Title
Expecting the Unexpected: A Study of New Principal Experiences

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5vc8j73w

Author
McDowell, Scott Randall

Publication Date
2012

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Expecting the Unexpected: A Study of New Principal Experiences

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

by

Scott Randall McDowell

2012

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATOIN

Expecting the Unexpected: A Study of New Principal Experiences

by

Scott Randall McDowell

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2012

Professor Wellford Wilms and Professor Eugene Tucker, Co-Chairs

Principals are instrumental in establishing effective schools and positive learning communities. There is only one principal in every school and thus, the position clearly requires a knowledgeable, highly skilled, and well-prepared individual. Principal training programs provide generally effective instruction that seemingly prepares emerging leaders for the expectations and logistical demands of the principalship. Yet the state of the profession is unstable. The research on principals shows that fewer administrators are applying for the position, newly hired principals are younger and less experienced, and longevity is a problem. The position is synonymous with long hours, little appreciation, and high stressful situations. Although principal preparation programs do address logistical problem solving, there is no curriculum for incoming principals that addresses the phenomenon of the unexpected event. Surprise events are stressful, salient, disruptive, and can make or break a career. A principal who is able to control an unexpected event, whether the event is caused by them or not, and foster an appropriate

outcome likely feels strongly self-efficacious. On the other hand, principals who are faced with unexpected events and handle their own role in a manner that leads to a negative outcome, likely develop low self-esteem, low feelings of efficacy, and are more likely to leave the position or be ineffective leaders. This research project queried high and middle school principals from a moderate sized urban school district about whether they have experienced an unexpected event and if so, the details of that event were recorded. Specifically, qualitative descriptions were collected to develop an understanding of the variety of events that could and do occur during a principal's career. Using both quantitative and qualitative data collection, the research documented the principal's role, feelings, and self-reflections about the event. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the nature of unexpected events. The project also sought to discover, in depth, the personal experiences of the principal and the views of the principals about the event and outcome, and most importantly, the feelings of the principals about their role in the event and their role in the outcome. The investigation revealed several notable findings that linked event types and outcomes with principals' feelings. In all, principals experienced significant unexpected events that had a high impact on all involved. The principals mostly stated that they were unprepared yet most controlled their own emotions and behaviors well. Theoretical frameworks were used to conceptualize the events and the emotional impact on the principals was characterized. Further, principals were passionate about elucidating the concept of a surprise event as a component of principal training programs, as all felt that if they could expect these events on some level, their ability to handle them would have greatly improved. This important implication was discussed and further research suggested.

The dissertation of Scott Randall McDowell is approved.

Robert Cooper

Gregory Leazer

Wellford Wilms, Committee Co-Chair

Eugene Tucker, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2012

DEDICATION

For my loving wife

Stephanny.

The only reason this ever got completed.

For my beautiful daughters

Ryann and Evann.

So they can see that there is always more to learn.

For my parents

Skip and Marilyn.

Both teachers, who instilled the values of education and leadership.

For all the first year principals out there.

May you not face what others already have,

but if you must, may you be prepared.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must thank my wife Stephanny, whose gentle prodding and expertise were the impetus and feasibility for this dissertation to have ever happened. She really was the brains of this operation.

Grateful thanks go out to Linda Rose, who made my readmission after an eight year hiatus possible. When I came to her in August for a September admission, an October Qualifying Exam, and November Preliminary Orals, she had her doubts and could have easily said no (actually did at first, recommending a Spring admission), but nevertheless read, reread and edited my drafts, practically overnight, until yes was the answer.

I am very much appreciative of and indebted to my Co-Chairs Gene Tucker and Buzz Wilms, who were both willing to take on this new, old project within an expedited timeframe. Their faith, feedback and support were exceptional. Most important, however, was the enthusiasm they had for my completion of the doctorate, nearly a decade removed from its start.

Thank you to my committee members Robert Cooper and Greg Leazer, whom I had never met, but who accepted invitations to serve based solely on an email and description of the project. Together with Gene and Buzz, they guided me, the guy with the degree in applied mathematics, away from a statistical analysis and toward a much more meaningful and personal investigation. The end result was so much more useful and impactful because of their direction.

Thank you to Michelle Fournier and Chad Mabery, whose stability as assistant principals and the confidence I had in them, allowed me to return to UCLA, secure in their ability to lead. Thank you to Tim McLellan, my first assistant principal, for providing ongoing faith that I would eventually finish. His positivity finally rubbed off on me after all those years. Great friends, all three of you.

And finally, thank you to the principals, my friends, who shared their stories. Stories that were deeply personal, stories that exposed fears and insecurities, stories that built character, and stories that shaped careers. Thank you for your trust, and for the opportunity you have given others to learn from your experiences.

VITA

1968	Born, Southern California
1991	Bachelors of Science, Applied Mathematics University of California, Los Angeles
1991	Single Subject Credential Mathematics University of California, Los Angeles
1992	Masters of Education University of California, Los Angeles
1991 – 1993	High School Math Teacher, Athletic Director, Assistant Basketball Coach St. Monica High School, Santa Monica, California
1993 – 1995	Assistant Dean of Students, Math Teacher, Math and Computers Department Chair, Assistant Basketball Coach St. Monica High School, Santa Monica, California
1995	Masters of Arts in Administration Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Mt. St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, California
1995 – 2001	Assistant Principal, Dean of Students, Head Varsity Basketball Coach, Head Varsity Golf Coach, Math and Computers Department Chair, Mathematics Teacher St. Monica High School, Santa Monica, California
1997 – 2004	Instructor, Mathematics Project University of California, Los Angeles
2000 – 2004	Co-Director, New Teacher Institute, Mathematics Project University of California, Los Angeles
2001 – 2004	Assistant Principal, North High School Torrance Unified School District, Torrance, California
2004 – present	Principal, South High School Torrance Unified School District, Torrance, California

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

- "Midnight Madness Basketball Event Goes Wrong. 14 Arrested for Alcohol and Marijuana. Longtime Coach Relieved of Duty by 1st Year Principal"

- "Three Soldiers Killed In One Year In Iraq From Same High School"

- "47 Year Old Coach Convicted of Having Sex with 14 Year Old Girl"

- "Family of Four Killed in Head-On Collision on Way To Family Vacation. Schoolmates Mourn Loss of Friends and Teacher."

- "Local Administrator Resigns, Checks Into Rehab Program."

- "Two Local Students Killed, Two Critically Injured in Collision with Suicidal Wrong-Way Driver."

Those were the headlines during my first years as a high school principal.

The problem: I didn't learn about handling unexpected crises in my principal training program! Despite extensive education/training programs and demands for better qualified principals, most new principals like me were not prepared for the unexpected and these events can make or break a career.

The problem is clear. Unexpected events occur within the career of a new principal. New principals have not been prepared, through their training or their experiences, to even expect these surprise events or to behaviorally or emotionally handle them. In turn, their feelings of self-worth and their ability to be effective are influenced by the outcomes of these events. Without preparation, it's likely that their responses will be less than ideal. Indeed, Santee &

Jackson (1979) and Callero (1985) support the assumption that the higher the self-concept and self-identify of the person, the greater the probability that person will perceive a given situation as an opportunity to perform and seek out effective solutions to situations. Further, Ellis (2001) describes extensively how people consciously and unconsciously construct emotional difficulties such as low self-esteem/blame/pity and behavioral tendencies (procrastination, avoidance, withdrawal, and impulsivity) from external events which they perpetuate by means of their self-defeating thinking. The more situations in which principals are unprepared to handle events in their school, the less effective those principals will be. Given the large demand, the high turnover, and shortage of principals that defines the profession, it is critical for principals to be as prepared as possible to positively respond, feel strongly about themselves, and sustain in their positions. The purpose of this project was to identify the need for principals to be prepared for unexpected events that occur in schools. I conducted a research project to investigate the phenomenon of surprise events and the emotional and behavioral responses to those events by principals in an effort to identify commonalities, provide guidance in what principals should expect, and how to respond to unexpected events.

Background Information

The Unstable Position of a Principalship. First, there is a shortage of principal applicants in the nation and the turn-over is high, particularly in California (Hill & Banta, 2008; Cullen & Mazzeo, 2008; Papa Jr., 2007; Gates et al., 2006; Sahagun 2007). Kerrins, Johnstone, & Cushing's (2001) peer-reviewed paper describes an Association of California School Administrators and the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration survey on school principals in which 90% of districts reported shortages of high school principal

candidates and 73% reported shortages of elementary school candidates. The report also stated that a national survey found similar shortages. Closer to home, the LA Times reported a severe shortage of principals (Sahagun, August 27, 2000) stating that LAUSD is "not the only district facing a shortage of leaders. Schools statewide are grappling with vacancies created by decreasing interest in a job that is synonymous with long days, high pressure, and moderate pay."

Second, the qualifications and experience of principal applicants and principals have been identified as weak. In general, those that are hired are younger in age, have fewer years of experience, and have fewer years of education. From 1999-2000, the average age of high school principals was 49.1, the average years of experience was 8.5 (as a principal), and the average years of teaching experience was 13.9. This represents a decrease of about 1.5 years of experience of principals in the public sector since 1988. Thus, the data suggest that in the year 2000, the decrease seems to be continuing (Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, & Chung, 2006).

Further, also in the same LA Times article, George Manthey (professional development executive with the Association of California School Administrators) was quoted (August 27, 2000) as stating "There are plenty of credentialed folks available but they just aren't applying for the job like before." In popular literature, the trend continues as reports remain that principal positions continue to be difficult to fill with qualified people (Guterman, 2007). A review of the literature by Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, (2003) found that fewer educators are applying for principalships because the compensation is poor, the stress level is high, the expectation is tremendous, demands on time is high, demands are often conflicting, new accountability pressures are strong, and societal issues make things even more complicated.

