and the deciding factor in determining effectiveness is the leadership he or she brings to the school” (p. 7). McCurdy (1983) insisted that principals are “important to the development of knowledge and practices useful in enhancing the conditions of learning and improving the consequences of teaching for our nation’s youngsters” (p. 9).

Principals as human resources are considered from two perspectives: (a) succession, and (b) socialization. Succession considers how leaders affect school performance. This consideration is viewed through competencies, defined as “a complex set of relationships between the principal’s intent and action and resulting intended and unintended outcomes of that action” (Snyder & Drummond, 1988, p. 48), and proficiencies. “Proficient,” the adjective form of proficiency, is defined as “highly competent, skilled, adept” (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1991, p. 1074). Socialization, by contrast, considers how other members of an organization affect the succession process and may shape the behavior of the principal.

The political frame “views organizations as alive and screaming political arenas that house a complex web of individual and group interests” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 163). The principalship is an ever-increasing political arena. McCurdy (1983) insisted that the effort of principals to implement practices they know to be viable is restrained by factors of politics, attitudes, and structure intrinsic within schools. Miskel and
Cosgrove (1984) concurred by stating: “The society and the environment in which an organization operates place limits on the leader’s influence.” They continued by noting that “in addition to the traits of a leader, the movement of an organization will depend on constraints of the environment and of the organization itself” (p. 33).

The succession process is full of uncertainty and inconsistency, thereby easily opening the door for political agendas. Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) noted that historically “administrative succession leads to instability and conflict” (p. 5). “The changes succession brings can center around the personal and leadership style of the successor, re-define work and social patterns, establish new networks of communication within the school and with the environment, and open members’ minds to new possibilities” (Hart, 1985, p. 4).

Finally, the symbolic frame attempts to “interpret and illuminate basic issues of meaning and belief that make symbols so powerful” (Bolman & Deal 1997, p. 216), far different from the reasonableness and certitude of traditional order. Through the symbolic frame, organizations center on meaning, beliefs, and faith, and use symbols to reveal “meaning in chaos, clarity in confusion, and predictability in mystery” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 219). Bolman and Deal (1997) described this frame of constant change as an “organic pinball machine” (p. 217), with meaning changing with every shot in life, so to speak. Sheive and Schoenheit (1987) asserted that the ability of symbolic leaders to communicate intent and meaning is more important than the behaviors they exhibit and the activities in which they participate. The authors further pointed out that within the school instructional setting, activities gain their meaning from the culture of the school—the culture creates a symbolic bridge between activities and outcomes. Outside the
school, in the community, the culture creates a symbolic appearance that summons faith and conviction among the stakeholders.

Succession has its own symbolisms, often difficult to describe and explain. Hart (1985) referred to her own succession experience as “a process transforming that stiff acknowledgment of power into a web of social bonds” (p. 4). Reasons for succession that bring their own symbolisms are diverse. Hart (1985), for example, listed death, promotion, retirement, and poor performance as prominent causes for succession. “No predecessor knows when or under what conditions the office will be passed on. Nor can he be certain who will succeed him, the results of the succession, or its final end” (Thiemann, 1968, p. 2).

**Three Traits Evident in the Succession Process**

In addition to the four frames, the succession literature describes various traits evident during the succession process and examined within succession contexts (Gordon & Rosen, 1981; Hart, 1991; LeGore, 1995; Whatley, 1994). Three of these traits, predecessor status, succession source, and experience, were used to examine the four frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997).

*Predecessor status* refers to the reason for which the predecessor left the position and how that leave-taking affects the succession process. The primary reasons for leave-taking include death, promotion, retirement, or other categories such as transfer, forced removal (firing), or voluntary resignation.

*Succession source* refers to the origin of the successor coming into an organization, whether from outside or from inside. Research shows varying evidence regarding which origin is the best in the succession process.
Experience in this study refers to the time spent in school administration. Experience is mentioned at various times with other traits in the succession literature, but explanation or discussion is absent. It is desired with this study to pursue this trait and thereby add to the literature.

Although data on gender were collected as part of the demographic data, they were not part of the theoretical model.

The relationship between the four organizational frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997) and the three traits evident during school principal succession (predecessor status, successor source, and experience) was examined. Figure 1 demonstrates the process through which this examination transpired.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between four organizational frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997; structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) and three traits described in the literature as evident during school principal succession (predecessor status, succession source, and experience). Both a thorough search of authoritative literature and a formal, quantitative research project were conducted. The following research questions based on the four organizational frames of Bolman and Deal (1997) guided the collection and analysis of data:

1. As a function of the predecessor’s reason for leaving, what differences will there be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?
**EXAMINATION PROCESS GRID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predecessor Status</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death or Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Succession Source   | Inside     |                |           |          |
|                     | Outside    |                |           |          |

| Experience          | None       | 1-5            | 6-10      | 11+      |

**THE FOUR ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 1.** This hypothesis grid demonstrates how the relationship of the four organizational frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997) were examined through three traits described in the literature as evident during school principal succession.

2. What differences will there be between successors from outside the district and successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

3. How is the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) related to the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position?
4. What are the relationships among the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

Research Hypotheses

Research questions based on the four organizational frames of Bolman and Deal (1997) were established to guide the collection and analysis of data. In response, the following research hypotheses are given:

1. As a function of the predecessor’s reason for leaving, there will be differences in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic). (My search of the literature, for example, leads me to believe death of a predecessor would likely have a greater symbolic impact, promotion of a predecessor would likely have a greater political impact, and retirement of a predecessor would likely have a greater structural or human resource impact.)

2. There will be a difference between successors from outside the district and successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic). (My search of the literature, for example, leads me to believe successors from outside the district will have a higher perceived importance of each of the four frames than successors from inside the district.)

3. The perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) is related to the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position. (For example, while this trait is stated in the literature to be of importance, my search reveals so few specifics about the trait that determining a belief based on the literature would be difficult. It is hoped this study will add insight into this trait. It is my personal belief that those with no
experience will have a higher perceived importance of the structural frame than those in
the other three categories, that those in the 1–5 and 6–10 categories will have a higher
perceived importance of the human resource and political frames than those in the other
two categories, and that those in the 11+ category will have a higher perceived
importance of the symbolic frame than those in the other three categories

4. There will be significant relationships among the four frames (structural,
human resource, political, and symbolic).

Significance of the Study

There were three pragmatic rationalizations for the proposed study. First, much
of the review of the relevant literature attests to the use successor principals can make of
an information base concerning principal succession, especially one that is grounded in
research.

Educators who have responsibility for the improvement of instruction are seeking
ways to enhance performance in their supervisory roles. This can only be
accomplished when one has a clear understanding of the nature of those roles,
assesses performance capabilities in them, and determines the priority that should
be assigned to each role. It is up to the instructional leader to do his or her own
assessment of personal abilities and to assign his or her own priorities in the
various areas of supervisory responsibility. (Burch & Danley, 1980, p. 93)

Second, school districts should be able to access and use pertinent and current
information on the school principal succession process as they hire new principals, and
should be able to assist successor principals in acclimating to their new roles within a
specific district and community. McCurdy (1983) substantiated the importance of this
argument as follows:

Superintendents and school boards, for example, have the authority and
wherewithal to ‘make or break’ principals as they pursue educational
excellence. . . . Two areas with great potential for strengthening the principalship are selection and training. . . . Superintendents and boards must use the new processes for selecting and training principals and then help principals stay abreast of developments in education. (p. 6)

Third, institutions of higher education need such information in an effort to make their preparation programs as current and effective as possible. There is growing concern that current organizational entry practices do not adequately ease the transition of new members into work organizations (Louis, 1980). Weindling and Earley (1987) affirmed that little orientation is provided by local education heads. McCabe and Compton (1974) agreed, finding that university preparation of principals is inadequate and ineffectual and that informal methods of learning administrative roles and competencies are more important than formal methods. As a result, they recommended that the primary segments of formal and informal methods of skill development be coupled in university programs. Louis (1980) concurred, stating: “college curricula and placement activities could, as a matter of course, provide students with a preview of typical entry experiences and ways to manage them” (p. 247).

Definitions

Arrival—A period of time when the successor begins the job, consisting of the following factors: “the school’s programs, demographics, culture, effectiveness, organizational structure, and the successor’s actions” (Noonan, 1996, p. 13).

Elementary school principal—The administrator of a school encompassing grades kindergarten through either four, five, or six.

High school principal—The administrator of a school encompassing grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12.
Junior high school principal—The administrator of a school encompassing grades seven and eight or seven through nine.

Middle school principal—The administrator of a school encompassing grades five through eight or six through eight.

Postarrival—The time frame after the arrival of the successor, including the following factors: “changes in reputations, or perceptions, orientations, and arrival factors” (LeGore, 1995, p. 21).

Postsuccession—The time frame and the events occurring following succession (Gordon & Rosen, 1981).

Prearrival—The time frame prior to arrival, including the following factors: “the reasons for the succession, the process by which the successor was selected, the reputation of the successor, the school’s culture, and the effects (outcomes) of the succession on the school” (Noonan, 1996, p. 13).

Predecessor principal—A principal whose tenure immediately precedes that of another principal.

Presuccession—The time frame and the events occurring prior to succession (Gordon & Rosen, 1981).

Principal succession—An interactive sequencing process for replacing school administrators and integrating them into the school’s organizational membership (Grusky, 1961; Whatley, 1994).

Realities—“The quality of being true to life” (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1991, p. 1118).
Secondary principal--The administrator of a school encompassing grades 7 through 12.

Succession--Following another in sequence to a position (Gordon & Rosen, 1981).

Successor principal--A principal whose tenure immediately succeeds that of another principal.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations are noted for this study.

1. Subjects included those principals of all elementary, middle, and secondary schools in the state of Kansas who assumed principalship of their schools during the 1997-98 or 1998-99 school years. Furthermore, those surveyed varied in the number of times they had been a successor principal and in their number of years of school administrative experience, and were therefore asked to limit their answers to the period of time used to complete the survey. Consequently, the generalizability of the findings must be interpreted within these limitations.

2. When developing individual items for the questionnaire, it was desired to determine from actual practice what realities successor principals experienced as they assumed their duties from the predecessor principal. The choice of principals for this purpose was a time factor; consequently, principals available during 1997 summer schedules were interviewed by phone.

3. The respondents in the survey self-reported and were asked to remember from the past. It is assumed that the respondents were honest, able to remember, and careful in responding.
4. It is assumed that the questionnaire designed for this study is a valid measure of the four conceptual frames used in the study.

Sources of Data

The information presented in the literature review was elicited from professional periodicals, doctoral dissertations, books, technical or research reports, proceedings of meetings and symposia, and personal communication. These sources were chosen through ERIC and doctoral dissertation searches, following leads from references in computer searches and from reading, as well as from discussions with professionals in the field.

To determine relevant and current realities regarding principal succession, 15 principals, both elementary and secondary, were interviewed by telephone. These 15 constitute a convenience sample according to their availability during summer hours.

A questionnaire was designed based on the information collected from the above sources. The questions represented the four organizational frames of Bolman and Deal (1997, structural, human resource, political, and symbolic).

Data Analysis

Procedures used in the data analysis include descriptive statistics, measures of internal consistency, and investigation of differences between the four conceptual frames based on the three traits evident during school principal succession. A description of this analysis is shown in Chapter IV.

Organization of the Study

The dissertation resulting from this study is organized in five chapters. Chapter I introduced the study. Principal succession is defined and justification for research into
the subject is provided. The purpose of the study is given, and a framework for treatment of the subject described. Other sections of Chapter I include research questions, research hypotheses, significance of the study, definitions of various terms, limitations of the study, sources of data, data analysis, and how the study is organized.

Chapter II reviews the literature pertinent to the principalship and the succession process. The literature review is presented through an historical perspective and through the perspective of the four frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997) and three traits described in the literature as evident during school principal succession.

Within the structural frame, data are presented describing structure as “a blueprint for the pattern of expectations and exchanges among internal players (executives, managers, employees) and external constituencies (such as customers and clients)” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 38). A major assumption underlying this frame is that “the right formal arrangements minimize problems and increase quality and performance” (p. 39). The survey implemented in the study inquired about structural realities that impact principal succession.

Within the human resource frame, data are presented on the interplay between organizations and people, advocating the notion that organizations can “be energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 102). This premise points out the importance of the school principal as a human resource in her/his ability to lead the school in educational endeavors and in working with the faculty and parent community. The survey implemented in the study inquired about individual school principals’ experiences as human resources and with other human resources that impact principal succession.
Within the political frame, data portrayed enduring differences and scarce resources as parts of organizations, which inevitably contribute to conflict among the individuals of a group, and in which power is a key resource. The principalship is shown to be an ever-increasing political arena, and the survey implemented in the study pursued how political realities affect successor principals.

Within the symbolic frame, data show how humans use symbols to reveal "meaning in chaos, clarity in confusion, and predictability in mystery" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 219). The survey implemented in the study explored what role symbolism plays in the principal succession process.

Regarding predecessor status, data show that the reason for the predecessor's leaving has a definite effect on the successor's entry into an organization. With respect to succession source, data show that whether it is best to hire an outsider or an insider depends on a number of contingencies. Finally, data concerning experience (referring to the time spent in school administration), are limited, and it is believed that this study has added to the literature in this area.

Chapter III describes the research methodology for the study. It has been divided into four segments: purpose, subjects, methods for data collection, and data treatment procedures. The data collection process was comprised of eight carefully delineated steps.