Retaining Principals. Third, once principals are recruited, keeping them in the position becomes the next challenge. Cross sectional data on the experience of principals by the RAND

corporation (Gates, Ringel, Santibanez et al., 2006) suggests that there may be a high exit rate among new principals who decide that the job is not a "good fit" for them. Indeed, data show that principals with three or fewer years of experience in a school position do not stay very long in the principalship – and this is not related to urbanicity or student demographic characteristics. Interestingly, the data also indicate that a substantial fraction stay in the principalship for a very long time (even a single principalship). In a University Council for Education Administration (UCEA, March 2008) report, in Texas, 61% of the high school principals left their positions within a 3 year period and the rate jumps to 71% within a 5 year period. These statistics were found to be somewhat consistent throughout the country (Baker, 2007).

       Lack of Research and Training for Educators in the Unexpected. These younger, inexperienced principals are less prepared for the unexpected because they have not experienced enough events and because principal preparation programs have not addressed this topic in any of their curricula. A tremendous amount of literature and research have focused upon creating and sustaining high-quality principal training programs and mentoring programs (i.e., Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2002; Hess & Kelly, 2005; Willmore, 2002). Principal preparation programs are readily available throughout the United States. Strong programs involve quality methods of instruction based upon content standards, principal internships, and principal mentors yet *none* of these programs have any focus on how to be aware of, prepared for, or both behaviorally and emotionally respond to the extreme number or intensity of unexpected events that occur throughout a career. Further, as will be delineated in Chapter 2, although there are data on surprise phenomena, none have applied surprise events to the profession of principals, yet this concept is beginning to gain the attention of popular literature (i.e. *Blink*, Gladwell, 2005). Being prepared and capable of effectively responding and

handling all situations and issues will clearly allow a principal to be more confident and will lead to better leadership and sustainability in the position.

The Importance of a Highly Trained Principal. All stakeholders in education (researchers, administrators, teachers, children and their families) clearly acknowledge through research and through experience that the role of the principal is central. Principals have great influence on the school in shaping and forming the philosophy and culture of the school. Their decisions carry the weight of the school and determine outcomes for administrators, teachers, the children, and their families (McCall, 1997). "Virtually all superintendents (99%) believe that behind every great school there's a great principal" (Public Agenda, 2001, p 21). Parents believe that the principal determines school quality, "As goes the principal, so goes the school." McEwan (2003) summarizes the significant research about the importance of the principalship and the impact school leaders have on student achievement and the wellness of the school community.

Thus, it is extremely important for new principals to feel prepared and equipped to address the events that occur. McEwan (2003) reviewed the data on how newly appointed principals feel. They are initially elated over the appointment, hopeful, eager, and impatient to get started. On the other hand, they are nervous and uncertain and state that they feel less prepared for the diversity of demands they might encounter. The first year especially is a critical period of time such that the extent to which principals are socialized in their position in the first year is often an indicator of their future socialization in the school community (Parkay, Currie, & Rhodes, 1992). The early part of a principalship can shape the success of the principal and the school.

Clearly then, it is essential for the first year of a principalship to be successful. Principal preparation programs prepare principals for the *expected* "problems" that might arise (Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2002). The problem remains – principal preparation programs nationwide are not preparing their students to respond to unexpected occurrences.

Research Questions

The following *research questions* guided the design and the course of the study:

1. The unexpected event. According to the principals sampled, what were the unexpected events they encountered in their careers as principals? Principals were asked to describe any unexpected events including the event itself, the situational and emotional impact on all involved, and the principal's behavioral and emotional responses to the situation.

2. The reflection on the event. In reflecting back upon the elements of the unexpected event, what did they say they learned, and if they could have predicted the event to some degree, would that have assisted in their response?

3. The principal's self-efficacy. In what ways did the unexpected events experienced (including the principal's control over the event or the outcome of the event and self-efficacy) influence the principals' view of their professional performance?

Studying the Research Questions

To answer these research questions, I queried the middle and high school principals in a mid-sized unified school district using survey methodology (on-line questionnaire). I asked them to recall and reflect upon unexpected events that occurred in their careers. In that

recollection, I asked them to describe the event, the situation, the impact of the event, the responses of others, and their own responses. I then carried out a phone interview with a sample of self-selected principals to gather more extensive data. During the phone interview, I queried the principals about their own thinking about the event: how they assessed the problem, broke down the elements of the event, how they responded, and what they learned from the situation. I then gathered information on how events can influence or shape the way in which the principal sees his/her own effectiveness.

This study identified how principals responded to unexpected events, what the resolution was, and what their attributions were to the causes of that event (internal, external) and their attributions to the resolution of that event (internal, external).

Goals

In the end, the goals of this study were to find out what principals found to be unexpected in their first years as principals. I focused on principals because they are the ultimate decision makers in the school – the onus rests upon them while other administrators can always defer to the principal.

A second goal of my research was to determine what specific knowledge, skills, and/or abilities principals perceive are required to best respond to unexpected events, thus making it possible to provide specific training for the acquisition of these skill sets. Training in the target areas could be instrumental in contributing to the appropriate responses which result in successful outcomes, even in instances where there was no previous specific exposure or training to the particular unexpected event.

Impact

In my own district of 33 schools (25,000 ADA), the leadership committed that the results of this study will be incorporated into a district-wide principal training program, but the impact of this study could extend far beyond the walls of a single school district. I believe this project could form the basis of an additional curricular focus for principal preparation programs, as well as a series of articles and professional development workshops sharing the results. Ultimately, it could serve as the pilot sample for a book of case studies highlighting the experiences, reactions and successes and failures of principals faced with dealing with unexpected events.

Impetus

The events referenced in the headlines at the beginning of this paper are real, and represent some of the unexpected events that occurred in my first few years as a high school principal. As a new principal, I was very unsure what to do in these situations and faced a tremendous amount of self-doubt, and assumed my exposure to these "freak" events was unique, until one of the events, which garnered national attention, changed my mind, and I realized that my unexpected surprises shouldn't have been surprises at all.

In the Spring of 2007, PFC Joseph Anzack Jr. (Class of 2005 in the school where I am principal) was one of three US Army soldiers ambushed and captured in Iraq. The Army initiated the largest manhunt in its history, and two weeks later, Joe's body was found floating in the Euphrates River. During the two-week search, countless news vans camped outside my school and reported daily on the progress of the search, and ultimately Joe's funeral service, held in our stadium, as well as the war protesters outside our stadium, which was broadcast live on ABC, NBC, CBS and Fox.

Later in the Fall, after our third school graduate soldier in less than a year had been killed, we held a jersey retirement ceremony at a football game which also generated national news, for our unfortunate distinction of losing three soldiers in such a short time. Three years into my principalship, feeling more secure in my knowledge and experience than ever, I still felt unique and alone in facing these kinds of challenges. That is, until a very strange thing began to happen: I began to get phone calls from other principals – a lot of them. And they all asked the same thing: How was I dealing with the deaths, or the funeral, or the jersey retirement, or the family, or the students impacted, or the media? They all were faced with something similar, and because they had seen the news about the manhunt, or the funeral, or the jersey retirement, the calls started to come. It's now almost five years later, and I still get calls, because someone goes through something similar, and they have questions. What I thought was unique and unexpected was actually commonplace, and yet nobody, including me, had any background on how to deal with it. What did turn out to be unique, though, was the amount of national media coverage focused on us over a six month span, which allowed others to feel not alone in their confusion and to seek support and advice, or to offer understanding and compassion. And 40+ phone calls later, all from other principals experiencing something similar, this project was born.

The purpose then, of this project, was to shed light on all events that feel unexpected, that surprise, that paralyze, that erode confidence, that isolate, and to demonstrate the kinds of situations principals should expect, should be prepared to respond to, should not be surprised by, and to share, by example, the ways others have already faced the challenges that will surely occur again.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Nationwide, school districts find it much more difficult to hold on to principals as standards get tougher and demands on principals increase (Hill & Banta, 2008). It has been well documented that principal turnover due to dissatisfaction is a common phenomenon nationwide. For example, in Texas, 22% of principals change jobs (Cullen & Mazzeo, 2008), in New York, after 4 years, only 46% of principals are still in the same school (Papa Jr., 2007) and after 6 years only 21% of principals are in the same school in Illinois (Gates et al., 2006). Holloway (2001) estimated that within the decade, public schools would face an estimated 40% turnover of their principals nationwide.

Why are principals leaving the positions? Extant literature has pointed to a number of variables that affect the longevity of a principalship from accountability expectations (Kochan, Spencer, & Matthews, 1999; Wallace Foundation 2006) to the long hours and multiple evening activities (NASSP, 2000). Hertling (2001) cited various studies as to why principals leave their jobs across all demographic populations and identified that one of the *main* reasons is the lack of preparation, training, and ability to deal with the increasing demands of the job. Indeed, "Today's principal is faced with the complex task of creating a school-wide vision, being an instructional leader, planning for effective professional development, guiding teachers, handling discipline, attending events, coordinating buses, tending to external priorities such as legislative mandates, and all the other unexpected details that come with supervising a school" (p.1). McAdams (1998) summarized research on the search for high-school principals, however, and indicated that there is actually not a shortage of certificated individuals for the vacant positions.

Instead, the issue is the quality of the individuals applying for the vacated positions. Thus, due to a lower pool of quality applications, those who are less prepared and less experienced are getting the principal positions. The end result creates a void in quality leadership at the secondary level.