Chapter IV presents the findings, followed by detailing the analysis of accrued data from the study.
Chapter V summarizes the findings of the study, presents the researcher’s conclusions relative to principal succession, makes recommendations as a result of the study, and suggests significant considerations for further research.

Conclusion

This study provides another important perspective of school principal succession and adds to the literature in that regard. The study is unique in three ways.

First, use of the organizational framework of Bolman and Deal (1997) provides a fresh insight into the succession process not delineated by any of the studies cited. The four frames provide a skeleton upon which to place the realities ferreted out in order to gain an understanding of what one can expect when succeeding another school principal, and why. It provides a roadmap not provided in any other study.

Second, none of the studies located during the study asked acting principals to divulge the many realities they encountered as they followed another principal in office.

Third, this study was based on three rationalizations: (a) successor principals will find it practically useful, (b) school districts need access to pertinent and current information regarding succession as they hire new school principals, and (c) institutions of higher education need such information for their preparation programs. None of the studies cited claimed these rationalizations as the significance of their work.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Perspective

During the nineteenth century when public schools were establishing their viability in our country, principals were principal-teachers, or head teachers, spending most of their time in the classroom as teachers. They were also responsible for clerical duties and took over when the lay board, which performed the administrative duties, was absent. The relationship of the principals to their peers was that of senior head teacher, not manager (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; McCurdy, 1983; Pellicer & Others, 1981).

Schools grew as the nation grew, and complex bureaucracies developed within school districts. School boards surrendered administrative roles to full-time professionals, principals became directing managers instead of presiding teachers, and the teaching duties of principals were virtually phased out (Campbell et al., 1987; McCurdy, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1981).

With the onset of the Twentieth century, the role of school principal had become that of manager and instructional supervisor, much as it is today. The trend for school principals has been away from the classroom and instructional supervision and toward professional management (McCurdy, 1983; Parker, 1978; Pellicer et al., 1981).

The school principalship, as it has developed, is no panacea. Daily expectations of principals become increasingly ponderous. McCurdy (1983) said that "being a principal—much less an effective one—is not an easy job" (p. 6), and referred to a "tumble of events" (p. 13) that school principals encounter in a given day. Fragmentation,
brevity, verbal communication, physical movement, one-on-one interactions, interruptions, and crises are descriptors listed in McCurdy's (1983) research. In one study 407 individual activities of school principals were interrupted by 1,457 other responsibilities, and 50% of all the principal did was interrupted.

School principals in succession situations do not face unique circumstances; in fact, "Administrative succession is common in all kinds of organizations" (Hart, 1993, p. 5). The earliest succession studies took place in the business world (Hart, 1993), and were referred to simply as organizational studies. Three researchers are considered forerunners in the organizational research. A. Gouldner, O. Grusky, and R. H. Guest (LeGore, 1995). Gouldner (Firestone, 1990) developed a case study in 1954 regarding the change of management in a gypsum plant. This study dealt with the two research questions (a) How does succession affect the level of bureaucracy? and (b) What is succession like in terms of a process? The predecessor manager in the study, Old Doug, used a very lenient type of leadership style, which resulted in strong worker loyalty to him, but in low productivity for the company. To reverse this trend of non-acceptable productivity, Old Doug was replaced by Mr. Peele, an individual from outside the organization, who implemented practices that led to considerably increased bureaucratization. Gouldner determined through his study that Peele, as an outsider, had no personal ties nor loyalties and, therefore, had a greater amount of freedom to implement change. Further, Gouldner found that succession was in fact a process. Gouldner failed, however, to fully develop an understanding of these factors in reporting his findings.
While developing a review of the literature on leadership change, Grusky (1960) conjectured that succession leads to disruption and instability within organizations. To be more definitive, in 1961 he performed a quantitative study designed to establish the relationship between organizational size and leadership succession. Securing the names of the largest 26 and smallest 27 Fortune 500 companies, he determined which of these companies had experienced succession and which had not. His conclusion was that there was a relationship between the size of the organization and the frequency of succession in top offices: that is, the larger the organization, the more likely succession had taken place in each of five top positions.

In 1962, Guest performed a qualitative study similar to Gouldner's (Firestone, 1990), examining manager succession in an automobile plant. The intent of this study was to determine whether organizational tensions increase or decrease following manager succession. Findings revealed that the new manager reduced interpersonal conflict and was able to bring recognition to the plant as having outstanding performance.

Grusky (1963) conducted yet another study, this time examining leadership change and its impact on organizational effectiveness. In this study he was interested in determining whether a negative correlation existed between (a) rates of administrative succession and degree of organizational effectiveness, and (b) a change in the rate of administrative succession and a change in organizational effectiveness. He was unable, however, to determine if the primary independent variable was succession or effectiveness. An association existed, but no causality could be determined. Because he believed a more controlled study was necessary, he conducted another research study. In this effort Grusky (1969) attempted to determine the effect of an ally on succession.
Following the hypothesis that if a chosen assistant accompanied him, the successor would experience a more stable situation, two simulated business organizations were established in a laboratory setting, each with three levels, and all with identical formal structures. The conclusion of the study was that with an ally there were "significantly more interlevel alliances and fewer intralevel alliances than succession without an ally" (p. 169).

A few specific studies within the field of education have focused on principal succession. One in particular "appears to have been the foundation for a succession framework in education" (Noonan, 1996, p. 12). Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) took a stage-based framework of Gordon and Rosen (1981), which determined three stages in the succession process (presuccession, succession, and postsuccession), and modified it in order to study what components are involved in principal succession. They concluded that the prearrival stage covered "the reason for the succession, the selection process used to find a successor, the reputation of the successor, and the personal and professional orientations of the successor" (LeGore, 1995, p. 20). The arrival stage covered "the demography of the school; the organizational structure; the school culture; educational programs; the actions taken by the successor; the community and environment; and the overall school effectiveness" (LeGore, 1995, p. 20). Finally, the postarrival stage covered "changes in reputations, or perceptions, orientations, and arrival factors" (LeGore, 1995, p. 21). Each of these stages was carefully developed and emphasized. At the conclusion of their study Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) called for (a) further longitudinal studies because such studies portray the more informal aspects of an organization, (b) actuarial studies because historical records aid in determining
measurable changes consequent to succession, and (c) field experiments because they can account for natural changes among staff.

Fauske and Ogawa (1987) completed a study based on the conceptual framework of Miskel and Cosgrove (1985). This was also a study of school principal succession, but it was limited to the prearrival stage. The purpose was to determine what effect, if any, the predecessor principal and prior events had on the succession. The findings of the study brought to light three recurrent themes regarding teachers' stance in the prearrival stage: (a) detachment (a sense of powerlessness and a minimizing of the succession's importance), (b) fear (of the unknown and a loss of autonomy), and (c) expectation (hoped-for qualities in the successor).

A follow-up study by Ogawa (1991) regarding succession revealed that in making sense of the succession process, teachers in schools where succession took place experienced three stages: (a) enchantment (optimism toward the succession), (b) disenchantment (anger, insecurity, and criticism of the successor), and (c) accommodation (adjustment).

Other studies have examined succession. For example, Miskel and Owens (1983) performed a study to determine the effect of school principal succession on both school coupling (structured linkages) and school effectiveness. Their sample included 89 new principals, a comparable principal control group, 1,658 teachers, and 900 students. Analysis of data from the study revealed that principal succession had no main effect on either school coupling (structured linkages) or school effectiveness.

Rowan and Denk (1984) conducted a study "to determine whether the effects of principal succession on student achievement differ according to the socioeconomic
composition of the school" (LeGore, 1995, p. 32). The authors hypothesized that the context of the school would have an impact on students' achievement when a principal succession occurred. Using longitudinal data from 149 schools in the San Francisco Bay area, the researchers not only found that "leadership changes have different effects in different contexts" (Rowan & Denk, 1984, p. 534), but also that any effects were slow to evidence themselves and were not likely to remain. Researchers concluded, "Principals are only limited actors in a complex programmatic, demographic, and political context" (p. 534).

Organizational Frames

A review of the literature supporting the four organizational frames of Bolman and Deal (1997) is presented below.

The Structural Frame

Meyer (1978) declared "The most reasonable, indeed obvious, succession hypothesis is that change in leadership is associated with change in organizational configurations and processes" (p. 29). In a study conducted by LeGore (1995), for example, the succession of a new principal to the school had considerable positive impact. Her arrival and subsequent establishment of definite structure, which included two-way communication, contrasted sharply with the fragmented structure in place during the predecessor's term.

Considerable research has documented that principals are largely actors inside a social setting responding to situational and contextual characteristics. That research suggests the structure of the school, as well as the social context of the beliefs and attitudes of the district, largely determine what types of behaviors are necessary and appropriate for principals within the context of their schools. (Smith et al., 1992, p. 112)
Dwyer (1985) argued that the context within which a principal works plays a major role in whether s/he is successful, and McCurdy (1983) mentioned structural circumstances within schools as a reason for difficulty many school principals have in implementing what they know to be good practice.

The term “structure” is often perceived as being limiting in nature or as a mere organizational chart, “machine-like and inflexible” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 39). Meadows (1967) described organization as “a function of the problem of order and orderliness” (p. 78). Louis (1980), however, said structure goes beyond “a collection of roles positioned on an organization chart” (p. 232). Bolman and Deal (1997) concurred, declaring that structure could more realistically be perceived as “a blueprint for the pattern of expectations and exchanges among internal players (executives, managers, employees) and external constituencies (customers and clients)” (p. 38). Assumptions underlying the structural frame “reflect a belief in rationality and a faith that the right formal arrangement can minimize problems and increase quality and performance” (p. 39). Grusky (1960) described this formal arrangement as the patterns of interrelationships and hierarchy of the offices in an organization. This structure directs the behavior of the workers within a framework of acceptable practices. This means that some arrangement of roles and relationships is vital to meeting both organizational and individual needs. Not all persons within an organization, for example, are more comfortable and do a better job with an open structure that allows greater latitude, as is often assumed (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Some prefer the increased security of predictability within greater structure.
According to Bolman and Deal (1997), "Every group will evolve structure as its members work together" (p. 96). The structure chosen, according to Meyer (1978), is often associated with leader changes, and as Grusky (1969) pointed out, a look at the history of succession will show simultaneous changes in structure caused by the succession.

Careful and advised decision-making in choosing and/or developing a structure is essential. Bolman and Deal (1997) listed structural imperatives that affect the design of an organization to be size, core technology, environment, goals or strategy, information technology, and the characteristics of its people.

Hart (1985) mentioned size as affecting succession, and Noonan (1996) discussed size as a characteristic of the succession process. Gordon and Becker (1964) saw succession as an issue for organizations only in combination with other variables like the organization’s history. Hart (1993) along with Oskarsson and Klein (1982), on the other hand, thought size has an influence on succession because larger school districts have more administrators. Grusky (1961) and Kriesberg (1962) also believed larger organizations experience succession more frequently. Regarding schools in particular, McCurdy (1983) discovered evidence that a principal’s work is significantly impacted by the size of the school, whether it is elementary, middle/junior, or high school.

Technology is another aspect of structure affected by succession as stated by Bolman and Deal (1997) and Cosgrove (1986). From a positive perspective, Pfeffer (1982) saw the reality of succession as one way to spread technical innovation between organizations. Cosgrove (1986) pointed out that in industry and business the technology used is clear and the results predictable, but as Freeman (1979) observed, it is not that
simple in education circles because learning is the technology, and it is uncertain. It is
difficult if not impossible within the world of education to show why various techniques
work or fail to work.

Another aspect of structure listed as essential by Bolman and Deal (1997) and
Pfeffer and Leblebici (1973) is environment. The environment is one part of the
contextual factors that according to Cosgrove (1986) limit principals’ influence. These
factors include available funding and resources, contractual agreements, laws and
regulations, the state of instructional technology, and community and special interests
demands. Hoy and Miskel (1991) also referred to contextual variables, listing
organizational size, structure and climate, role characteristics, and subordinate
characteristics.

Still another part of structure accounted for by Bolman and Deal (1997) is the
characteristic of its people. Group culture, a personality of sorts that delineates acceptable
behavior and says this is “how we do things and what matters around here” (Louis, 1980)
is one such characteristic. Demographics is another characteristic, including age, sex,
educational level, length of service, race, experience, and maturity (Pfeffer, 1983). Norms
is yet another characteristic. Hart (1985) mentioned environmental norms in a discussion
regarding succession, and Ogawa (1991) stated that organizational norms go a long way
in determining acceptance of the successor within an organization.

As stated earlier, Bolman and Deal (1997) described structure as “a blueprint for
the pattern of expectations and exchanges among internal players (executives, managers,
employees) and external constituencies (such as customers and clients)” (p. 38). Such a
blueprint has been presented here.
The Human Resource Frame

The human resource frame focuses on the interplay between organizations and people, and advocates the notion that "organizations can . . . be energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 102).

This premise points out the importance of the school principal as a human resource in her/his ability to lead the school in educational endeavors and in working with the faculty and parent community. The educational literature abounds with discussions of school-site leadership as an essential ingredient for successful schools (Austin, 1981; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Elmaleh, 1989; Goodlad, 1987; McCurdy, 1983; Melton & Stanavage, 1970; Miskel & Cosgrove, 1984; Ogawa & Hart, 1985). Specifically, McCurdy (1983) believed that "the principalship holds one of the most important keys to excellence in schools" (p. 6). Elmaleh (1989) claimed that "The school principalship has developed into one of the most important positions in our society. Few, if any, people in other professions discharge a role that has a greater impact upon the development of individuals in our society" (p. 5). Referring to the convictions of Sergiovanni, Elmaleh (1989) also asserted, "It is clear that no single person is more key to school effectiveness than the principal, and the deciding factor in determining effectiveness is the leadership he or she brings to the school" (p. 7). McCurdy (1983) insisted that principals are "important to the development of knowledge and practices useful in enhancing the conditions of learning and improving the consequences of teaching for our nation’s youngsters" (p. 9).

The level of competency demonstrated in the school principal’s leadership is vital. "Competency,” as defined by Snyder and Drummond (1988), is “a complex set of
relationships between the principal’s intent and action and resulting intended and unintended outcomes of that action” (p. 48). A second definition by the same researchers is “a complex set of relationships of an individual’s underlying characteristics” (p. 48). They added, “A person’s competencies interact with the demands of the job and the organization’s environment” (Snyder & Drummond, 1988, p. 48). Boyatzis (1982, p. 49) provided the following list of competency characteristics:

1. Motives—repeated interest in the condition of a goal which impels and guides a person.
2. Traits—a characteristic pattern of response to an equivalent set of stimuli.
3. Self-Image—the perception of one’s self and the self-evaluation of the image.
4. Social Role—one’s perception of a set of social norms for behavior that are acceptable and appropriate in the social group or organization.
5. Skill—the ability to demonstrate a system and sequence of behavior that are functionally related to attaining a performance goal.
6. Knowledge—the range of one’s information for understanding.

The term “proficiency” is a synonym for competency. The adjective form, “proficient,” is defined as “highly competent, skilled, adept” (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1991, p. 1074). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP; 1997) delineated a number of proficiencies in its publication Proficiencies for Principals. Designed for and used by elementary school principals nationwide, these proficiencies were determined through research findings and the practical experience of acting school principals to encompass those elements that will “help assure the best possible leadership for our nation’s elementary and middle schools” (p. v).

The document presents its espoused beliefs by beginning with four fundamental prerequisites: (a) advanced skills in the teaching and learning processes, (b) a thorough understanding of practical applications of child growth and development, (c) a solid background in the liberal arts, and (d) a sincere commitment to children’s welfare and
progress. Supporting comments for these prerequisites come from a variety of sources. Austin (1981) claimed that successful school principals tend to have been prepared as teachers and that exemplary schools have principals who have more advanced training. McCurdy (1983) included in his listing of personal characteristics for strong leadership qualities in school principals a high level of academic achievement in college. Kline (1985) mentioned both demonstrating a commitment to academic goals and creating a climate of high expectations as behaviors seen in exemplary principals.

One category of proficiencies named by NAESP (1997) is leadership proficiencies, including: (a) Leadership Behavior—The schools of proficient principals are marked by collegiality and a sense of common purpose (p. 6); (b) Communication Skills—The image the principal projects affects how students, staff, parents, and the community perceive the school (p. 8); (c) Group Processes—The proficient principal mobilizes others to collaborate in solving problems and accomplishing school goals (p. 9); (d) Curriculum and Instruction—The proficient principal facilitates the establishment of a curriculum framework that provides direction for teaching and learning (p. 10); and (e) Assessment—The proficient principal uses assessment to improve the school’s programs and services. These proficiencies are echoed in the writings of other researchers. For example, in discussing a collegial model of school leadership, Kline (1985) included the strategy of consulting with others. McCurdy (1983) noted in another study that one characteristic of strong leadership qualities is a high degree of interpersonal skill. He further noted “that a cooperative spirit was necessary to bring out the best in a teaching staff” (p. 23), and said that “Today’s effective principals show strength through their ability to persuade teachers, students, and parents to move ahead
with them and to inspire with enthusiasm and skill” (p. 23). Blase (1995) reported as a major factor accounting for principal success the assumption of a very proactive leadership orientation. Finally, McCabe and Compton (1974) included human resources communications in a list of competencies their research has led them to believe should be taught in university preparation programs.

Another category of proficiencies listed by NAESP (1997) is that of Administrative/Management, including: (a) Organizational Management—The origins of a school’s organization lie in its shared beliefs, mission, and goals (p. 15); (b) Fiscal Management—For proficient principals, sound fiscal management begins with the establishment of program goals and objectives (p. 17); and (c) Political Management—The proficient principal understands the dynamics of local, state, and national political decision making (p. 18). Collaborating evidence is provided by: (a) Smith et al. (1992), who included the defining of goals and mission of the school in a listing of essentials vital to effective leadership; (b) Kline (1985), who declared that two proficiencies often listed as behaviors of principals in successful schools include a commitment to academic goals and functioning as an instructional leader, and referred to marshaling resources as a behavior of exemplary principals; (c) The American Association of School Administrators (AASA, cited in Southern Regional Education Board, 1986), who published a list of competencies for school leaders, which includes planning and implementing an instructional management system, and referred to managing finances, materials, and human resources as skills of high performing leaders; and (d) McCurdy (1983), who named coordinating instruction and providing instructional support through
an emphasis on instruction to be among strategies principals employ when effectively moving their schools toward excellence.

McCurdy (1983) made several pertinent remarks regarding principal competence. First he cited a study referring to successful schools that establish clear goals followed by staff development as resulting from the principal’s leadership. He also mentioned an Indiana University study where principals in 59 successful schools were said to understand the school’s instructional program thoroughly and to make this issue their first priority. Finally, he quoted Nancy J. Pitner of the Center for Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon as saying, “Principals are effective when they direct the activities of teachers and students toward attainment of goals” (p. 11). Fowler (1991) included, in a list of six leadership behaviors consistently associated with well-managed and high-achieving schools, the setting of instructional strategies with frequent evaluations of student progress and the coordinating of instructional programs. Duke (1982) noted that principals must closely monitor student progress to know the effectiveness of the instruction. Similarly, Smith et al. (1992) asserted that overseeing curriculum, supervising teachers, and monitoring student progress should be listed among strategies used by effective principals.

A significant advancement has been the recent development of standards for effective educational leadership by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), under direction from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO; Shipman, Topps, & Murphy, 1998).

Another aspect of succession and the human resource frame is the socialization process. Hart (1991) pointed out that “the mainstream of succession research remains
focused on the individual leader—his or her action, beliefs, and possible effects on organization performance” (p. 452). Referring to studies by Brown (1982b), Gordon and Rosen (1981), Miskel and Cosgrove (1985), Rowan and Denk (1984), and Ogawa and Hart (1985), Hart stated that their studies “reveal only that succession may affect school performance, not how these effects occur” (p. 452). In contrast to such succession studies regarding the effect leaders have on school performance, socialization studies consider the effect other members of an organization have in shaping the behavior of the principal.

Clarifying the differences between and showing the need for both succession and socialization perspectives, Hart (1991) asserted that the two views are “the same events and processes from very different perspectives” and that and that “each have advantages” (p. 452). She further explained that socialization, through interactions between individuals and groups, investigates social role learning. Continuing, she noted that socialization “often attends most carefully to the impact of the group on the individual—no matter how powerful or important that person might be. It also reveals how these interactions shape outcomes” (p. 452).

Louis (1980) approached the realities raised by Hart (1991) in a similar fashion, discussing “turnover” and “socialization.” Turnover deals with unrealistic expectations and unmet expectations, both of which focus on the role of expectations and an assumption of rationality. Socialization deals with characteristics, stages, content, and practices. She provided a model for dealing with the entry of a school principal into the succession process. Briefly, upon entry into an organization new to them, principals experience change, contrast, and surprise. To attribute meaning to these experiences,
they employ the interpretations of acquaintances, local interpretation schemes, personal predispositions and purposes, and past experiences. Having employed these sense-making strategies, principals can select certain behavioral responses and update their expectations and view of the setting within which they work (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2.** A model (Louis, 1980) for dealing with the entry of a school principal into the succession process.

As stated earlier, the human resource frame focuses on the interplay between organizations and people. The concepts presented here demonstrate that interplay.

**The Political Frame**

The political frame “views organizations as ‘alive and screaming’ political arenas that house a complex variety of individual and group interests” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 163). This frame portrays the perspective that enduring differences and scarce resources...
are often a part of organizations, and that these realities contribute to conflict among the individuals of a group. Thus, power becomes a key resource. According to Cosgrove (1986), "succession offers an excellent opportunity to study the mechanisms of power and influence in schools" (p. 33).

Three considerations are important in understanding the political frame (Bolman & Deal, 1997). First, power takes eight significant forms: (a) position power (authority); (b) information and expertise; (c) control of awards; (d) coercion; (e) alliances and networks; (f) access to and control of agendas; (g) control of meaning and symbols; and (h) personal power. The reality of so many forms of power limits leaders, and decisions are most safely made in "zones of indifference" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 171) when people seldom care strongly about issues.

Second, conflict in the political frame is not considered a negative as it may be, for example, in the structural frame. It does not necessarily need resolution. Rather, strategy and tactics become the focus (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Third, an issue of moral mazes is best summed up by Jackall (1988): "Wise and ambitious managers resist the lulling platitudes of unity, though they invoke them with fervor, and look for the inevitable clash of interests beneath the bouncy, cheerful surface of corporate life" (p. 37). Bolman and Deal (1997) further clarified this "maze" by stating, "Moving up the ladder inevitably involves competition for the scarce resource of status" (p. 173).

The principalship is an ever-increasing political arena. Belief in the principal’s competency and influence is coming under increasing scrutiny. For example, Reitzug (1991) noted, "While many of us were raised in an age when the formal roles of parent,
teacher, clergy, police, or principal commanded immediate respect and reflexive compliance, the external environment that spawned and nurtured this kind of authority has changed dramatically” (p. 70). McCurdy (1983) insisted that the effort of principals to implement practices they know to be viable is restrained by political, conduct, and organizational factors intrinsic within schools. Dwyer (1984) concurred, noting that leaders lead within the limits determined by the context and are largely swept along by it. Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) referred to the realities of the environment that limit leader influence.

The succession process is full of uncertainty and inconsistency, thereby opening the door for political agendas. Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) observed as a common thread among administrative research that “administrative succession leads to instability and conflict which, in turn, should influence organizational processes and performance” (p. 3). They also noted that succession “is a disruptive event because it changes the lines of communication, realigns relationships of power, impacts decision-making, and generally disturbs the equilibrium of normal activities” (p. 4). “The changes succession brings can center around the personal and leadership style of the successor, re-define work and social patterns, establish new networks of communication within the school and with the environment, and open members’ minds to new possibilities” (Hart, 1985, p. 4).

Various studies on succession involve issues with political implications. One such study is that of Gordon and Rosen (1981), which LeGore (1995) argued provided the basis for several later studies in the educational arena. Desiring to integrate previous studies, Gordon and Rosen (1981) designed a stage-based succession model that postulated investigation of the factors surrounding presuccession, succession, and
postsuccession. Specifically, this model requires examination of events some time prior to the arrival and assumption of duties by the successor and concludes when the successor is no longer considered new. During this time period, "group members make judgments regarding the accuracy of their expectation for and perceptions of the new leader" (LeGore, 1995, p. 10). Group members also observe the manner in which the successor takes and develops her/his power. Gordon and Rosen (1981) contended that these events are greatly affected by the reason for succession, by the personality of the predecessor, and by the selection process used in selecting the successor.

Another area with political implications is status degradation, the denouncing of a leader as viable for her/his position and taking the necessary steps to replace her/him (Gephart, 1978, p. 559). Studies regarding status degradation outside the field of education have served as the basis for a number of subsequent studies within education (LeGore, 1995). Gephart (1978, p. 559) conducted one such study and found that four requirements in an ideal status degradation process are:

1) A deviant (rule-violating) activity and a perpetrator be identified.
2) Violated rules be shown to derive from values the group considers to be ultimate in nature.
3) A denouncer emerges and becomes a public figure supporting these ultimate values on behalf of the group.
4) The perpetrator, defined as a deviant motivational type preferring not just one deviant act, but deviant acts in general.

In one of the earliest efforts at such research, Gephart (1978) studied himself as predecessor and the circumstances leading up to his "degradation" and the ultimate selection of his successor. Through these means he hoped to determine group members' sense-making processes. His study revealed the development of a status degradation process wherein the members determine standards and norms violated by the predecessor.
The five stages of this process served as a way to determine what they wanted in a successor. Stage 1 includes initially denouncing the predecessor as an offender, indicating what the offense is, and proposing the resignation of the predecessor as the rectification for the problem. Stage 2 involves the determination of the “facts” of the situation and agreeing on an interpretational scheme that warrants degradation. Stage 3 involves determination of the next steps toward replacement of the predecessor. Stage 4 involves the actual degradation motion and passage by voting. Finally, Stage 5 involves selecting the successor.

Ideas and studies such as these demonstrate the political arenas as having a “complex web of individual and group interest” as stated by Bolman and Deal (1997, p. 163).