If principals have the certifications, why are they still ill-prepared and not considered, "quality"? Principal preparation programs, internship programs, and mentoring programs provide instruction to emerging principal leaders in accordance with comprehensive standards-based instructional guidelines. Why are principals still unprepared, leaving the position within 5-6 years, and dissatisfied? I would argue that one reason is because the one area that is not covered by principal training programs is the "unexpected events that come with supervising a school".

It is the unexpected events for which principals are not prepared. The ability of a principal to address these surprises will greatly affect the manner in which the school operates and the perceived competency of the principal by him/herself and by the stakeholders in the school programs (parents, children, staff, colleagues, community).

I will provide a brief history of the increasing demands of a principalship followed by how principal training programs across the nation have tried to address all of these demands through standards and curriculum. I will then address California standards for principals and how they match national standards. Given the structured and high-standard curriculum, I will then review the research on principal experiences on the job. At this point, it will become clear that none of the literature addresses the issue of the "unexpected" and how to better prepare principals pre-position and within the position. I will justify the need for this and propose a theoretical viewpoint to consider instruction and curriculum in this area.

Brief History of the Principalship

Rousmaniere (2009) provides an eloquent and extensive editorial on the historical perspectives on principalships. Interestingly, the school principal is only a recent (150 years) figure in the history of education created alongside the state school systems. The organization shifted from having one teacher who taught a room full of children to a system in which one manager supervises a collection of teachers. This dramatically changed the delivery of educational programs, power relations, social relations, and the texture of school culture overall. Further, one must also take into account that the principal stands between the school and the local government (serving both). Indeed, historians have identified the principal's role as complex and contradictory fluctuating between policy and practice; to the point of criticizing the complex role of the principal's responsibilities.

In the past 5 years, more empirical and analytic studies have addressed the question of how the principalship developed in the creation of more modern school systems, including variables such as personal characteristics (gender, race, class identity, life history, experience of the principal), the principal's relations at work, their navigation of the policy directives and administrative expectations of their roles, and most importantly, the importance of the principal's subjective identity and self-representation in their leadership positions. Indeed, as society has grown and become more complex, the school system has followed suit, and the principalship has as well.

Thus, the changing context of school leadership is making the role of principal more difficult and less satisfying than ever before. The principal's role has expanded from being the building manager of the 1970s and 1980s to the instructional leader of the 1990s to the present. As mentioned, Hertling's (2001) description of the current state of the responsibilities of

principals is overwhelming just to read, let alone to carry out. The job of a principal is incredibly complex.

Training Professionals for the Complex Principalship

Despite the complexity of the position and the somewhat dismal prediction of longevity, some school professionals do desire the leadership position of principal. How can one ever prepare for the responsibilities required of the position? Although this project focuses on California principals, it is critical to begin with the identification of nationwide training standards for principals as many California principals receive training outside of the state. This section will then be followed by the standards that embody the California Professional Administrative Services Credential. Finally, I will provide a review of mentorship and internship programs that give the new principal experience and support in the practical setting.

Nationwide Standards

Like teaching, what are the standards by which a principal is measured? To lead a school effectively, one must know what is expected. In 2002, seven standards were compiled by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (Appendix A). It is the recommendation of the ELCC that these standards be used throughout principal instructional programs as the basis for preparation curriculum. These standards then define what the ELCC has determined to then be measures of principal success. In short, a principal must be a leader who understands the vision of the school, can promote a positive school culture which is measured by effective instructional programs, can manage the organization, can collaborate, be ethical, and be culturally and philosophically sensitive; all of which should be practiced in a real-life internship under the

supervision of university faculty and mentors. New principals will be more prepared and in turn,

more successful with a strong training program that adheres to these standards for instruction.

Promoting the Success of All Students. All of the ELCC standards begin with the idea

that a principal's main goal is to promote the success of all students. No principal would deny

the importance of the education of all students – regardless of race, economics, culture, religion,

behavior, skills, physical or mental abilities. Roy Romer, a former superintendent of LAUSD

was faced with angry parents outside of Taft High School after the shooting death of one of the

students (parents blamed bussing – "those kids are why this is happening here") – took the

microphone and stated – our responsibility is to educate ALL students; not "these" or "those".

Vision. Principals should "begin with the end in mind" (Covey, 1990). A vision is where

a school wants to be, reality is where a school is, and the mission is the manner in which the

school plans to achieve the vision (Wilmore, 2004). People cannot run a successful organization

unless they share a common vision (Garrison, Parks, & Connelly, 1991). McCall (1997)

identifies the multiple groups of people who have interest in public education and help define a

vision. The parents (e.g. who want children tracked so their 'gifted' child is not with the at-risk

learners) vs. the educational theorists (e.g. who claim that tracking has deleterious effects on

student learning). The business community (e.g. who wants graduates who can work) vs. parents

and counselors (e.g. who want self-actualized and caring young adults). The taxpayers (e.g. who

want costs to stay down) vs. the music teacher and parents (e.g. who want arts in the schools).

Parents of special needs children (e.g. who want individualization) vs. parents of children in the

general pool. Within the school, sex education vs. no sex education. In all, it is clear that an

understanding of the purpose of the school and the vision of the program is incredibly important

in order to be able to sort through the basic philosophical and cultural positions in which these values have their foundation.

Principals learn to collectively (with colleagues) determine where the school is going through conversations, meetings, and collaborations. Then, the steps to get there are written and defined, and goals are set. All content area goals, campus activities, budget, and resources must be examined and ensured that they aligned with the vision. A study of the diversity of academic, developmental, social, and cultural needs of the students will lead to appropriate choices for curricular materials and instructional strategies. Finally, evaluation procedures must be developed, defined, and implemented (Wilmore, 2002)

Effective Instructional Programming. Curriculum and instruction are fundamentally what makes a school unique. Goals for instructional programs are more specific and define the benchmarks to reach the vision. The goals relate to designing, implementing, and evaluating all forms of curriculum, instruction, programs, products, technology/information systems, and personnel (Wilmore 2002). Some feel that improving the instruction is the foremost function of a principal (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985) and is the most commonly discussed elements of leadership preparation in principal preparation programs, e.g. the topics "instructional leadership" and "school culture" (Hess & Kelly, 2005).

Originally, principals were identified as the instructional leaders of the school (Edmond, 1981). However, since then, more realistically, the concept of being the instructional leader is to understand and facilitate appropriate processes for curriculum enhancement and developmentally appropriate instructional methods. Further, principals must know and facilitate actions that apply theories of effective instruction rather than knowing the content of each curriculum area (e.g. math, language, science, technology, history, etc.) (Wilmore, 2002).

Successful principals pull together their own knowledge and skills on current research, district policies and procedures, curriculum, teaching and learning styles, staffing and staff development, and teacher supervision and evaluation (OCP, 2007) to effect curriculum and instruction. A principal must lead the staff in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvements in the school's curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular offerings and activities (Lipham & Daresh, 1981). Successful schools are correlated with principals who are committed to instructional improvement (Wellisch, et al., 1978); participate in classroom instructional activities and are knowledgeable (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980), monitor time on task in classrooms (Denham & Lieberman, 1980), and have a positive attitude towards staff and students (Squires, Huitt, & Segars, 1983). Indeed, Hess and Kelly (2005) find that up to 12% of the time in administrator preparation programs is spent on managing classroom instruction.

Managing the Organization. Between 25 and 30% of principal preparation program time is spent teaching about the technical aspects of organization (Hess & Kelly, 2005). The longstanding emphasis on "technical knowledge" of school law, school finance, and facilities management in principal preparation has fallen out of favor of late. As Eerrandino and Tirozzi (2004) said, 'Yesterday's principal was often a desk-bound, disciplinarian building manager who was more concerned with the buses running on time than academic outcomes." Nonetheless, teaching aspiring principals this body of vocational knowledge remains an identifiable, significant element of instruction. Recent survey data reveal that 82 percent of principals report dealing with school facilities, resources, or procedures every day while only 40 percent say the same about driving student achievement ("Leading for Learning", 2004).

The "organization" is the school (the structural framework), the "operations" are the daily activities necessary to keep the school operating smoothly and efficiently – further, they should

be aligned with the vision of the school (Wilmore, 2004). This includes resources which are *all* well established as scarce in most school programs. Indeed, principals have felt that the most difficult task was the allocation of resources as they are forced to discover and procure resources, "make do", stretch, distribute with caution, be accountable, and plan for the future (McCall, 1997). An even more important finding is that a principal's leadership in acquiring and using appropriate and adequate human and material resources directly affects the success of a school (Rossmiller, Lipham, & Marinelli, 1976).

The principal's role in the school budget is spelled out through education legislation but local districts also have certain policies and procedures in place. Principal preparation programs, district written manuals, and "how to books" have aspired to prepare new principals for budget responsibilities (OPC, 2005).

Collaborate. "No man is an island". No one can work in isolation. Schools are communities within themselves and exist within a community. Steps to collaboration begin with first understanding other people's interest, needs, and perspectives (Covey, 1990b).

Some describe collaboration as involvement – involving the community, for example, Planned, unplanned, spontaneous interactions, visits, brainstorming and problem solving sessions are all opportunities for collaboration and shared decision making. Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh (1985) describe 5 types of involvement used in effective schools (home visits, parent conferences, community-based learning activities, citizen volunteers, and citizen representation on advisory committee).