The Symbolic Frame

Equating organizational life to a “complex, constantly changing, organic pinball machine” (p. 217), Bolman and Deal (1997) suggested that organizations are more fluid than linear. This frame suggests that the “acts” in our social world are of human construction and that humans use symbolism to reveal “meaning in chaos, clarity in confusion, and predictability in mystery” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 219). Smircich (1983) noted that anthropologists sometimes deal with groups of people as systems having shared meanings or symbols, and that in order to explain those systems, anthropologists link symbols meaningfully to activities. Bolman and Deal (1995) attempted to bring this concept alive in their book Leading with Soul. Dealing with the symbolism of the term “soul,” they referred to an understanding of soul as “personal and unique—grounded in the depths of personal experience” (p. 9). In describing efforts to
"connect with readers on an uncommon journey" and "searching for new ways to infuse secular organizations with soul and spirit," the authors said "Both are hard to talk about. They are elusive, ethereal, and subject to widely differing interpretations" (p. 559).

Succession has its own symbolisms which are difficult to describe and explain. Succession is more correctly depicted as a process than an event. Hart (1985) described her own succession experience as "a process transforming that stiff acknowledgment of power into a web of social bonds" (p. 4). According to Thiemann (1968), "The drama of succession is not a single point in time. . . . It occurs and has myriad consequences. . . ." (p. 2).

Reasons for succession that bring their own symbolisms are diverse. For example, Hart (1985) listed death, promotion, retirement, and poor performance as prominent causes for succession. "No predecessor knows when or under what conditions the office will be passed on. Nor can he be certain who will succeed him, the results of the succession, or its final end" (Thiemann, 1968, p. 2).

Stone (1992), who noted the use of symbols by transformational principals in particular, pointed out that transformational principals transform their schools by constructing cultural linkages such as building behavioral norms, using symbols, defining the school mission, and fostering staff leadership. "The use of symbols and mottoes, for example, are often part of the leader's repertoire of inspirational practices which increase awareness of mutually desired goals" (Stone, 1992, p. 3). While it would be misleading to define transformational leadership as totally symbolic, there is much about this philosophy that embodies symbolism. One aspect of Mitchell's (1991) orientation theory is "typification," in which "cultural norms and ideas serve to segment experience, to
separate the important from the trivial, the fulfilling from the frustrating, the potent from the impotent”... Typification is, in short, the norm and value generating aspect of culture” (p. 227). He noted further that cultural typification closely parallels transformational leadership.

Recognizing the connection between school culture and symbolism, Liethwood, Jantzi, and Fernandez (1993) suggested that school leaders make it a priority “to consciously attend to the content, strength and form of their school’s culture” (p. 24). Pfeffer (1978, 1981) went so far as to claim that a leader’s primary function is to interpret the symbolic realm of her/his organization.

Sheive and Schoenheit (1987) made a passionate appeal with regard to symbolism and symbolic leadership when they asserted that the ability of symbolic leaders to communicate intent and meaning is more important than the behaviors they exhibit and the activities in which they participate. The authors further pointed out that within the instructional setting, activities gain their meaning from the culture of the school—the culture creates a symbolic bridge between activities and outcomes. Further, outside the school, in the community, the culture creates a symbolic appearance that summons faith and conviction among the stakeholders. Committed principals must be willing and ready to provide symbolic leadership and to develop cultures with new traditions and new and original organizational stories. To accomplish this, they must use a variety of symbols such as oral and written words, time, attention, and personal presence to consistently accentuate the desired goals. Symbolic leaders articulate and create within the organization a vision that stirs and drives all actions within the school and communicate clearly to the organization how to realize its chief, overriding values.
Finally, Bass (1990) articulated the support necessary for such symbolism to affect change and the desired direction: “Napoleon declared that an army of rabbits commanded by a lion could do better than an army of lions commanded by a rabbit” (p. 24). He went on to say, “Organizational policy needs to support an understanding and appreciation of the maverick who is willing to take unpopular positions, who knows when to reject the conventional wisdom, and who takes reasonable risks” (pp. 26-27).

In these ways humans use symbolism to reveal “meaning in chaos, clarity in confusion, and predictability in mystery” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 219).

Traits Evident During School Principal Succession

A review of the literature supporting the three traits evident during the succession is presented below.

Predecessor Status

Predecessor status refers to the effect the predecessor’s leave-taking has on the succession process. Thiemann (1968) succinctly pointed out “No predecessor knows when or under what conditions the office will be passed on. Nor can he be certain who will succeed him, the results of the succession, or its final end” (p. 2). What is certain according to Grusky (1960), however, is that succession occurs for either environmental reasons (death, illness, or movement to a more advantageous position) or organizationally controlled causes (promotion, demotion, or dismissal). Hart (1985) listed death, promotion, retirement and poor performance as prominent causes for succession, and Gephart (1978) listed death, retirement, forced removal, voluntary resignation, or promotion, transfer or advancement as reasons for the processor’s leave-taking.
Although other aspects of a predecessor's influence are mentioned, such as personality (Gordon & Rosen, 1981), style and behavior (Weindling & Early, 1987; Daresh, 1993), strength or weakness (Rieger, 1995), and tenure (LeGore, 1995), the reason for the predecessor's leaving receives the most attention in the literature (Gephart, 1978, Gordon & Rosen, 1981, Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985). If the predecessor's leaving (such as death, illness, or moving away) prevents contact between her/him and the successor, then transfer of the predecessor's knowledge and understanding is restricted. Conversely, if the predecessor remains accessible, more stable conditions are likely. In the event, however, that the predecessor remains in the area and has been promoted, the successor may remain in his shadow and experience difficulty establishing her/his own authority.

Succession Source

Succession source refers to the origin of the successor's entry to a position, and a significant amount of research has been done in this area. That succession is of high importance is substantiated by numerous researchers (Cosgrove, 1986; Fauske & Ogawa, 1987; Gordon & Rosen, 1981; LeGore, 1995; LeGore & Parker, 1997; Noonan, 1996; Whatley, 1994). "When current members of the hiring organization are promoted, they are said to be insiders. When successors are selected from an entirely separate organization, they are outsiders" (Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985).

Whether it is better to enter an organization from inside or outside is debatable. Daum (1975) and Birnbaum (1971) noted that promotion from inside can be problematic because insiders who applied unsuccessfully for the job may harbor resentment. Cosgrove (1986) concurred, saying that when organizations train employees to fill
upcoming vacancies, surpluses develop, resulting in frustrated and unhappy employees or the loss of the individuals trained. Because of this reality many organizations hire outsiders from comparable institutions, thus side-stepping the insider/outsider conflict. While no research has yet supported the concept, Caplow (1983, who referred to insiders as place-bound, and outsiders as career-bound) suggested looking at the two successor sources from the perspective of the strength of the predecessor. Thus, he hypothesized that insider success would be unfavorable when following a strong predecessor, and uncertain when following a weak predecessor. If the successor were an outsider, on the other hand, Caplow predicted moderately favorable success if the predecessor were strong, and very favorable if the predecessor were weak.

According to Whatley (1994) whether an outsider or an insider is appointed rests on a number of contingencies including the tenure of the predecessor, organizational performance, successor’s leadership style, growth in the organization’s major field, and organizational size.

Experience

In this study experience refers to the time spent in school administration. Experience is mentioned with some frequency and at times with other traits in succession literature, but explanation or discussion is either absent or quite brief at best. Two studies that deal with the subject at least to some extent are Hart (1991) and Macmillan (1993). Hart (1991) referred to experience in the phrase: “Talents, preferences, traits, and experiences from the personal context in which succession occurs” (p. 462), then pointed out that some researchers “focus on the career as an unfolding evolutionary process; some rely on psychological theories of adult development, and some synthesize adult and
career perspective” (p. 462). Macmillan (1993) conducted a study in which length of experience was considered. The conclusion was that experience in the succession process may influence the willingness of the successor to act as a change agent.

This study pursued this trait from the standpoint of length of time spent in school administration and thereby added to the literature.

Survey Instruments

One of the most frequently used methods for collecting data of this nature is a self-report measure such as the survey (Babbie, 1983; Moore, 1983). Purposes of surveys include description, explanation, and exploration (Babbie, 1983). “Survey research is probably the best method available to the social scientist in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly. . . . Surveys are also excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population” (Babbie, 1983, p. 209).

According to Haack (1995), surveys are generally of a descriptive nature, and are used to collect data from large population samples at a particular point in time. Such surveys, Haack (1995) contended, often become essential steps leading to procedural improvement based on current activity status. In fact, he claimed that surveys are the most frequently used method of securing knowledge regarding current practice and that surveys produce factual information versus opinion. Even qualitative research, which could be greatly beneficial to an understanding of subjects such as principal succession, is best performed following the gathering of basic data such as that in this study. It is for these reasons that the survey method was chosen for this study.
Survey research frequently employs the questionnaire (Haack, 1995). A questionnaire gathers information through a form filled out by the respondent(s). This type of research assumes that the respondent is willing and able to provide truthful answers. Berdie and Anderson (1974) presented particular advantages of questionnaire surveys, and Anderson (1986) summarized critical developments, issues and trends impacting survey research.

Construction of a reliable questionnaire requires much consideration. For example, Berdie and Anderson (1974) noted that because there is no personal interaction with the respondent in questionnaire surveys, it is vital to ensure clarity of meaning. These authors also pointed out that the respondent may be hesitant to do research for answers to questionnaires, but may have forgotten factual information from the past. Consequently, it is advisable to devise questions that the respondent can answer from direct knowledge, knowledge that can be ascertained from no other source.

Wang (1993) provided principles that underlie skillful questionnaire construction, with further considerations for questionnaire construction given by Haack (1995).

To comply with these recommendations, a particular type of self-reporting instrument must be chosen. Moore (1983) noted the Likert scale (Likert, 1934) is one of the most frequently used self-report methods for such purposes. One reason for the prevalence of this scale in questionnaires is its flexibility and the fact that it can be constructed more easily than most other perception or attitude scales (Hopkins & Stanley, 1981). Through clear directions and a mixture of positive and negative questions and statements, respondents are able to manifestly indicate their beliefs (Wang, 1993).
Statistical Measures

A review of the literature regarding statistical measures used in the study are presented below.

Reliability

A reliability analysis is conducted to study the properties of measurement scales and their items and determine internal consistency. Additionally, it provides information about the relationships between individual items and the scale. The model of internal consistency used in this study was Cronbach Alpha (Cronbach, 1951), which is based on average inter-item correlation.

Discriminant Analysis

Discriminant analysis is conducted to classify individuals into groups based on one or more measure, or to distinguish groups based on linear combinations of measures (Huberty, 1994). This procedure was used to predict values of categorical dependent variables based on a set of continuous independent variables. Each case in a discriminant analysis “must have a score or scores on one or more quantitative variables and a value on a classification variable that indicates group membership measures” (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 2000, p. 278). Discriminant analysis was used in this study to determine differences among the four reasons for leaving.

Summary

Although administrator succession has been studied extensively (Argyris, 1964; Cosgrove, 1986; Fauske & Ogawa, 1978; Gephart, 1978; Hart, 1988, in press; Louis, 1980, 1985), succession research in education circles is sparse when compared to research in other institutions (Fauske & Ogawa, 1987).
From an historical perspective we learn that the trend for principals has been away from the classroom and instructional supervision and toward professional management (McCurdy, 1983; Parker, 1978; Pellicer et al., 1981). The present reality of the principalship is no panacea, with daily expectations of principal becoming increasingly ponderous. Fragmentation, brevity, verbal communication, physical movement, one-on-one interactions, interruptions, and crises are descriptors of the principalship listed by McCurdy (1983).

Bolman and Deal (1997) assured us that all organizations adopt structures, and Smith et al. (1992) indicated that the type of structure a school adopts will determine "what types of behaviors are necessary and appropriate for principals within the context of their schools" (p. 112). According to the premise of the human resource frame "organizations can . . . be energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 102), and McCurdy (1983) proposed the idea that leadership is the catalyst for such realities in successful schools. Bolman and Deal (1997) attested in the political frame that enduring differences and scarce resources contribute to conflict among the various individuals in an organization. McCurdy (1983) concurred by saying that efforts of principals are restrained by political, conduct, and organizational factors found in schools. Finally, Bolman and Deal (1997) awakened us to the necessity of symbolism in clarifying chaos, confusion, and mystery, while Hart (1985) listed a number of specific reasons for succession that require symbolism for making meaning during the succession process.

Regarding predecessor status, Gordon and Rosen (1981) noted that the reason for the predecessor’s leaving had a definite effect on the successor’s entry into an
organization. Whatley (1994) discussed succession source, and noted that whether an outsider or an insider is appointed rests on a number of contingencies including the tenure of the predecessor, organizational performance, successor's leadership style, growth in the organization's major field, and organizational size. Although experience, referring to the time spent in school administration, is mentioned at various times with other traits in succession literature (Hart 1991; Macmillan, 1993), discussion of it is limited. Hopefully this study will add to the literature in this area.

These realities collectively provided ample reason for a further study of principal succession. The historical perspective provided the backdrop for a new study as outlined in Chapter III. The four organizational frames and the three traits evident during school principal succession furnished the groundwork for developing a method of study. References to and discussion regarding survey instruments and measuring techniques guided the creating of a structure for looking into the realities surrounding school principal succession.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Administrator succession has been studied extensively (Argyris, 1964; Cosgrove, 1986; Fauske & Ogawa, 1987; Gephart, 1978; Hart, 1988, in press; Louis, 1980, 1985). However, this study dealt specifically with school principal succession. With half of the nation’s practicing principals retiring by the end of the century (Whatley, 1994), concern is growing that current organizational entry practices fail to adequately transition successor principals into new positions (Louis, 1980). Consequently, it is important for educational organizations to continue focusing on principal succession (LeGore, 1995).

The intent of this study was to provide further insight into the realities of principal succession and to set the stage for further study in the future.

This section provides a description of the research methods used to conduct this study. It is divided into four segments: the purpose, the subjects, instrument development, and data collection.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between four organizational frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997; structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) and three traits noted in the literature as evident during school principal succession (predecessor status, succession source, and experience), thereby answering the following questions:

1. As a function of the predecessor’s reason for leaving, what differences will there be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?
2. What differences will there be between successors from outside the district and successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

3. As a function of the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position, what relationship will there be with the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

4. What are the relationships among the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

**Instrument Development**

There were three steps in the development of the survey instrument.

**Step 1: Basis for the Study**

In order to provide the a basis for the study, information was compiled from two sources. First, an in-depth study of current literature regarding principal succession was conducted. Second, 15 Kansas principals currently serving as school-site administrators were interviewed regarding the realities they encountered during their succession experience. These 15 constitute a convenience sample according to their availability during summer hours, and to represent both elementary, middle (or junior high), and secondary interests. Understandings gained during the review of the literature and responses recorded during the interviews were the basis for the design of a data-collecting instrument.
Step 2: Questionnaire Design

The method designed to collect data for this study was a questionnaire. Questions were based on the interview responses from of the 15 principals and from understandings gained in the literature review. Demographic questions were included. After the questions were written, Dr. George Crawford, Professor at the University of Kansas, assisted in narrowing the number of questions and eliminating overlap within the four frames. The format for answering these questions was a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following choices: 5 = Very Significant, 4 = Significant, 3 = Moderate, 2 = Insignificant, 1 = Very Insignificant. The questionnaire, presented in Appendix A, was composed of 10 questions for each of the four organizational frames, listed randomly throughout the questionnaire (Appendix B shows the questionnaire items listed by organizational frames). To restrict the number of questions to 10 per organizational frame, the questionnaire was sent to five professional educators (see Appendix C), who were asked to rate the questions as to the likelihood that each represented the frames it was listed for. Adjustments were made and the number of questions for each frame limited to 10.

Step 3: Piloting of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was piloted to improve the grammar and clarity of the questionnaire items for the purpose of validation. Because all the principals who entered the principalship in Kansas during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years were included in the proposed study, six principals who entered the principalship during the same time frame in the neighboring state of Iowa (which represents Midwestern norms and standards similar to those of Kansas) were chosen for the pilot. The Iowa principals
involved in the pilot were chosen from two elementary schools, two junior high schools, and two senior high schools. Based on contributions received from pilot participants, wording in two questions was changed. Specifically, concern was expressed regarding a common understanding of the term “provencialism (Item 7);” consequently a definitional phrase was inserted in parentheses immediately following the word, so that the sentence read: “The prominence of provincialism (deeply ingrained local beliefs) in the school community was….” Likewise in Item 35, concern was expressed regarding a common understanding of the term “sanctioned;” consequently, the word was changed to “legitimate,” so that the sentence read “The time it took me to know the people with legitimate power, both stated and unstated, has been….”

**Step 4. Human Subjects Review**

An application to do the research, including the questionnaire, was sent to and approval was obtained from the Human Subjects Committee at the University of Northern Iowa.

**Subjects**

The names of 550 principals who succeeded during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years were received from the Kansas State Department of Education. Of those 550 names, 63 did not return a competed questionnaire, 6 were undeliverable, 42 were non-fits (not meeting the criteria, i.e., followed no predecessor), 27 were incomplete because the respondents failed to fill in the second page of the survey, leaving a total of 412 (268 males and 144 females). The total of 412 divided by the 550 actually mailed provided a response rate of 75%. Such a substantial response rate provided support for making inferences about the principal population in the state of Kansas.
Data Collection

The following steps delineate the sequence followed in implementing the data collection process.

Step 1. This step involved the initial mailing of the survey instrument to 550 successor principals. This mailing consisted of the questionnaire, an explanatory cover letter, and a stamped, return-addressed envelope. The recipients were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it within two weeks. As in any survey, maximum participation was encouraged. To facilitate a high return rate, each questionnaire was numerically coded to facilitate follow-up actions. Individual responses were held in strictest confidence.

Step 2. The first follow-up contact was a postcard mailed to all participants after 14 days, thanking those who have returned the questionnaire, and reminding those who had not yet responded to do so.

Step 3. Approximately four weeks after the first follow-up, a second follow-up was mailed to those not responding. They received a new, personalized cover letter, a questionnaire, and a stamped, return-addressed envelope.

Step 4. It was decided that a third mailing was unnecessary as will be explained later.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

It was the purpose of this study to examine the relationship between four organizational frames delineated by Bolman and Deal (1997; structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) and three traits noted in the literature as evident during school principal succession (predecessor status, succession source, and experience). A questionnaire, designed to represent the four frames, was used to survey all public school successor principals in the state of Kansas who succeeded another principal during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years.

Demographic Data

Three demographic questions were included in the survey (see Table 1) based on the three traits evident during school principal succession which supported the design of the study, namely predecessor status, succession source, and experience, were included in the survey.

As was noted in Chapter III, the decision was made to divide the Predecessor Status into four categories (see Appendix B). It can be seen in Table 1 that those in the Death/Retirement, Promoted/Transferred, and Different District categories were approximately the same size. The remaining 17.2% were in the “other” category, which accounted for a variety of less common reasons for leaving the principalship, such as being terminated or becoming incapacitated.

In the Successor Source, more successors from outside the district (N = 232) assumed positions than from inside (N = 180).
In the trait for Administrative Experience, the experience category with the most frequently occurring score is 1-5 years, and those respondents with no experience (meaning they are in their first principalship) were the second largest group.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predecessor Status (Reason for leaving)</td>
<td>Death/Retirement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion/Transfer</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different district</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor Source</td>
<td>Inside the school district</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside the school district</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Experience</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11+ years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics

Questionnaire Items

Certain information is gleaned by studying the frequencies of responses to the survey questions. Appendix D displays the frequency of responses to questions by the organizational frames used in the study. The name of the variable is given for each table. For each of the five categories, the percent responding is shown. Although the omitting by some respondents of one or more items on the survey caused the number for each question to be slightly smaller than 412, the number of missing values is not considered to be of major concern.

Histograms are also shown. In the Structural Frame it can be noticed that with the exception of Q28, the most frequently occurring score is 3 or 4, thereby approximating a reasonably normal distribution. Within the Human Resource Frame, with the exception of Q17, the most frequently occurring score is 4, which, again, approximates a reasonably normal distribution. Both the Political and Symbolic Frames show the most frequently occurring score to be 3 or 4, which as stated previously, approximates a reasonably normal distribution.

Missing Data Procedure

In order to deal with the issue of missing data points, total scores were created for participants who answered at least 9 of the 10 questions within each frame through a procedure which substitutes “the mean of the nonmissing ratings for the missing rating and summing the . . . nonmissing ratings and the substituted value for the missing rating” (Green et al., 2000, p. 106).
A process for evaluating the reliability, or internal consistency, of the total score and the contribution of individual questionnaire items within each of the four frames was implemented. The purpose of the internal consistency is to discard any item that did not meet the reliability test. The process used was the Cronbach Alpha procedure in the SPSS software program because the items were scored polychotomously, meaning for this study the use of a 1-5 rating scale. Based on the reliability values using this procedure, a determination was made to retain or discard items.

The Cronbach Alpha procedure used for determining internal consistency of questions showed the alpha for the Structural frame to be .50. Question #12 had the lowest item-total correlation and was therefore a candidate for elimination. After examining Question #12 in relation to the other questions in the frame, it was concluded that the content of Question #12, dealing with state-initiated issues, was not consistent with the content of the other 11 questions, whose content dealt with locally initiated issues. Question #12 was therefore eliminated, with a subsequent alpha computed at .52.

The Cronbach Alpha was also applied to the Human Resource frame, the Political frame, and the Symbolic frame. On the basis of this procedure, it was decided to eliminate Question #3 from the Human Resource frame with a resulting alpha of .56, Question #22 from the Political frame with a resulting alpha of .61, and Question #6 from the Symbolic frame with a resulting alpha of .61.

As shown in Appendix B, the questions in the survey represented each of the four organizational frames. For each of the four frames a summary score was created by summing the scores from each of the nine items that pertained to that frame. The mean and standard deviation for each frame was then calculated. Finding the mean for each
frame meant determining the arithmetic average of the summary score for each respondent for that frame. Table 2 shows the results of this procedure. The fact that the means of all the frames range between 3 and 4 and are fairly evenly balanced, and that all have comparable standard deviations, indicates an appropriate and accurate measure of centrality.

Means and standard deviations are further represented by histograms and Q-Q plots for each frame in Appendix E. Each histogram shows the distribution of a single questionnaire item. The histograms include an imposed normal distribution curve to provide a clearer picture of whether the histogram does in fact resemble a normal curve. A normal curve presents a symmetrical bell shape, where most of the scores cluster around the center, with the frequency of the scores falling off as they approach the tail of the curve. The mean, median, and mode all fall at precisely the same point, the center. A Q-Q plot accompanies each histogram. In this plot, values of an individual variable are plotted against expected values if the sample were from a normal distribution. If the sample does represent a normal distribution, points will cluster around a straight line. In this study the observed distribution of the imposed normal distribution curves on the histograms and the clustering of points close to the straight line on Q-Q plots provide reason to assume that the data within each frame show an approximately normal distribution.
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations Within Each Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Differences

Research Question 1

As a function of the predecessor's reason for leaving, what differences will there be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

Research Hypothesis 1

As a function of the predecessor's reason for leaving, there will be differences in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic).

Table 3 shows the Predecessor Status categories. For each Predecessor Status category the mean, standard deviation, and N are given.

As discussed in Chapter II, a method for looking at differences between groups was needed. To this purpose, discriminant analysis was used to distinguish among the four categories of the Predecessor Status using the four frames as predictor variables. As
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seen in Table 3, for all four frames the group to having the lowest mean of the four frames is the group of predecessors who left to go to a different district.

Table 3

**Predecessor Status Group Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predecessor Status Categories</th>
<th>Death/Retirement</th>
<th>Promotion/Transfer</th>
<th>Different/District</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first discriminant function accounted for 84.30% of the variance in the frames. Because this was the dominant function, it is the only one to be discussed. Table 4 presents the structural matrix which shows the correlation between the information provided by each frame and the information provided by the first discriminant function. We can conclude that the function that distinguishes between the categories within the Predecessor Status trait tends to correlate with the Symbolic and Political frames. Consequently, it appears that Research Hypothesis 1 is supported.
Table 4

Predecessor Status Structural Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05.

Research Question 2

What differences will there be between successors from outside the district and successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

Research Hypothesis 2

There will be a difference between successors from outside the district and successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic).

In Table 5 the Succession Source categories are shown. For each category the mean, standard deviation, and N are given. A statistical comparison between the Inside mean and the Outside mean, an independent sample t-test, yielded the p values shown. Clearly, the Structural, Human Resource, and Symbolic frames are not significant at p < .05. In the Political frame there is a significance of p < .07. Because this significance
level is in close neighborhood to $p < .05$, for this study $p < .07$ was considered an interpretable difference. According to Cohen (1988) this is a "small effect size" (p. 25), meaning that the impact on the importance of the Political frame of succeeding from different sources (inside versus outside) is small, yet still interpretable. The difference between the Political frame mean for the inside successor category (3.63) and the Political frame mean for the outside successor category (3.56) is 0.07 (not to be confused with $p < .07$). This mean difference of 0.07 indicates that the Political frame is more important to the inside successors than to the outside successors. Consequently, it appears that Research Hypothesis 2 is supported.

Table 5

Succession Source Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Succession Source Categories</th>
<th>Inside</th>
<th>Outside</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3

How is the perceived importance of each of the four frames (Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Structural) related to the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position?

Research Hypothesis 3

The perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) is related to the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position.

Group statistics, the means and standard deviations for each frame within each of four categories in the Administrative Experience trait are shown in Table 6. The Administrative Experience categories were recoded 1 through 4, respectively. The r values are the correlations between the Administrative Experience categories and the mean values. The resulting p values are also shown for each frame.

The Structural, Human Resource, and Political frames are not significantly correlated with the Administrative Experience trait at the p < .05 level. In the Symbolic frame, the correlation (r = .09) represents a "small effect size" with a significance of p = .06 (Cohen, 1988, p. 76). However, this significance level is in close neighborhood to p < .05 and was therefore considered interpretable for this study. This means that the relationship between years of Administrative Experience and importance of the Symbolic frame is small yet meaningful. It can be seen that the respondents' valuing of the Symbolic frame increases as the number of years of administrative experience increases. Consequently, it appears that Research Hypothesis 3 is supported.
Table 6

Administrative Experience Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

What are the relationships among the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

Research Hypothesis 4

There will be significant relationships among the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic).

As shown in Table 7, all of the frames were moderately correlated with one another at the $p < .01$ level. The Structural, Political, and Symbolic frames were all positively correlated with each other, while the Human Resource frame was negatively correlated with the other three frames. Consequently, it appears that Research Hypothesis 4 is supported. The relationships represented by these correlations are discussed in Chapter V.
Table 7

Correlations Among the Four Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>-0.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < 05. **p < 01. N in ( ).
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

School principal succession is the process for hiring and inducting a new principal. This topic is becoming increasingly significant with the recognition that typical practices during succession inadequately prepare the successor for the realities encountered when assuming the principalship. The number of principals retiring near the end of the 1990s has not been met by an equal number of educators preparing for and entering the principalship. Expectations for increased effectiveness, more creative leadership, and school restructuring have caused fewer individuals to consider entering the principalship. When looking for enlightenment regarding this dilemma, it becomes obvious that the majority of previous studies on administrative succession have concentrated in areas other than educational administration. Therefore, studies regarding school principal succession in particular are increasingly vital to educational administration.