Family collaboration is also touted as a means to understand different perspectives, facilitate open and respectful discussion and lead to meeting the mission and vision of the schools. Wilmore (2002) state that families and the children are the first priority and they should

be solicited, welcomed, and encouraged to be a part of the school community. Students should share in decision making. In years past, school was viewed as an authoritative institution where students should passively participate in programs designed for them. Increasingly it is recognized that the rights of individual students must be protected, educational needs met, and that students' active participation in educational decision making is related to effective schooling (Klausmeier, Lipham, & Daresh, 1983).

Principals are encouraged to be active in their communities, capitalize on diversity within the community, and leave the office to visit the community including the families and children who are stakeholders in the school. This enables parents and citizens to participate actively and meaningfully in the educational activities of the school (Daresh, 1983) as guided by concepts from social systems theory. Community members (parents, citizens) are identified, become involved in the educational processes of school through working with teachers, and share in decision making, which then increases communication and also additional involvement, which helps those within the school understand the home and neighborhood conditions of their students and allows for better problem solving and shared decision making (Kim, Fruth, & Bowles, 1976; Getzels, 1978).

Finally, collaboration within the team of administrators is also key. There is a clear importance logistically and in a supportive manner to build and have a positive working relationship with the vice-principal(s) and other administrative team. It is suggested to meet regularly to discuss day-to-day operations, allot time for mutual professional growth, allot time to discuss research trends/leadership literature, and find time for evaluating and considering instructional strategies (Ontario Principal's Council, 2005).

Ethical. Ethical standards are the hardest thing any human can confront – the highest standard of performance behavioral imaginable (Wilmore, 1994). Although all principals arriving in the position will state that they themselves will act with integrity and ethics, the truth is that not every situation is black or white. Context may affect the right decision, being fair is not always a consistency, and there is no rule book of all the right and wrong things to do when dealing with people in a moral, ethical, and honorable way. Wilmore tries to generalize simply with the statement that principals should, "treat people right."

There is an abundance of new research highlighting the importance of ethics instruction in training programs broader than education (e.g. psychology, business, law enforcement, etc. Baggett, 2007; Souryal, 1998). Within education, new curriculum is being proposed to impose ethical training of educators in preparation programs. Bruneau (1998) developed, "PEP (protocol, ethics, and policies)" to be a part of education training programs (albeit for teachers, it's applicable to training programs for all educators). Protocol establishes how things are generally done. Ethics are serious and complex issues that lead to "what should I do?" questions. Teachers and teacher educators use the term ethics broadly as personal life choices and situation specific choices prescribed by a professional code of conduct (Aurin & Maurer, 1993). Policies are usually the answers to the questions of particular situations. Bruneau states that all instructional programs should encourage new teachers to understand the values they themselves hold, improve communication/conflict resolution/dialogue to understand adequate and relevant facts to understand the consequences.

Shapiro, Poliner, & Stefkovich (2005) developed a text to be included in education training programs. The authors apply a number of theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas to engage education leaders into problem solving ethical situations. The authors demonstrate the

application of different ethical paradigms--the ethics of justice, care, critique, and the profession

through discussion and analysis of real-life moral dilemmas that educational leaders face in their

schools and communities; addresses some of the practical, pedagogical, and curricular issues

related to the teaching of ethics for educational leaderships; emphasizes the importance of ethics

instruction from a variety of theoretical approaches; and provides a process that instructors might

follow to develop their own ethics unit or course. Part I provides an overview of why ethics is so

important, especially for today's educational leaders, and presents a multi-paradigm approach

essential to practitioners as they grapple with ethical dilemmas. Part II deals with the dilemmas

themselves. It includes a brief introduction to how the cases were constructed, an illustration of

how the multiparadigm approach may be applied to a real dilemma, and ethical dilemmas written

by graduate students that represent the kinds of dilemmas faced by practicing administrators in

urban, suburban, and rural settings in an era full of complexities and contradictions. Part III

focuses of pedagogy and provides teaching notes for the instructor. The authors discussed the

importance of self-reflection on the part of both instructors and students, modeled how they

thought through their own personal and professional ethic codes, and reflected upon the critical

incidents in their lives that shaped their teaching and frequently determined what they discussed

in class.

    Culture and Philosophical Basis. All the philosophical analysis needed could never be

learned in one preparation program. Rather, it is suggested that principals continue to study

society and philosophy to keep in touch with emerging values and perspective so they can be in a

position to analyze them and compare them with their own personal philosophies. It is an

ongoing lesson to grasp the connections between demands placed on a principal daily, with the

cultural values inherent in these demands, and the underlying philosophies of the demands (Thomson, 1993).

Multicultural issues are a recent, yet important topic that has become a critical component of teacher and administrative education programs. In the last U.S. Census population survey of 2006, 58% were native-born non-Hispanic White, 14% African American, 14% Hispanic, 6% Asian, and the rest other foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). Thus, with the significant number (nearly half) of minority students, the education system must be prepared to meet the learning needs of a culturally diverse population. Principals are not only expected to promote but also to make certain that school-wide multicultural education programs are implemented and they must construct an empowering school culture and a learning environment where all students (from all racial, ethnic, and social groups) are to be heard, valued, respected, and encouraged (Parks, 1999, Banks, 1993, Manning and Baruth, 1996). Indeed, aspiring administrators are expected to become knowledgeable of multicultural issues and become people who respect and encourage diversity (Barth, 1990). The response is to include multicultural courses in administrator preparation programs – courses that have administrators discuss, listen, understand, appreciate their own values to then allow for the understanding of others, and to confront their own fears and issues (Manning & Bartuh, 1996, Troutman, 1997-1998, Hansman, Grant, Jackson, & Spencer., 1999).

California Standards

California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) as well as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium for School Leaders (ISLLCS) are used in California to guide the manner in which the principal leads the school. These CPSEL standards

mirror and reflect the ELAC standards very consistently. Thus, California has embodied the

nationwide standards and interpreted them in a very consistent manner. All of the ELAC

standards have in common the desire to establish the administrator as an educational leader that

works towards the success of all students and practitioners in the school. For CPSEL & ISLLCS,

this thread is also identified as all of the standards begin with the statement, "A school

administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students…" This is

similar to the above ELAC standard of promoting the success of all students. Standard 1 of

CPSEL relates to the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of

learning that is shared and supported by the school community; indeed, an integration of ELAC

standards of vision and collaboration. The administrator must have knowledge and

understanding of systems, strategic plans, information and data sources, effective strategies for

communication and negotiation, and learning goals. Standard 2 relates to developing a school

culture and instructional environment that facilitates faculty and student growth. Thus, the

principal must know about motivation theory, principals of effective instruction and curriculum,

evaluation tools, professional development, organization systems, technology, the school culture,

and diversity. Standard 3 relates to management (theories and practice of organizations, fiscal

and technology operations, legal issues, and technology and resources) while Standard 4 relates

to collaboration and respect for diversity. Standard 5 specifically addresses the personal and

professional code of ethics. The principal is expected to know about the purpose of education,

ethical frameworks and their purpose, the value of diversity, and the background of ethics and

education. Standard 6 acknowledges the balanced role that has historically been important in a

principalship – one that understands, influences, and responds to the larger political, social,

economic, legal and cultural context. In all, the standards that guide principal training and

leadership programs are consistent across the nation (including California) and are extensive and philosophically grounded.

Training and Internships

Barth (1980), who founded the Principals' Center at Harvard stated that a new principal often gets a "title, an office, responsibility, accountability, and obligation…Nothing more." This is an extreme version of what really happens but how does a new principal achieve the nationwide and the California standards with what seems like such little support? Thankfully, in the recent decade, support and instruction for principals does not end after the principal training program ends. Principals participate in internship and mentorship programs -- coinciding with the ELCC's Standard #7. Internships should be substantial. All activities by the intern should directly connect to one of the aforementioned standards and state or national standards (which are research –based and collaboratively developed). Internships should be full-time, at least 6 months but preferably a year long, paid, and conducted under a trained mentor with supervision from the district and from university level personnel. Finally, internships should be conducted in real-life multiple settings (across grade level and across community settings). The intern should participate in activities that are planned collaboratively (by the intern, the mentor, and the university professor) (Wilmore, 2002). Indeed, there is an abundance of research that identifies the benefits of field-based situation learning/internships and opportunities to practice authentic administrative work guided by qualified professionals (Aiken, 2002; Capasso & Daresh, 2001; MiUndrae, 2004; Milstein & Krueger, 1997).

Traditional Theoretical Perspectives that Guide Training Programs

Theoretically, a variety of theoretical perspectives guide mentorship and internships for both principals and teachers: Even back to Paolo Freire (1973) who coined the term "the banking concept of education" to describe a model of education designed to maintain existing power relationships rather than to promote students' critical thinking. According to Freire, when an instructor acts as the possessor of knowledge and the student as the receptacle, "the teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence" (pp. 53–54). If we consider the consequences of Freire's theory in a psychoanalytic institute, the banking concept of education would ensure that a small cadre of "expert" analysts oversees a community of "novice" supervisees, passing referrals to each other in the name of providing the "best" treatment available.

Further, Social Learning Theory also can set the framework for principal preparation programs. The idea is that learning occurs through avenues other than actual experience. Learning occurs on a vicarious and symbolic basis by observing the behavior of others and the consequences of this behavior. This theory becomes the theoretical foundation to facilitate learning and teaching within cross-functional cases. Effective cross-functional integration is needed to solve problems and improve work processes that cross organizational lines. Cross functional education is intended to develop managers with an organizational perspective that enhances communication, learning, and decision making (Crittenden, 2005).

Systems Theory has been commonly used as one conceptual framework for increasing a principal's understanding of essential inputs, processes, outputs, and feedback mechanisms of school in relation to its environment. The theory teaches a principal his/her management role in planning, preparation, management, and evaluating of a school budget (Lipman, Rankin, &

Hoeh, 1985). Systematically relating educational resources, programs, and evaluation results leads to improving the budgetary process (Frohreich, 1983).

Programs can take on <u>Stage Theory</u> – when the induction of new principals is best achieved when it addresses the needs of principals in their different developmental stages. Principals go through survival, control, stability, educational leadership, and professional actualization stages. The purpose then of the mentorship would be to help the principal through stages 1 and 2 as quickly as possible.

<u>Vygotsky's</u> theoretical perspective bases such a theory of teacher self-regulation aimed at higher order thinking and affective states. This type of instructional program may hold promise for preparing teachers who are consciously aware and monitor their own teacher introspection, who use this awareness to exercise proactive control over teaching situations, who base this self-monitoring and metacognition on the (1) quality of their teacher preparation, (2) unique internalization of this knowledge and skills via reconstruction, and (3) specific teacher student interactions. A teacher education model based on this theoretical basis is outlined and contains six components. Benefits of the mode1 have included improved lesson planning, classroom performance, creative problem solving, and less anxiety.

<u>Identity theory</u> has been used mostly in teacher preparation programs – but mentioned here because it challenges the pre-service professionals to be reform-minded thinkers and to challenge the current system or philosophy of thinking. New teachers are encouraged to develop a new professional identity by recognizing themselves as a certain kind of person because of the interactions they have with others, that identity is constantly being formed and reformed, and that it is constituted in interpretations and narrations of experience. Thus, a new teacher must learn to align themselves with a new identity (which a more progressive manner of thinking), they must

25

be supported in an open and progressive class structure (in prep programs), and certain experiences should be highlighted as they relate to identity development – particularly those with retrospection and reflection. The problem, however, is that innovative thinking is not usually the norm in most schools, those that have not seen or experienced reform will not "buy in", and some teachers will not see a connection between standards and methodology.

Again, although this is designed for teacher preparation programs, reform and innovation are extremely critical characteristics for any principal over time. Principals should seek a professional identity that goes against the current norm (Leuhmann, 2007; Cochran-Smith, 1991).

Other philosophies of educator training exist that teach students/interns to self-reflect, re-evaluate, and challenge their own thinking. For example, a "contemplative practice approach" is a form of phenomenological inquiry that is designed to disrupt the habitual thinking patterns of teachers, enabling them to see aspects of their teaching practice more clearly. In this approach, learning to suspend judgment, bias, conditioned responses, and hasty interpretation allows for more fluid and open perception, guiding the practitioner into forms of inquiry closely akin to Polanyi's tacit knowing (1962), Schon's reflection-in-action (1983), and Miller's contemplative practice (1994). Such disciplined perception works to broaden the range of pedagogical actions and responses and allows for deeper layers of meaning to emerge from classroom events.

Another example, Metaphor Theory, aims to provoke increased teacher reflexivity and provide a catalyst for shifts in belief and practice. Metaphor theory is situated within the psychology of embodied cognition so this intended use as a personal and thereby social change mechanism is an attempt to bridge social and psychological paradigms. That said, embodied cognition theories describe how social meanings are embodied through bodily action into neural

patterns (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), and so challenges the notion of innate ability and emphasizes

the experiential and social origins of knowledge.

Mostly studied then, are the theoretical backgrounds to the instruction and training of

new teachers yet many of these philosophies are applicable to the administrator and principal

training program. Indeed, a principal in training gains theoretical knowledge to form the basis of

their behaviors that lead to the achievement of the training program standards. But, this is not all

that's required. Much research has contributed to the knowledge that such social and emotional

domains (motivation, communication, sensitivity, management of stress) also require being

addressed in training programs.

New Theoretical Perspectives on Training Principals

Motivation. McCall (1997) argues that one of the primary roles of an effective principal

in forming and maintaining a learning organization is that of a motivator, which can only be

done if they themselves are well-motivated. One extreme difficulty faced by most principals is

the lack of external motivation for their own behaviors – thus, they must be self-motivated. Tips

to do this include enhancing the meaningfulness of work, responsibility of work-outcomes,

knowledge of results provided to others, shaping effort-performance expectations, and shaping

performance outcome expectations.

Communication. The ability to communicate is critical. The Ontario Principal's Council

(2005) dedicates an entire chapter to the development and sustainment of appropriate and

effective communication. They clearly state the need to make communication a focus, in a

visible and real manner (not just through technology) and emphasize the priority of face-to-face

communication. Tips are presented on what types of communication are available to principals,

27

who the audience is, and what format communication can take. Most important, they identify the importance of active listening and the development of a school communication plan. Some principal training programs even take a step further by working to teach a principal how to write better to allow for even deeper understanding of their own ideas to enhance communication (McCall, 1997; Thompson, 1993)

Sensitivity. Most principals spend an inordinate amount of time smoothing ruffled feathers and soothing hurt feelings. When principals are sensitive, they demonstrate consideration towards the feelings, attitudes, needs, and intentions of others and sense what others feel about themselves and their place in the world. They spend 80% of their time using interpersonal skills (McCall, 1997). Skills learned in sensitivity training assist leaders in all labor organizations, including K-12 education. These skills are critical in examining the internal and external factors involved when a principal tries to predict the responses of others to better respond to and handle a situation. This is under the assumption that the more sensitive a person, the more able they will be to predict the behavior of others.

Management of Stress. Steinberg (2000) and Ferrandino (2001) identified one cause of the shortage of principals as the fear of the time and stress management linked to the position: "numerous evening and weekends at schools, watching extracurricular activities and attending meetings…the long hours, the difficulty meeting under-funded mandates". Queen and Queen (2005) identified the educational leader as one that exists within a culture of stress. Such situations are extremely time consuming and stressful -- personal stressors (self and of staff), non-instructional responsibilities (e.g. dealing with discipline problems, paperwork), personnel issues (finding and keeping qualified teachers), school reform, etc. As a result, immune system suffers, body functions suffer, psychological and thought processes suffer, eating habits suffer,

and burn-out occurs faster. The authors provide a slew of strategies to cope with and reduce stress. Others also have addressed the stress levels associated with a principalship (Ontario Principals Council) with self-evaluation tools to identify personal stress levels and suggestions for reducing stress. Other strategies include creating trusting relationships, caring communities, and shared responsibility among teachers and principals for activities within the school building – indeed, work with others to help manage one's own stress (Kelehear, 2004).

  Leadership. An abstract concept but probably the most critical for a principal who is, indeed, the leader of the school. In fact, one characteristic evident in high-performing schools is a dedicated and dynamic principal. Strong leadership is essential for school reform (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Murphy, 2002; Murphy & Louis, 1999; Wallace, 1996). Principals in training experience leadership training through interactions with practicing principals in the context of authentic situations, operationally defined as the social construction of professional performance expectations to develop and steadily improve role performance. Strong leadership develops strong relationships among peers, fosters reciprocal learning, and creates a community of practice (Hansen & Matthew, 2002; Browne-Ferrigno, 2005). Thankfully, there are a number of books for new "educational leaders" that give tips – "one-liners" to help organize, cope, and survive in the new position. For example, leaders maintain integrity, praise in public and criticize in private, keep promises, are on time, and are responsible for their own actions and the actions of others (Crittendon, 2002). Goleman (1998)'s five components of emotional intelligence contribute to leadership skills and thus, should be developed and fostered: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill. Other tips to be an effective leader include, "don't take yourself or others too seriously' (Daly-Lewis, 1987), "do something safe, dramatic, and visible early (Skelly, 1996), and Joel (2002) "the buck stops here."

Summary of Training Program Components

As has been reviewed, a plethora of authors with evidence based practice, experience, as well as qualitative data have contributed to principal training programs by identifying the 'missing piece' -- as a matter of course, that is how these training programs have evolved over time. They have all identified their own component that is critical to the training of principals and indeed, most training programs embody many of these core standards and self-actualizing concepts. In other words, the principal training programs teach the spectrum of the facts and practical aspects of the job to the interpersonal and personal characteristics of the job. Why then is it so hard to keep strong, effective school principals?

Summary of Research on Principals in Practice

The Fear of the Logistical Knowns. All potential principals are prior teachers, school personnel, or school administrators. They have first hand experience with a principalship because they were either guided or served under a principal, have worked with a principal, or have experienced or known a principal. Aspiring principals understand how difficult the position is: the daunting job requirements, small pay differential, frequent criticisms of public schools, and the particularly difficult task of leading high-risk school environments (Roza et al., 2003; Fenwick & Peirce, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001). In a study by Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, (2005), aspiring principals were qualitatively questioned as to what their needs were after participating in a training program to offer insight into perceived principalship readiness. The common theme from other studies as well identified the first issue to be one of juggling current positions while training as a principal – not surprising and not new information. The two notable

other findings however, were that how much "leadership" experience they had had and whether their internship was guided by an "outstanding leader" or an "exceptional principal" greatly related to their feelings of readiness. As a result, 60% of the students who completed a core (standards based) program for principals at a prominent university declared that they were not ready for a principalship. Milstein & Kruger, (1992) states that strong principals should demonstrate the ability to respond adequately in situations that require leadership behaviors. Some suggestions of Browne-Ferrigno & Muth are to use retired principals to mentor new principals, principal-teacher job sharing to give teachers more 'leadership' experience, and teachers who can go on special assignments to develop leadership experiences. Clearly, the need to be prepared to "lead" and "make leadership decisions" is a critical component of principal readiness which leads to principal success.