This study sought a way to provide new insight into school principal succession. When searching out a viable means for conducting such a study, two sources were exceptionally prominent. Bolman and Deal (1997) have delineated four frames important in organizations: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. Further, three traits are noted in the literature as evident during school principal succession: predecessor status, succession source, and successor principal experience. This study examined the relationship of these factors with the intent of shedding new light on realities surrounding school principal succession. It was expected that as a result of the findings, successors themselves would have a better perception of the realities involved in succession, schools
would know better how to support successor principals, and training institutions would have new information with which to prepare successors.

The first of the four frames, the *structural frame*, is a blueprint for those within an organization or between those within and without the organization for determining ways of associating and interacting. Structures will naturally evolve as people work together, but imperatives such as size, environment, and characteristics of the people are important in deliberately creating an effective structure. The *human resource frame* emphasizes the interaction between the organization and the individuals comprising the organization. Principals can and do significantly affect the organization and its success, but the organization in turn often defines the principal’s actions as well. The *political frame* looks at organizations as arenas in which different interest groups compete for power and scarce resources. Varying needs, perspectives, and life styles create conflict, resulting in the bargaining, negotiations, coercion, and compromise that make up daily organizational life. Finally, in the *symbolic frame*, attempts are made to harmonize the disorder, disorientation, and mystification found in organizations and to provide meaning and beliefs through symbols, or representations of meaning to activities and rituals. These underlying meanings become more important than the activities and rituals themselves.

The three traits also have particular importance. *Predecessor status* shows why the predecessor left a particular position and the significance of that leaving on the succession. *Succession source* indicates whether the successor took the position from inside the hiring organization or from somewhere outside that organization. *Experience* indicates how much time the successor principal has spent as a school administrator before taking the present position vacated by the predecessor.
During the early nineteenth century when public schools were beginning, principals did very little managing and were, instead, principal-teachers, or head teachers, who spent most of their time in the classroom. As the nation grew, complex bureaucracies developed in schools, causing school boards to change the principal's role into full-time management outside the classroom.

The principalship today is demanding and complex, with expectations of the principal becoming increasingly ponderous. McCurdy (1983) asserted that the principalship is presently noted for its fragmentation, brevity, verbal communication, physical movement, one-on-one interactions, interruptions, and crises. As mentioned previously, early studies on succession were conducted in the business world and were referred to simply as organizational studies (Hart, 1993). The relatively few studies in education (Firestone, 1990; Grusky, 1960, 1963; LeGore, 1995) have centered around various phases of succession, and the detachment, fear, expectations, and ultimate accommodation during the succession process.

A discussion of the historical perspective of succession studies provided the backdrop for a new study. The four organizational frames and the three traits evident during school principal succession furnished the foundation for developing a method of study. References and discussion regarding survey instruments and measuring techniques guided the creation of a structure for looking into the realities surrounding school principal succession.
Summary

This chapter provides a summary of the data analysis as well as conclusions drawn from the study, limitations of the study, and recommendation for further research are provided as well.

The purpose of the study was to better understand the realities of principal succession through examining the relationship between the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames (organizational frames delineated by Bolman and Deal, 1997) and predecessor status, succession source, and successor experience (three traits noted in the literature as evident during school principal succession). The intention was to determine (a) what differences there would be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames as a function of the predecessor's reason for leaving, (b) what differences there would be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames between successors from outside the district and those from within, (c) how the perceived importance of each of the four frames would be related to the number of years of school administrative experience prior to entering the present position, and (d) what relationships there would be among the four frames.

The instrument used was a questionnaire designed by the researcher and piloted with principals in a neighboring state. The basis for the design of the questionnaire was telephone interviews conducted with 15 principals who had experienced school principal succession as well as understandings gained during the review of the literature. The study intent and participant involvement was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Committee at the University of Northern Iowa. Subjects were 550 Kansas principals whose names and addresses were received from the
Kansas State Department of Education and who succeeded their predecessors during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years. The questionnaires were mailed out, follow-up steps were implemented, and the data were received in the Fall of 1999. There were 412 respondents, generating a response rate of 75%.

Research Question #1 regarding Predecessor Status asked:

As a function of the predecessor’s reason for leaving, what differences will there be in the perceived importance of each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

The discriminant function showed interpretable group differences on the Political and Symbolic frames, but no group differences found within the Structural and Human Resource frames. This means that the Political and Symbolic frames were more important in distinguishing between the groups of respondents than the Structural and Human Resource frames when considering the Predecessor Status trait. In particular, the successors whose predecessors left to go to a different district valued all the frames less than when the predecessor left for any other reason.

A search of the literature sheds light on this finding. As an initial consideration, the succession process itself brings concerns. Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) noted that succession “is a disruptive event because it changes the lines of communication, realigns relationships of power, impacts decision-making, and generally disturbs the equilibrium of normal activities” (p. 4).

Consideration of the Predecessor Status, or reason for the predecessor’s leaving, adds another weight to the process. Hart (1985) listed death, promotion, retirement, and poor performance as prominent causes for succession. Thiemann (1968) pointed out that “No predecessor knows when or under what conditions the office will be passed on. Nor
can he be certain who will succeed him, the results of the succession, or its final end” (p. 2). It is at these times, according to Gordon and Rosen (1981), that members of the group (the faculty) closely observe the incoming successor, determining ultimately to accept or reject her/him. These realities make the moments of succession carry heavy importance, and it is here that the implications of the Political and Symbolical frames show their impact.

As shown in Chapter II, the political frame is portrayed as enduring differences and scarce resources in organizations, which inevitably contribute to conflict within a group, and where power is a key resource. Such conflicts within the Structural frame are often considered a negative because it interferes with the creation of a needed structure. In the Political frame, however, conflict does not necessarily need resolution. Rather, strategy and tactics become the focus (Bolman & Deal, 1997). This provides opportunities for successors to rise to the occasion. “Moving up the ladder inevitably involves competition for the scarce resource of status” (p. 173). Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) noted that during the succession process instability and conflict lead to the influencing of organizational process and performance, opening member’s minds, as Hart (1985) put it, “to new possibilities” (p. 4).

Symbolism plays an important role at this point. Bolman and Deal (1997) talked about the Symbolic frame attempting to “interpret and illuminate basic issues of meaning and belief that make symbols so powerful (p. 216). During times of uncertainty, such as in moments of succession where moving up the ladder brings competition for scarce resources of status, humans use symbolism to discover “meaning in chaos, clarity in confusion, and predictability in mystery (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 219). Liethwood et al.
(1993) suggested that school leaders make it a priority "to consciously attend to the content, strength, and form of their school's culture" (p. 24). Hart described her own succession experience as "a process transforming that stiff acknowledgment of power into a web of social bonds" (p. 4).

In a process of succession, it seems reasonable that realities, such as those described in the Political and Symbolic frames, initially outweigh the necessity of organizational configurations of the Structural frame and the role principals' competencies play in the interaction between organizations and people within the Human Resources frame. Support is hereby given to the findings in the study that the Political and Symbolic frames were more important to the respondents.

In other words, when successors take over from their predecessors, they want to "make it work"—to be successful. Thiemann's (1968) statement, "No predecessor knows when or under what conditions the office will be passed on. Nor can he be certain who will succeed him, the results of the succession, or its final end" (p. 2) becomes obviously important, then, for each successor must clearly establish her/his place of importance if s/he is to make a difference in this life. It's a matter of dealing with first things first. Political issues have moved to the forefront for all parties involved because each is interested in making her/his own future secure. The meaning behind all actions, those symbols and stories that say "here's why we do what we do," move to the front as well, because the story for each person must be told and understood at the feeling and meaning level if her/his perspective and purpose are to survive.

It appears likely, therefore, that careful attempts to learn various specific political concerns and symbolic realities will help set a course in which stakeholders are willing to
participate. Much could be learned from casual conversations over coffee, reading the local newspaper, perusing the recent yearbooks, carefully analyzing records—any strategy by which information could be gleaned which would provide an understanding of the people with and for whom the successor will work.

It was also noted that among the four reasons for predecessor-leaving, those who left for a different district had the lowest mean scores. This would indicate that when their predecessors left to go to a different district, successors valued all the frames less regarding Predecessor Status than when their predecessors died or retired, were promoted or transferred, or left for some other reason. Apparently, if the predecessor dies or retires, s/he attains permanent standing or respect, which causes all the frames to be valued more than when the predecessor leaves for a different district. Likewise, when the predecessor is promoted or transferred and stays in district, s/he is a force to be reckoned with. Consequently, each of the frames is valued more. A similar attitude seems to be present even when the predecessor leaves for any other reason, such as termination. Perhaps all the reasons listed by Hart (1985) as causes for succession (death, promotion, retirement, and poor performance) afford cause for attention if not concern—perhaps a different emotional impact. If an individual leaves for a different district, then s/he never has to be thought of again. Perhaps the issue of “moving up the ladder (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 173) plays into the responses of the participants, causing them to attend to reasons for leaving other than to a different district.

Understanding the reason for the predecessor’s leaving, for whatever reason, will provide a clue as to the kind of reception one can expect and allow candidates to think about how to respond to that reception. The results of the study also showed that
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successors believed they were quite different from their predecessors. Understanding the
differences and how they will impact succession in each setting is vital to success in any
circumstance.

Research Question #2 regarding Successor Source asked:

What differences will there be between successors from outside the district and
successors from inside the district in the perceived importance of each of the four
frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

The discriminant function showed interpretable group differences on the Political
frame, but no group differences were found within the other three frames. This means
that the Political frame was more important to the respondents than the other three frames
when considering the Succession Source trait. It was also found that inside successors
valued the Political frame more than outside successors. Various reasons could account
for the importance respondents placed on the Political frame. It would seem evident that
living through the succession process had brought the respondents face to face with the
cold realities of politics; perhaps what they knew prior to assuming their position was
reinforced, or perhaps they were not prepared and did not pay enough attention to the
political issues surrounding them, thus finding through the “school of hard knocks” how
important such issues are. For many, knowing the faculty power people and political
network in place, for example, would have been vital to making critical decisions that
stakeholders would support. Simply understanding power in even some of its various
forms undoubtedly made a difference in establishing authority.

Again it is important to note the comment from Bolman and Deal (1997) that
describes the Political frame as arenas housing a “complex web of individual and group
interests (p. 163). One such interest is observed in Table 1 (repeated here for clarity): nearly 60% of the respondents were successors from outside the district and only 40%

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predecessor Status</td>
<td>Death/Retirement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion/Transfer</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different district</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor Source</td>
<td>Inside the school district</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside the school district</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Experience</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11+ years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from within. As previously stated, “Moving up the ladder inevitably involves competition for the scarce resource of status” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 173). As a predecessor leaves a position, it is always of interest and often the topic of lengthy discussion as to whether the position will be filled from inside or outside. Various
contingencies explained in the literature may influence this decision. *How they influence the process is subject to various realities unique to each building and district and to the persons involved in the process.*

1. Power, for example, is one contingency that becomes a key resource. Cosgrove (1986) noted that “succession offers an excellent opportunity to study the mechanisms of power and influence in schools” (p. 33). Power, according to Bolman and Deal (1997), takes eight significant forms: (a) position power (authority); (b) information and expertise; (c) control of awards; (d) coercion; (e) alliances and networks; (f) access to and control of agendas; (g) control of meaning and symbols, and (h) personal power. The reality of so many forms of power limits leaders, and decisions are most safely made in “zones of indifference” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 171) when people seldom care strongly about issues. This “zone of indifference” is evidently more common among the outside successors than those from inside. Insiders may feel they have more territory to protect, they have given time and energy to the district, and are expecting to advance within that district.

If an insider has assumed a stance of authority where key persons under her/his supervision (either students or staff) respect that authority, s/he is in a power position that an outsider would not have opportunity to develop. If the insider demonstrated expertise in an information area, power is likely. If an insider or outsider has alliances and networks upon which to draw in connection with the hiring process, there is power.

2. A contingency that is coming under increasing scrutiny is the belief in the principal’s competency and influence. Reitzug (1991) noted, for example, that “while many of us were raised in an age when the formal roles of parent, teacher, clergy, police,
or principal commanded immediate respect and reflexive compliance, the external
environment that spawned and nurtured this kind of authority has changed dramatically”
(p. 70). McCurdy (1983) insisted that the effort of principals to implement practices
they know to be viable is restrained by political . . . factors intrinsic within schools.
Dwyer (1984) concurred, noting that leaders lead within the limits determined by the
context and are largely swept along by it. Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) referred to the
realities of the environment as limiting leader influence. Inside successors likely know
the context and its implications, and are therefore protective of their standing. Because
outsiders could be a threat to this status, political issues would then be of high importance
to insiders.

The insider’s competency and influence within the district has already determined
that person’s credibility with local personnel, and would likely provide her/him an edge
in the hiring process over unknown outsiders. If, on the other hand, there is some
question as to the insider’s performance or ability, it may be considered a favorable
option to bring in an outsider for the position.