   Not Knowing What You Don't Know: "Surprise!" Under the assumption that the training of new principals has adhered to all of the above standards (both school based and self-based) at the highest level, the new principal has had ample and effective intern experiences with a strong mentor principal (a strong leader), and the new principal has an understanding of the logistical and day-to-day demands of the position; once in the position, a whole new socialization begins.

   Most of the research on first year new principals is either from over-seas (where the system is different than in the US) or if in the US, the papers published are mostly all anecdotal. There is a clear distinction across all of the works between "problems" and "surprises." Principals consistently reported problems with financial management (Thomas & Hornsey, 1991; Hobson et al., 2003), administrative overload including staffing issues (Thomas & Hornsey, 1991; Hobson et al., 2003; Draper & McMichael 1998, 2000; Prince, 2004; Parkay and Hall, 1992), conflict resolution (Webster, 1989) and the taking over of a position from a prior person

31

whether beloved or loathed (Benaim & Humphreys, 1997; Hobson et al., 2003; Webster, 1989).

In one fairly comprehensive study that combined case studies with a national survey of new

principals, Parkay & Hall (1992) reported that the most problematic in-school concerns were

dealing with multiple tasks and decisions, and communicating effectively with various

audiences. While these problems were interesting, they were uninformative as they are problems

faced by any organizational leader regardless of context (Quong, 2006).

What is interesting and not predictable by prior training experiences are what is being

termed the "surprises" of the principalship. Surprises or events that are perceived to be

unexpected are those which come "without warning' or are "unforeseen" (American Heritage

Dictionary,). Unexpected events have the potential to induce varied reactions, ranging from

surprise to behavioral "freezing" as well as alterations in neurological, physiological, and

psychological, behavioral, and social processes. Most importantly though, reactions to

unexpected events involve processes whose associated cognitive and behavioral influences have

wide spread implications to human performance.

Draper & McMichael (1998) surveyed "heads of schools" in Scotland and their reported

level of competency was highly related to the degree of crisis experienced in the school which

was also related to their degree of surprise. Support from senior management team and heads'

mentors greatly assisted this area.

Anecdotal stories describe the surprises faced by principals – things they were never

prepared for or were never mentioned in principal preparation programs, their prior jobs, or their

internships, (e.g., how a new principal handled a school in the wake of 9-11 – essentially one

week after he took the post) (Kinley, 2002). Another report described the specifics of a first-year

female principal in a small rural school district – albeit mostly interview and perspectives from

faculty, parents, and administrators (Kay & Seguin, 2002). Prince (2004) highlights the importance of mentoring and feedback during a first year principalship given the surprises for which he was not prepared. Quong (2006) in Australia, described his first year prinicpalship by answering the personal question, "What can be said about my first year experience that can benefit other beginning principals?" To answer the question, a theoretical basis was used – an action learning approach to focus and describe how unexpected surprises and problems were dealt with. Further, Quong also queried 5 other first year principals to identify common themes of the difficulties faced (both expected and unexpected). Parkay and Currie (1992) investigated 12 case study principals and all saw themselves as inhibited in their role as leader by the constant need to "fire-fight" or respond to unexpected demands.

Using career socialization theory (Day & Bakioglu, 1996; Reeves et al 1998), the phases of learning of a newly hired principal are as follows (O'Mahony & Mathews, 2003):

Phase 1: Idealization phase: Before taking up the role, mixed emotions (elation, uncertainty, expectation, and fears). Comprised of hopes and visions, beginning familiarization;

Phase 2: Immersion phases: learning the role and the most difficult phases of all due to the onslaught of demands. It is a time of "surprise" and "sense making";

Phase 3: Establishment phase: defining the role. More calm period of time where structure and processes are put into place;

Phase 4: Consolidation phase: when one feels accepted in the role and more perceived wisdom.

Within the most difficult "immersion phase" new principals form a new identity as they truly experience the new position. Identity theory from literature on occupational mobility (Kelly, 1980; Louis et al., 1983) describes the forming of the "leader" that one hopes the new

33

principal becomes. Identity is seen as dynamic and developmental. It is not a fixed element of

the adult self but instead evolving as one incorporates new elements from the roles and

relationships encountered in family and occupational life. Identities are constructed out of

directly experienced success and failures, but also out of role expectations and learning by

observation and imitation. Not only does identity change, but the elements which contribute to a

person's job identity do not themselves stay static. In relation to a principalship, for example,

expectations of what makes for effective schools, changes annually. In addition, the role one

once occupied is altered (e.g. from a teacher, to an administrator, to a principal – thus from

delivering curriculum to managing and interpreting curriculum, to being someone who makes

decisions about curriculum). Change represents the differences between the old positions and

the new and although some aspects of the change may be predicted, many are not clarified until

the job begins.   Thus, surprise results when there is considerable difference between the job as

expected and as experienced (Louis, 1980).

Studies and discussion about the causes, responses, and outcomes of unexpected events

span a wide array of domains and contexts – from medical (Whitfield, Morley, & Willick, 1998;

Woods & Patterson, 2001; Mintun, Vlassenko, Rundle, & Raichle, 2003) to astronomy (Lyne et

al., 2004), to business (Kylen, 1985; Weick & Sutclife, 2001) to evolution (Spinka, Newberry, &

Bekoff, 2001).

Psychological Frameworks on Surprise Events

Three psychological frameworks are used to understand the thought processes for

unexpected events. The first is within a schemata-theoretic framework (Mandler, 1984;

Rumelhart, 1984; Taylor & Crocker, 1981; Meyer, Reisenzein, & Schutzwohl, 1997) where

34

perception, thought, action, emotion are controlled by knowledge structures called schemata. Schemata are informal, unarticulated theories about objects, situations, and events. We consistently monitor and evaluate these schemata based upon available data encountered. If all are congruent, the process is somewhat effortless or automatic; however, if there is a discrepancy between the schema and input, surprise is elicited and more effortful, conscious, and deliberate analysis of the unexpected event is initiated. For example, if a principal has a schema that all male basketball coaches have the knowledge and understanding of appropriate physical behaviors with female youth under 18 and as they continue to meet coaches who are maintaining ethical standards, the schemata continues without thought. However, if the principal comes across a coach who is having a sexual relationship with a minor, that surprises the principal and an analysis and evaluation of the event (e.g. "is this person really a coach" or "there is no way he would do that as he is a coach") or an update, extension, or revision of the relevant schema is necessary (e.g. "oh, this evidence could be true and I cannot assume that all male coaches are ethical simply because they are coaches"). Thus, simply put, surprising events disrupt a person's schema and cause cognitive thought processes (assimilation/accommodation). Surprise is an adaptive response to unexpected invents – cognitive and motivational processes are directed to understand the unexpected event and cope.

Said in another way, (Myer, Reisenzien, & Schutzwohl,1997) when the events fit your schema, appropriate actions are automatic (i.e. effortless, unconscious and undeliberate). In contrast, if a discrepancy between schema and input exists, surprise is elicited and schematic processing is interrupted and a more effortful conscious and deliberate analysis of the unexpected event is initiated.

Further, the ability to respond to a surprising event is mediated by a number of variables. Hortsmann (2006) conducted 4 experiments altering certain variables and measuring response time. He found that the processing demands imposed by a surprising event are higher especially if it is comprised of multiple objects (rather than single), and the complexity and the length of the interruption renders the interruption more conspicuous. Surprise eliciting events result in the interruption of ongoing information processing and reallocation of processing resources to the schema discrepant event and culminate in an analysis and an evaluation of this event plus an updating extension or revision of the relevant schema (Meyer, 1988; Myer et al., 1991, Epal et al., 1994)

Indeed then, outside of a controlled experiment, particularly in a dynamic environment such as a school, a surprise event is extremely intrusive and involves complex mental, emotional, and cognitive processes.

From cognitive-behavioral research, when surprise occurs, the following four processes occur: 1) the verification of the scheme discrepancy which consists of making sure that an apparent schema-discrepancy really exists; 2) the analysis of the causes of the unexpected events; 3) the evaluation of the unexpected event's significance for well being; and 4) the assessment of its relevance for ongoing action. After conducing 3 different experiments, Meyer et al. (1988) concluded that when surprise events occur, the response time is increased and the accuracy in the response is decreased and that the delay in responses and the decrease in accuracy both increase based upon the complexity of the surprise event. In essence, surprise causes delays in reaction and an increase in errors. Further, another interesting finding was that when a similar surprise event occurred later on, the delay in event was shorter (albeit still delayed) and the error rate was less.

36

Other research confirms the latency observed in cognitive processing while one is faced with a surprise event. Surprise or discrepant events trigger the interruption of ongoing cognitive and motor processing. Indeed, the action interruption was involuntary and contrary to intentions (meaning the intent was to not delay). Further, one's focus of attention becomes selective to only the surprising event and an emotional component is triggered (e.g. the physiological feeling of surprise). Another factor that contributes to the latency in response is if the event is comprised of complex concepts and factors (Horstmann, 2006).

From psychological research, the unexpected-event hypothesis states that understanding your own knowledge and being able to report on it can be triggered by the *recognition* of unexpected events (Frensch et al., 2003). Thus, when you search for a cause of an unexpected or random event, it likely leads to the discovery of your own knowledge of other regular and related events (Runger & Frensch, 2007). This is critical for understanding thinking during a first year principalship. Indeed, when something unexpected occurs, it causes one to stop and think not only about the response to the unexpected event but also how expected practice occurs. Further, external vs. internal control interacts with expected and unexpected events and predicts depression. While the control variable was not found alone to predict depression, the expectancy variable was -- an internal attribution for an unexpected event is associated with increased depression (Flett, Blankstein, & Kleinfeldt, 1990). Further, while not as strong, unexpected events with an external attribution also had a small level of predictability for depression. A principal who feels an unexpected event is related to an internal locus of control (and to a lesser degree and external locus of control) can greatly contribute a negative identity forming within the first year. "I should have predicted that."

Control and Preparation in Relation to Efficacy

School leaders who were effective had to be individuals who could make decisions and balance their responsibilities (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998). Further, school leaders with negative self-efficacy cannot be efficacious.

According to social cognitive theory, self-efficacy is a personal factor (P) that can have significant effect upon human agency. Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). Self-efficacy beliefs influence the courses of action people pursue, effort exerted, perseverance in overcoming obstacles or failures, resilience to adversity, the extent to which thoughts are self-aiding or self-hindering when coping with environmental demands, and ultimately the level of accomplishments realized (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is, therefore, an important construct useful for understanding a broad spectrum of human behavior in various social contexts.

Social cognitive theory also provides a theoretical framework for understanding how strength of self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectancies interact to produce behavioral outcomes. High self-efficacy for a task with a positive outcome expectancy is expected to facilitate productive engagement. High self-efficacy coupled with a low outcome expectancy would be likely to facilitate protest or grievance. Low self-efficacy for a task that is perceived to be important creates stress while low self-efficacy for an outcome that is not valued is likely to facilitate apathy. It is important to recognize that, when considered independently, self-efficacy beliefs are better predictors of behavior than outcome expectancies (Bandura, 1997).

A review of extant literature on teacher and student self-efficacy reveals a large body of empirical studies (e.g., Pajares, 1996; Parker, Guarino, & Smith, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy,

& Hoy, 1998). On the other hand, research into the self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators regarding their ability to create and facilitate effective instructional environments has not enjoyed as much attention. Indeed, an extensive literature review on this topic with principals revealed a minimum number of related studies (DeMoulin, 1992; Hillman, 1984; 1986).

Interestingly, Oplatka (2004) identified self-efficacy in instructional leadership within a function of career stage. According to Oplatka, middle and later career principals have higher self-efficacy for instructional leadership. How can we provide newer principals with higher self-efficacy such that they remain in their positions and to be effective at an earlier stage?

The Need for Principal Training for Surprise Events

Taken together, we have a new principal who is forming an identity based upon success and failure responses to unexpected events or surprises given the changing nature of a position. Setting aside the core standards of principal preparation, to develop a successful principal leader -- one with ethics, motivation, stress-management, sensitivity, communication skills -- we want to increase the opportunity for success by decreasing surprise. This seems a lofty task given that no one can predict every incident or crisis that will present to a first year principal – but, by simply making a new principal aware of the multitude of unexpected events that could happen in the first year – beyond the logistics of the standards, the new principal realizes that these events are just like the events that they actually predicted (e.g. budget cuts, teacher issues, etc.). Thus, by querying a number of new principals and identifying the surprises they faced, identifying locus of control, and whether they rate their response to the problem as successful vs. unsuccessful, we can provide this information as written mentoring support for new principals. Tell a new principal – don't worry – this is actually what you should expect, others have dealt

with it too, here's the response and whether it was successful, and how to continue to build a positive identity as a leader. Expect the unexpected.

CHAPTER THREE

Design and Methodology

Background and Guiding Questions

Principals are not prepared for unexpected events that occur in their early careers. Unexpected events in a principalship can shape not only the impressions others have of a principal but also the self-evaluation of a principal. A strong, successful principal is one major key to a successful school and while training programs prepare principals for problems, they do not prepare them for surprises (Hess & Kelly, 2007). Further, within the job, high school principals are younger, less experienced, and have the highest turnover rate as compared to other administrators and teachers (Baker, 2007; Sahagun, August 27, 2000). This is a profession in jeopardy and it is critical to provide ways to prepare principals for the on-the-job surprises. The more successful they are at dealing with unanticipated problems and surprises of a principalship, the more likely they will feel successful, and the more likely they will succeed and remain in their positions. Indeed, principals' sense of self-efficacy can greatly relate to their ability to function in their job. The problem is, however, that the underlying philosophy of any training program is to prepare new principals for the logistical and leadership components of the job, but training programs do not prepare principals for the every-day issues and surprises.

The aim of this study was to make unexpected events more expected for high school principals. Study findings identified unexpected events from a sample of high school principals to understand the breadth of possibilities, to help identify the causes of those events and the locus of control, and to identify behavioral and emotional responses to the situations. The importance of knowing these findings will, in the end, guide the curriculum of principal training programs and/or school district induction programs for new principals to include a strand of instruction that

teaches new principals about surprise events so that they can be emotionally ready, respond effectively and in a timely manner. In turn, principals will have high self-efficacy which will lead to sustained employment.

I examined principals' experiences, impact, and responses to unexpected occurrences. To gather data, local principals were queried through a questionnaire to recall and report on any unexpected events they encountered early in their careers. Again, the goal of the proposed study was to further understand the breadth and impact of unexpected events to identify patterns to help new principals be more prepared beyond what even highly regarded principal training programs prepare them for.

The following *research questions* guided the design and the course of the study:

1. The unexpected event. According to the principals sampled, what were the unexpected events they encountered in their careers as principals? Principals were asked to describe any unexpected events including the event itself, the situational and emotional impact on all involved, and the principal's behavioral and emotional responses to the situation.

2. The reflection on the event. In reflecting back upon the elements of the unexpected event, what did they say they learned, and if they could have predicted the event to some degree, would that have assisted in their response?

3. The principal's self-efficacy. In what ways did the unexpected events experienced (including the principal's control over the event or the outcome of the event and self-efficacy) influence the principals' view of their professional performance?

The responses to the first research question resulted in a "training database" for events that could arise within a principalship. This essential question provided examples of problems, events, or situations that arose. Simply hearing "stories" about an event will empower principals

to anticipate more unexpected occurrences in their positions. In, for example, violence prevention research, the term "proactive" is the key to developing prevention and solutions to extreme situations. Indeed, Armistead (1996) provides a clear plan development for principals beginning with the importance of developing credibility before a crisis occurs. Part of this credibility rests upon developing a prevention plan. Having even a minimal idea of what possible events could occur make developing a plan considerably easier. Thus, with so many possibilities, the more examples of situations allows for better prevention and response.

Further, describing (research question #1) the impact of the events in detail provided an opportunity for the principal to reflect upon the event and the outcome (research question #2). The rationale for these questions is grounded within two very different theories. To understand an experience and solve a problem, one must identify the components that require change and then make the appropriate decision. The process of breaking tasks or objectives down into their simpler components is called task analysis (Gardner, 1985). To break down the objective, the principal must identify the pre-situation, the actual components of the event, and the outcomes of the event. This is grounded in learning theory which proposes that learning is defined as a change in an individual caused by experience (Mazur, 1990). Thus, the positive and negative outcomes of a particular situation shape the manner in which a person will respond in the next situation. Indeed, knowing what to change next time will likely lead to better behavioral response.

Research question #2 targeted reflection and thinking which then led the principal to reflect upon the consequences of their actions (research question #3). In terms of emotional responses, McCall (1997) describes a strong principal as one who spends 80 percent of his/her time using interpersonal skills but 20% of their time learning more about what is going on inside of

themselves. McCall also suggests that writing about events is therapeutic, a good way to pass on information, and a good way to reflect upon one's situation to become enlightened. Thus, these questions provided an opportunity for principals to not only identify the events, but to reflect upon their responses and the responses of others (both behaviorally and emotionally) as well as the impact upon themselves and other's views of them.

Appropriate prevention, analysis, and responses can be empowering to a principal. The foundation of this study was to allow principals to identify events, describe them, and reflect upon their impact. Their feedback both helped them and other principals respond in the future.

Research Design and Rationale

"Mixed methods research has come of age," (pg 4, Creswell, 2003). To include only quantitative or qualitative methods fall short of the major approaches used today in the social and human sciences. Researchers have felt that a mixed model neutralizes the biases of single methods (Sieber, 1992), leads to triangulation in that information from one method helps inform the other method (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), and can serve as a stepping stone to promote change in certain groups or samples (e.g. new principals) (Mertens, 2003).

Therefore, a mixed model of methodology was used in this study; specifically, a sequential exploratory design, which is the most straightforward of the mixed models. It is characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data. The priority is typically given to the quantitative data and the two methods are integrated during the interpretation phase of the study. Typically, the purpose of this type of design is to use qualitative results to assist, explain, and interpret the findings of a primarily quantitative study.

To collect data, a questionnaire employing both a forced choice response and a structured but open-ended free response design was used. Quantitatively, the responses were judged and categorized into domains of event type, locus of control, successful responses, and emotional impact. Subsequently, the study advanced to a second phase. Those who consented to be interviewed participated in a detailed qualitative, open-ended interview to collect more extensive views from participants including their analysis of the event.

The survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or options of a sample of a population. From sample results, the research generalizes or makes claims about the population (Creswell, 2003). Thus, from sampling the high school principals in a diverse district, one can make conclusions about high school principals in general. The survey is the preferred type of data collection procedure due to the economy of the design and the rapid turnaround in data collection (Babbie, 1990; Creswell, 2003). The data were cross-sectional in that it was collected at one point in time and the questionnaire was in the form of a self-administered, web-based questionnaire (Fink, 1995; Nesbary, 2000). Given the time pressures on principals specified in Chapters 1 and 2, the quickest and easiest manner for them to respond (e.g. no paper, envelopes, mailing) yielded the highest return rate.