3. Other contingencies are those promoted by Gordon and Rosen (1981): the
reason for succession, the personality of the predecessor, and the selection process used
in hiring the successor. Each of these would be seen differently by insiders and outsiders.
The reason for succession, for example, involves more than merely whether the
predecessor resigned or was promoted, although those reasons may have an effect. This
contingency could involve the belief systems of the faculty and staff and how they feel
regarding the leaving of the predecessor. If, for example, the faculty and staff were
unhappy with the predecessor from inside, then the likelihood of an outsider having a positive influence is heightened.

4. Another contingency would be the personality of the predecessor. If the stakeholders associated the source of the predecessor’s succession (whether from inside or from outside) are pleased with the predecessor’s personality, their feelings and beliefs regarding hiring of the successor from inside or outside would be greatly affected.

5. A final contingency would be the hiring process and whether the stakeholders felt their opinions were considered regarding the hiring. If their attitudes regarding such opinions as wanting a “home-grown” person, for example, are not considered, then an outsider would likely have considerable difficulty succeeding.

Research Question #3 regarding Administrative Experience asks:

How is the perceived importance of each of the four frames related to the number of years of school administration experience prior to entering the present position?

A positive linear relationship was found between the Symbolic frame and number of years of experience. This means that the Symbolic frame is more important to the respondents when considering the Administrative Experience trait. It should be noted that the effect size here is small but interpretable (Cohen, 1988). No significant relationships emerged between the other three frames and number of years of experience. It was also found that those with more experience valued the Symbolic frame more that those with less experience.

Once again, as noted in Chapter II, Bolman and Deal (1997) described the Symbolic frame as attempting to “interpret and illuminate basic issues of meaning and belief that make symbols so powerful” (p. 216). This frame suggests that the “acts” in our
social world are of human construction and that humans use symbolism (rituals, ceremonies, stories, etc.) to reveal "meaning in chaos, clarity in confusion, and predictability in mystery" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 219). In other words, this is how and why we do things around here.

It is interesting to note from Table 1 that a majority of the respondents (65%) had the least experience. It could be suggested that they hold a different perspective from those with more experience. Perhaps as years pass and school principals gain more experience, symbolism carries a different meaning than in earlier years. Perhaps there is a different understanding of symbolism due to the years spent, as well as a more developed sense of meanings inherent in the various symbols. Stone (1992) noted "The use of symbols and mottoes, for example, are often part of the leader's repertoire of inspirational practices which increase awareness of mutually desired goals" (p. 3). It stands to reason that those with more experience would have a more developed repertoire than those just beginning.

Perhaps those with less experience simply have not had opportunity to understand the meaning and importance of symbolism. Thiemann (1968) pointed out that: "The drama of succession is not a single point in time. . . . It occurs and has myriad consequences" (p. 2). Mitchell's (1991) orientation theory of "typification" seems to support the notion that successors will value symbolism over time: "Cultural norms and ideas serve to segment experience, to separate the important from the trivial, the fulfilling from the frustrating, the potent from the impotent" (p. 227). The data from this study indicate that as years go by, the successors will value symbolism more.
Research Question #4 regarding the correlations among the four frames asked:

What are the relationships among the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic)?

It was found that all the frames showed moderate, statistically significant correlation. Structural, Political, and Symbolic frames showed a positive correlation with each other, while Human Resource frame showed a negative correlation to each of the other three frames.

It appears from the data that the successor principals who responded attended in some fashion to the realities inherent within the Structural, Political and Symbolic frames, they either actively pursued them or at least responded at some level if those realities were merely allowed to develop spontaneously. Action in those frames was in a positive direction. While there was action in the Human Resource frame as well, it was in a negative direction. The response to this area of administration by the same successor respondents was not the same as to the other three frames. Either they chose deliberately not to attend to the realities inherent in this frame, or they were so caught up dealing with the realities within the other three frames that they had no time for the Human Resources frame. A look at each frame will be enlightening.

Meyer (1978) declared “The most reasonable, indeed obvious, succession hypothesis is that change in leadership is associated with change in organizational configurations and processes” (p. 29). “Research suggests the structure of the school, as well as the social context of the beliefs and attitudes of the district, largely determine what types of behaviors are necessary and appropriate for principals within the context of their schools” (Smith et al., 1992, p. 112). Louis (1980) said structure goes beyond “a
collection of roles positioned on an organization chart” (p. 232), and Bolman and Deal (1997) referred to structure as “a blueprint for the pattern of expectations and exchanges among internal players (executives, managers, employees) and external constituencies (customers and clients)” (p. 38). Indeed, some arrangement of roles and relationships is vital to meeting both organizational and individual needs. It would appear then that whether organizations, such as schools, consciously choose to develop a structure or simply ignore it, there will be a structure. It is simply a matter of a structure designed to maximally meet the needs of the organization or a structure that makes do, so to speak.

In a similar vein of thought, political issues will take place. With or without design, organizations seem to become arenas in which different interest groups compete for power and scarce resources (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Furthermore, Jackall (1988) suggested that insightful and aspiring managers seek out the inescapable conflicts existing below the appearance of a calm surface in organizational life.

Symbolism echoes the realities stated above regarding Structural and Political Frames—symbolism will occur: symbols will represent the meaning of events within an organization. Bolman and Deal assured us that every culture develops, even if unconsciously, its own set of metaphors for the purpose of interpreting actions and assessing significance in the midst of discord and predicting or anticipating responses to bewildering circumstances. And in the same sense that Jackall (1988) asserted that wise managers pursue political issues, Liethwood et al. (1993) suggested that school leaders make it a priority “to consciously attend to the content, strength and form of their school’s culture” (p. 24).
The issues with Human Resource are different, consistent with the findings of this study, where the Human Resource frame shows a negative correlation with the others. Thus, the Human Resource frame focuses on the interplay between organizations and people, and advocates the notion that "organizations can . . . be energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 102). The operative phrase is can be.

Within the Human Resource frame are found the principals' attributes, which are described as competencies or proficiencies. Snyder and Drummond (1988) referred to competencies of the principal as vital, describing them as "a complex set of relationships between the principal's intent and action and resulting intended and unintended outcomes of that action" (p. 48). They added, "A person's competencies interact with the demands of the job and the organization's environment" (p. 48). Boyatzis (1982) included motives, traits, self-image, social role, skill, and knowledge as competency characteristics. Finally, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP; 1997) delineated a number of proficiencies in its publication Proficiencies for Principals, stating that such characteristics will "help assure the best possible leadership for our nation's elementary and middle schools" (p. v). It is these competencies and proficiencies that can be used positively for a school.

From the above discussion it is evident that the realities inherent in the Structural, Political, and Symbolic frames take place to at least some extent even when left to develop on their own; the same is not true of the Human Resource frame, however, and the data reported in this study substantiate this perspective. Consequently, the principal must, through her/his competencies and proficiencies described and discussed above, consciously pursue the characteristics of this frame or give conscious attention to how the
human resources are attended if s/he wishes to be successful in this regard. The necessity of such conscious pursuit may account for the negative correlation of the frame with the other three frames. A conscious effort to read and reflect on these competencies followed by specific action based on new and constantly developing understandings will cause a successor to take nothing for granted and will allow her/him to behave in thoughtful ways to best maximize the likelihood for successful leadership.

Conclusions

As stated in the very beginning, this study was conducted in order to better understand the realities of principal succession. Those realities may be summed as follows.

For Research Question #1 regarding Predecessor Status, it seems that in the succession process the issues of power in the Political frame regarding moving up the professional ladder and the issues of interpreting cultural symbols in the Symbolic frame at least initially outweigh the necessity for structure and the interaction between the organization and its individuals within the Human Resource frame. It is also evident that when their predecessors left to go to a different district, successors valued all the frames less regarding Predecessor Status than when their predecessors died or retired, were promoted or transferred, or left for some other reason.

For Research Question #2 regarding Succession Source, it seems that contingencies within the Political frame such as power, competency and influence, reason for succession, whether the stakeholders had a say in hiring, and the personality of the predecessor were the issues that would most likely influence decisions to hire from inside or outside the district.
For Research Question #3 regarding Administrative Experience, data showed the respondents valued Symbolism and that the value for Symbolism increased with years of experience.

For Research Question #4 regarding the correlations among the four frames, the fact is that the realities inherent in the Structural, Political, and Symbolic frames ensure they will take place, to at least some extent, and that successors either attend to these areas deliberately or respond to what naturally happens in them. Data show, however, that successors are not attending in the same way to the Human Resource frame, resulting in a negative correlation. It appears that it is important for successors to deliberately pursue this area more actively than is presently occurring.

Limitations

The following limitations for the study are acknowledged.

Principals in the study included those principals of all elementary, middle, and secondary schools in the state of Kansas who assumed principalship of their schools during the 1997-98 or 1998-99 school years. Furthermore, those surveyed varied in the number of times they had been a successor principal and in their number of years of school administrative experience, and were therefore asked to limit their answers to the period of time used to complete the survey. Consequently, the generalizability of the findings must be interpreted within these limitations.

When developing individual items for the questionnaire, it was desired to determine from actual practice what realities successor principals experienced as they assumed their duties from the predecessor principal. The choice of principals for this
purpose was a time factor; consequently, principals available during 1997 summer
schedules were interviewed by phone.

The respondents in the survey self reported and were asked to remember from the
past. It is assumed that the respondents were honest, able to remember, and careful in
responding.

It is assumed that the questionnaire designed for this study is a valid measure of
the four conceptual frames used in the study.

Suggestions for Further Research

To complement this study and follow up on its findings, the following suggestions
are given for further study.

1. A similar study with additional questions that probe other areas such as
parental input in the school program.

2. A similar study where questions regarding issues such as experience are
designed in a continuous format rather than a categorical format. Perhaps additional
information would surface.

3. A quantitative study with open-ended questions or where some of the
respondents are interviewed in person could show a different perspective than yet
realized.

4. A study using the four frames as predictor variables but with only one criterion
variable (e.g., Predecessor Status) in order to distinguish more fully each of the
perspectives of the study.

5. Political and Symbolic frames were the two frames found through discriminant
analysis to carry the most importance regarding the Predecessor Status trait. Further
study exploring the relationship of the Political and Symbolic areas to Predecessor Status should be revealing.

6. A study regarding successors’ understandings of political and symbolic implications during the succession process could greatly benefit those anticipating and preparing for succession, and would provide preparation institutions specific material for use when guiding prospective successors.

7. A more in-depth study also could involve the predecessor’s preparations for leaving and what actions s/he may take that affect the achievements of the successor.

8. Hart (1985) listed death, promotion, retirement, and poor performance as prominent causes for succession. It would therefore be helpful to know how the stakeholders’ reactions to the predecessor’s reason for leaving affected the successor’s assumption of duties.

9. Another area for further study is the relation between the political frame and whether the successor came from inside or outside the district. This could be explored through examining the eight forms of power listed by Bolman and Deal (1997, p. 171) and how those forms interface differently between inside and outside successors.

10. A study regarding political realities incumbent within the setting of the succession and how those realities affected the selection of outside successors and their acceptance and ultimate success could be helpful.

11. A study exploring the selection process used to secure a successor and the difference of success between outside versus inside successors would be helpful.
12. Pursuing more in-depth how experience plays a role in successors' understandings of symbolism and subsequent behaviors would provide valuable evidence in preparing for succession. Perhaps a study over time of selected individuals would provide a richness of understanding.

13. As a follow-up to the correlations among the four frames, a study of how various principals take deliberate steps in the area of Human Resource could benefit prospective successors.

14. A study of the various proficiencies and competencies of principals listed in the “Summary” section and how principals apply them could provide material for successors as well.

15. A final suggestion is to take the findings here and perform a qualitative study with a few successor principals. This could provide greater insight into those realities inherent in any school principal succession.

Recommendations

Three rationalizations were given for this study: (a) successor principals will find it practically useful; (b) school districts need access to pertinent and current information regarding succession as they hire new school principals; and (c) institutions of higher education need such information for their preparation programs. For each of these three rationalizations the following recommendations are made.

Successor Principals

1. As successor principals assume new responsibilities, they would do well to take note of the evidence found in this study: political and symbolic issues within and surrounding the school setting are of major importance during the succession process,
and probably take precedence over structural and human resource concerns. Careful attempts to learn various specific political concerns and symbolic realities will help set a course in which stakeholders are willing to participate. Much could be learned from casual conversations over coffee, reading the local newspaper, perusing the recent yearbooks, carefully analyzing records - any strategy by which information could be gleaned which would provide an understanding of the people with and for whom the successor will work.

2. Attending to the contingencies noted is important. Understanding power in its various forms and how it can establish or undermine authority can help a successor avoid various difficulties.

3. Tapping into established networks, indeed learning what those networks are, can give a "heads up" in decision-making.

4. Taking deliberate steps to demonstrate one's competency can begin to establish vital influence and trust among new constituents, if one is careful not to appear egotistical.

5. Understanding the reason for the predecessor's leaving will provide a clue as to the reception one can expect and allow candidates to think about how to respond to that reception.

6. Another understanding rising from this study is the necessity of deliberately attending to competencies and proficiencies vital in establishing "energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding" organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 102). A conscious effort to read and reflect on these competencies will cause a successor to take nothing for
granted and will allow her/him to behave in thoughtful ways to best maximize the likelihood of successful leadership.

7. Question #28 in Appendix E shows how significantly the respondents believed they were different from their predecessor. Understanding that difference, what it is, and carefully determining how to handle that difference with the local stakeholders is critical.

8. Question #32 attests to the importance of cultural background in acceptance by the school and community. Understanding of this reality will not only help avoid conflict, but can provide opportunity for proactive gestures and decisions.

9. Question #34 reminds successors how important it is to understand the faculty power people and political network in place. Ignoring this reality could seriously impact the successor’s ability to establish trust and respect.

10. Successor principals would do well to attempt to understand how the reason for the predecessor’s leaving may affect their “competition for the scarce resource of status” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 173).

School Districts

1. Taking deliberate steps to help outside successors understand local politics and symbols can go a long way in preparing new principals for the job at hand. Providing a mentor principal would be a positive strategy. To ensure that the successor carefully attends to the critical human resource issues, an evaluation plan designed between the successor and the mentor or central office official could establish both high expectations and the security of knowing exactly the guidelines within which the successor is expected to perform.
2. Question #17 in Appendix E demonstrates the importance successors place on support from the superintendent. The amount of support needed may vary according to the number of years of experience. Less experience successors, for example, and successors in politically unstable situations would require a greater amount of support.

3. Understanding early in the hiring process the importance stakeholders place on the method and manner of hiring and whether their concerns are addressed through the process can place the successor in a secure position when assuming the principalship. Neglect of this vital reality can be damaging.

4. Careful consideration of political issues inherent in a particular school or community can help determine if it is safe to consider an outside candidate, if an insider should be the only possibility, or if it matters at all.

5. Considering the reason for the change in leadership prior to setting in motion the hiring process may cause the district authorities to make certain decisions regarding the process, and may help them understand critical realities during the succession itself. For example, when a successor follows a predecessor with a 20+ year incumbency, careful consideration should be given to input from stakeholders in order to maximize support for the successor.

Institutions of Higher Education

1. Institutes of higher education that train individuals for the principalship would do well to consider each of the suggestions listed above for the successor and for the hiring institution and use the information in teaching.

2. Specific classes regarding succession and the realities inherent in that process are vital.
3. Too much is assumed; too often all concerned believe successors automatically know or will do what is expected. And too often many of the realities are unknown to the successor, or overlooked in the job of taking on the responsibility of a new school.

4. Question #14 in Appendix E shows that about 80% of the respondents in this study said they were either moderately or significantly prepared for the realities of the principalship. This demonstrates the importance the respondents place on preparation. Yet within this statistic the fact that 35% were only moderately prepared is a concern. Greater efforts directed specifically at helping future successors understand these realities and implications of the succession process are highly recommended.

Concluding Statement

It was intended from the beginning that this study would shed light on realities successor principals face during the succession process. New perspectives have been given for consideration by successor principals, by school districts, and by preparation institutions. New evidence has been brought to light that will be added to the literature on the subject. Further bases have been established from which to launch future studies and it is hoped that suggestions given for study will ultimately provide even greater understanding.
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APPENDIX A

Questionnaire
Realities Encountered in the Principal Succession Process

For each item, please circle the number that most nearly describes your belief regarding that question, using the following scale:

1 – Very Insignificant
2 – Insignificant (negligible, trivial, minor)
3 – Moderate (average, medium, fair)
4 – Significant (important, consequential, critical)
5 – Very Significant

Questions 1 through 15 are based on realities prior to and at the time of your succession.

1. The degree of power held by the secretary was .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
2. The desire for change regarding school improvement was .................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The need for various personnel changes within the building was ........ 1 2 3 4 5
4. The degree of discontent with informal procedures of which I was not aware was ....................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
5. The need for more rigorous evaluations was ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
6. The degree to which racial issues had been a source of contention among the staff was .......................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
7. The prominence of provincialism in the school community was .......... 1 2 3 4 5
8. The existence of common values shared by teachers and the community was .......................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
9. The degree to which I entered the district with personal credibility was .......................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
10. The level to which I was well informed regarding the various aspects of administrative succession was ......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
11. The need for change in the budget was ................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
12. The degree to which QPA procedures were in place and were well functioning was .......................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
13. Stakeholders wanting me to attend to school issues in the manner they perceived suitable was ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The degree to which I was well prepared for the realities of principal succession is .......................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
15. The level of district support systems in place to inform and assist me during my succession was ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5

Questions 16 through 40 are based on realities following your succession.

16. The amount of support I receive from the school board has been ....... 1 2 3 4 5
17. The amount of support I have received from the superintendent and/or assistant superintendents since assuming my duties has been ....... 1 2 3 4 5
18. The degree to which I have anticipated the political ramifications and the conduct of all stakeholders prior to implementing changes has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
19. The level of support from the faculty and staff has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Support for change from the faculty has been ............................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
21. The result in the school of the assignment of new faculty and staff has been .................. 1 2 3 4 5
22. My relationship with the school secretary has been .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
23. The relationship between the school secretary and the faculty and staff has been ............. 1 2 3 4 5
24. The degree to which relationships of power have been realigned upon my succession has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
25. The clarity of expectations for task assumption and duty assignment has been ............... 1 2 3 4 5
26. The time and effort necessary for me to learn and understand community values have been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
27. The degree to which I perceive parents accept me and to which they are allies is .......... 1 2 3 4 5
28. The difference in style between my predecessor and myself is ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
29. The degree to which the predecessor relinquished power to others in the building is ...... 1 2 3 4 5
30. The degree to which I used interpretation schemes unique to my school community in an effort to make sense of the realities of my new situation is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
31. The degree to which I used my own predispositions and purposes in an effort to make sense of the realities of my new situation is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
32. The degree to which my cultural background had a clear impact on my acceptance in the school and community is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
33. The degree to which my job expectations have been greater than my time and energy is .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
34. The degree of necessity for me to understand the faculty power people and their network that was in place has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
35. The time it took me to know the people with sanctioned power, both stated and unstated, has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
36. The result of my image being different from that of my predecessor (male vs. female, youthful vs. grandparently, etc.) has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
37. The number of people helping me acclimate and adjust has been .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
38. The frequency with which it was necessary for me to provide a rationale for my actions and decisions has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
39. The respect I have gained by showing an understanding of and respect for important symbols present within the community has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
40. The degree to which positive attention to the concerns of the public, staff, and student body gave me added credibility has been .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
41. The reason for my predecessor’s leaving was (a) death/retirement  
(b) promotion/transfer within district (c) position in different district  
(d) other.

42. I was hired to my administrative position from Inside/Outside the district.

43. My school administration experience when I assumed my present responsibilities falls in the following range: (a) None (b) 1 - 5 years (c) 6 - 10 years (d) 11+ years.

44. My gender is (a) female (b) male
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Items Within Each of the Four Frames
### STRUCTURAL
1. (2.) The desire for change regarding school improvement was .............................................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. (5.) The need for more rigorous evaluations was ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. (10.) The level to which I was well informed regarding the various aspects of administrative succession was ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. (11.) The need for change in the budget was ...................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
5. (12.) The degree to which QPA procedures were in place and were well functioning was .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. (15.) The level of district support systems in place to inform and assist me during my succession was .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
7. (20.) Support for change from the faculty has been ............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
8. (25.) The level of clarity of expectations for task assumption and duty assignment had been .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
9. (28.) The difference in style between my predecessor and myself is .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
10. (29.) The degree to which the predecessor relinquished power to others in the building was .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5

### HUMAN RESOURCE
1. (3.) The need for various personnel changes within the building was ................................... 1 2 3 4 5
2. (9.) The degree to which I came in with credibility was .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
3. (21.) The result in the school of the assignment of new faculty and staff has been .............. 1 2 3 4 5
4. (14.) The degree to which I was well prepared for the realities of principal succession is .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
5. (18.) The degree to which I have anticipated the political ramifications and the conduct of all stakeholders prior to implementing changes has been .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. (37.) The number of people helping me acclimate and adjust has been .................................. 1 2 3 4 5
7. (17) The amount of support I have received from the superintendent and/or assistant superintendents since assuming my duties has been .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
8. (19.) The level of support from the faculty and staff has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
9. (16.) The amount of support I receive from the school board has been .................................. 1 2 3 4 5
10. (33.) The degree to which my job expectations have been greater than my time and energy is .................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
POLITICAL
1. (1.) The degree of power held by the secretary was ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
2. (4.) The degree of discontent with informal procedures of which I was unaware was ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. (13.) Stakeholders wanting me to attend to concerns in the manner in which they perceived suitable was .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. (22.) My relationship with the school secretary has been ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
5. (23.) The relationship between the school secretary and the faculty and staff has been .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. (24.) The degree to which relationships of power have been realigned upon my succession has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
7. (34.) The degree of necessity for me to understand the faculty power people and their network that was in place has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
8. (35.) The time it took me to know the people with sanctioned power, both stated and unstated has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
9. (27.) The degree to which I perceive parents accept me and to which they are allies is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
10. (38.) The frequency with which it was necessary for me to provide a rationale for my actions and decisions has been ........................................... 1 2 3 4 5

SYMBOLIC
1. (6.) The degree to which racial issues had been a source of contention among the staff was .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. (7.) The prominence of provincialism in the school community was .................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. (8.) The existence of common values shared by teachers and the community was .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. (39.) The respect I have gained by showing an understanding of and respect for important symbols present within the community has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
5. (40.) The degree to which positive attention to the concerns of the public, staff, and student body gave me added credibility has been ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. (26.) The time and effort necessary for me to learn and understand community values has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
7. (30.) The degree to which I used interpretation schemes unique to my school community in an effort to make sense of the realities of my new situation is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
8. (31.) The degree to which I used my own predispositions and purposes in an effort to make sense of the realities of my new situation is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
9. (32.) The degree to which my cultural background had a clear impact on my acceptance in the school and community is .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
10. (36.) The result of my image being different from that of my predecessor (male vs. female, youthful vs. grandparently, etc.) has been .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX C

List of Questionnaire Raters
Dr. Nettie Collins-Hart  
Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction  
Lawrence Public Schools  
Lawrence, KS  66047

Dr. James L. Doud  
Professor and Chair of the Dept of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Foundations  
University of Florida  
Gainsville, Fl.

Dr. P. Kay Duncan  
Executive Director  
Kansas Association of Elementary School Principals  
Emporia, KS

Dr. Howard Ebmeier  
Associate Professor of Educational Leadership  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS  66014

Mrs. Brilla Highfill-Scott  
Executive Director  
United School Administrators  
Topeka, KS  66612
APPENDIX D

Frequency of Responses to Questions by Organizational Frame
The Structural Frame

Q2. Desire for change-school imp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>12.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>30.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very significant</td>
<td>12.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Need for more rigorous evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>19.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>32.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>28.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. Level I was informed re: aspects of admin. succession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>33.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>32.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q11. Need for change in budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>30.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>32.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>14.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Histogram:**
  - Degree of change: 1-5
  - Mean: 2.6
  - Std. Dev: 1.10
  - N: 411.00

### Q15. Dist. support system in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>32.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Histogram:**
  - Degree of change: 1-5
  - Mean: 3.4
  - Std. Dev: 1.08
  - N: 412.00

### Q20. Support for change from faculty and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>40.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Histogram:**
  - Degree of change: 1-5
  - Mean: 3.6
  - Std. Dev: 0.97
  - N: 409.00
Q25. Clarity of expectation for task assumption and duty assign.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>44.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28. Difference in style of me and my predecessor.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q29. Degree pred. relinquished power to others.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Human Resource Frame

Q9. I entered district with personal credibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16. Support I got from School Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>41.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17. Support I got from superintendent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>32.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>44.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. I anticipated political ramifications and stakeholders' conduct prior to changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>39.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>42.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19. Support from faculty and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>53.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Result of assigning of new faculty and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>42.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q33. Degree my job expectations greater than time and energy.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q37. Number of those helping in job.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>34.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>38.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Political Frame

Q1. Power by secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>31.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>38.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>19.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Discontent with informal procedures of which I was not aware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. Stakeholders want me to attend school issues as they wanted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>37.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23. Relationship between secretary and faculty and staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>47.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>31.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q24. Degree relationships realigned upon my successor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>36.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>38.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27. Degree parents accept me and are allies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>58.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q34. Necessity for me to understand faculty power people and network in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>40.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>19.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q37. Time to know those with legitimate, stated and unstated power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>42.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>25.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q38. Frequency I provided rationale for my action and decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>24.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Symbolic Frame

Q7. Prominence of provincialism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>31.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>18.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. Existence of common values - teachers and community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>44.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. Time and effort necessary to learn and understand community values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>33.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Degree I used interpretation schemes of school community.</td>
<td>Q30. Degree I used Interpretation schemes of school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>53.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q31. Degree I used my predisposition and purposes for realities.</th>
<th>Q31. Degree I used my predisposition and purposes for realities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q32. Degree my cultural background impacted by acceptance in school and comm.</th>
<th>Q32. Degree my cultural background impacted by acceptance in school and community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>30.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>12.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q36. Result of my different image from predecessor.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>36.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>24.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q39. Respect I gained by understanding of & respect for important symbols.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>25.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>53.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q40. Degree positive attention for concerns gave me added credibility.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>58.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>26.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Means and Standard Deviations for each of the sets of 10 Questions Within Each of the Four Frames
Histogram of Structural Frame

Histogram of Human Resource Frame

Q-Q Plot of Structural Frame

Q-Q Plot of Human Resource Means

Std Dev = 4.5
Mean = 3.37
N = 411.00

Std Dev = 4.1
Mean = 3.65
N = 423.00
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