Sample Selection and Background

The questionnaire was sent to 13 principals from the high and middle schools in a mid-sized school district.

The questionnaire was sent only to middle and high school principals because there is a much more robust range of surprises that occur with adolescent children/young adults due to increased independence (Dinkes, Kemp, & Baum, 2009; Phelan, 1998) and simply as a result of

larger populations/environments which equals more opportunities for problems. For example, in terms of violent acts in school in 1999-2000, 92% of secondary schools and 87% of middle schools reported violent problems as compared to 61% percent for elementary. Further, the size of a school's student enrollment was positively related to the prevalence of both violent and serious violent incidents. That is, the larger the school, the more incidents, (Miller, 2003). The use of middle and high schools is also extremely efficient as they generally cover a larger geographic area and have a more diverse student population than do schools at the elementary levels.

In terms of feasibility of this study, if all the schools were surveyed in California, the number would be near 10,000; if only the high schools were surveyed, the number would still be close to 2,000. This scope is unmanageable without external funding and support and thus, I limited the sample to one district.

The *quantitative* portion of the study included an email questionnaire sent to 13 local principals using a web-based database system. The email included a recruitment letter briefly explaining the aims of the study and the protection guidelines. The second email repeated the aims of the study, protection guidelines, and introduced the link to the questionnaire on the web-based database system. The quantitative portion included a question that asked if the principal could provide their contact information so that they may be contacted for a qualitative interview. This question also included best contact information (telephone number).

The *qualitative* portion of the study included all of those who responded positively to being contacted for further interviews. All those interested in participating in the qualitative interview were contacted via telephone.

Sample

The participants in the quantitative study were all principals (public) who consented to participate in the quantitative study by answering the consent question and then the questionnaire questions. No other exclusionary criteria were used (length of time as a principal, race, gender, socioeconomic status of the school, or school philosophy/magnet). Thus, there was no bias or ethical concerns regarding the sample selection. Indeed, the study was all-inclusive.

The rationale to include principals was to get the most comprehensive understanding of the events that could occur during a principalship. Assistant principals and other administrators were not sampled for two reasons. First, positions and roles are inconsistent at the lower levels in that many schools do not have particular administrators. Further, within the various positions on campuses, job descriptions and responsibilities vary extensively across districts depending upon the support (particularly at the middle school and elementary school levels). Second, principals possess ultimate responsibility and decision making. This accountability is unmatched throughout all other leadership positions of those that report to the principal. All positions under the principal essentially can release responsibility back to the principal and thus, do not face the event challenges at the same level.

The participants in the qualitative segment were self-selected. Thus, it depended on whether the responding principal agreed or volunteered to be contacted to carry out the qualitative questions.

Both sampling techniques offered the highest level of respect to the principal's desire to participate by using an extremely non-intrusive manner or recruitment (an email) with reminders (but without pressure or undue coercion) to participate.

Data Collection Methods

Quantitative Distribution Procedures. Following Salant and Dillman's (1994) recommendations, a four-phase administration process took place. The only difference was this administration was electronic rather than on paper. First, a short email advance notice was sent to all members of the sample (Appendix A). The second email was the actual link to the questionnaire, approximately 1 week afterwards (Appendix B). The third mail-out was another email follow-up sent to all members of the sample 4-8 days after the initial questionnaire (a simple reminder). The fourth mail-out was a "Thank you to those who responded" with a link in case non-responders changed their minds. There was no incentive to participate aside from the altruistic tenet that responding to the questionnaire could help guide principal preparation programs which in turn would help new principals be more effective.

Questionnaire. The questionnaire (Appendix C) was placed online through a web-based survey site (Survey Monkey). The questionnaire was separated into Section 1: Demographic Data. Section 2: Description of the Event, which included a description of the event itself including the impact of the event on the principal and others involved, the behaviors and emotions of all involved, and how well the event was recalled. Principals had the option to "add fields" and thus, describe as many memorable events as they could recall. Each event was queried with the same questions from the remaining sections. Section 3: Description of the principal responses (both behavioral and emotional), a break down of the key components of the event(s), and rating of how well the principal felt the event(s) was resolved by them. Section 4: This section evaluated the locus of control – how much the principal felt they had control over the event(s), other's responses, and their own responses. Section 5: How an event affected the working capability of those involved reflected the impact of the event(s). Some events rendered

a school unworkable (e.g. Columbine). Section 6: The expectation. Had the principal had any clue or hint that something was going to happen and to what degree? Had they had any training or warning on events such as these? Finally, Section 7 asked if the principal could be contacted by interview to get more information about the event for further information.

Although one example was given, I did not create a list of possible surprise occurrences because I wanted the principals to generate their own list without influence from my own biases of what might be salient or not.

Qualitative Method - Interviews. After the respondent provided contact information, they were immediately contacted to participate in the interviews. The purpose of the follow-up interview was to more deeply understand the thinking related to the principal's responses. The focus was first on the task analysis of the event or the ability of the principal to break down that event to identify the pre-situational components, the actual event and what situations it possessed, and the outcomes of the events. Second, the focus was to more deeply understand the emotions of the event and finally, the focus will be on the respondent's insight into possible preparation for that event. A tertiary focus was to confirm the questionnaire data.

These interviews were carried out via telephone or in person, audio taped, described in detail, and then the data were organized for clear presentation based upon the responses. The participants were notified that they would be able to review, edit, and erase the tapes/recordings of their research participation if they desired. In terms of the sample size for the interviews, Merriam (1998) identifies the significant difficulty qualitative researchers face when identifying a sample size. Patton (1990) recommends specifying a minimum samples size based on expected reasonable coverage of the phenomenon given the purpose of the study. I interviewed all those who volunteered to be interviewed which was greater than the minimum number (eight,

49

61.5%). Thus, the choice was not random. Since categorical conclusions were made based upon the aggregate of the quantitative data collected through the larger questionnaire, the rich descriptions represented a broad spectrum of scenarios. Given there was no "benchmark" on the number of persons to identify in a qualitative interview, this number seemed reasonably feasible given this project's breadth and upon reflection, covered the understanding of the research questions. Inconsistencies were not found; the self-selected group was not too homogeneous in terms of gender, ethnicity, age, length of career; the categorizations were not highly diverse; and I was able to get at least eight respondents to agree to an interview. There was no need to follow up with, based upon referrals from interviewees, additional principals from nearby districts who may have experienced surprise/crisis to collect more quantitative (and potentially more qualitative data).

The interview technique I used was the person-to-person interview. Person-to-person interviews are defined as a conversation "with a purpose" (Dexter, 1970, p. 136). This project used a semi-structured interview in that the questions were a mix of more- and less-structured approaches. Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, and Sabshin (1981) offer a list of four major categories of questions: hypothetical, devil's advocate, ideal position, and interpretive questions. This study did not use the devil's advocate questioning technique but used the other three.

The first set of questions focused upon the actual event. The respondents were asked to pick one of their events to discuss (the interviewer did not need to remind the respondent what events they named on their initial questionnaire). Then, the respondent was asked to re-describe this event to establish reliability of reporting. The respondent was permitted to describe it freely. Third, the interviewer asked the respondent to break down the event into the pre-components, the acts of the event, and the outcomes in a step by step manner. At this point, the interviewer

probed with interpretive questions. Interpretive questions advance tentative interpretations of what the respondent has been saying and then ask for a reaction. An example would be, "When a teacher noticed that 15 boys were in the girl's bathroom, would you identify that as a critical component in the larger issue?" The interviewer allowed the respondent to discuss and elaborate using probes to signify key issues.

The second set of questions focused on the principal's feelings about the outcomes of the event. To initially probe this, the respondent was asked to validate their questionnaire responses on their outcomes and behavioral responses to the event. Then, again, more interpretive questions were used to probe into their feelings and most importantly, some ideal position questions were used. Ideal position questions asked the respondent to describe an ideal situation. Thus, the respondent was asked to describe what ideally they might have hoped would happen and how they thought they might feel.

The final set of questions focused on their psychological reflections of the event. This began with both validation (from the questionnaire) and open ended questions about whether they felt prepared. Again, interpretive questions and ideal position questions were used to probe and facilitate responses. Hypothetical questions (ones that allow the respondent to identify what it might be like in a particular situation) regarding their training were used (e.g. "What experience or knowledge did you draw on to respond to the event? What if you could design a program for principals on unexpected events? What would it include?")

Data Analysis for the On-Line Questionnaire

This project was descriptive given the single sample and lack of control group; however, all quantitative and aggregated data from the open-ended questions were categorized and described. The data was extremely rich and highly descriptive.

First, from the questionnaire, the demographic data and the Likert–like scale data were aggregated. Independent variables were static and event variables. Dependent variables were response, emotional, and feelings of efficacy variables. Dependent variables were derived from the Likert-like scales and the aggregated open-ended question data. The open-ended question data was categorized by responses. As defined in Chapter 1, I categorized surprises (theoretical background, type of event, etc.); surprises were also categorized and then judged as to either proximal control or distal control. Proximal control meant the event happened within the school setting and distal control meant the event was a community or world event.

Data Analysis for Follow-up Interview

The analysis task of qualitative studies is to reach across data sources and to condense them as well as making use of pre-existing category schemes or subcategories to organize and analyze data (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Murdock et al., 1982; Lofland & Lofland, 1995) often with a classification scheme that is derived from the data itself (Lofland & Lofland, 1995).

A few common themes arose given the research on experience and learning. From Chapter 2, I identified themes based upon the extant literature; a schemata-theoretical framework where responses from the task analysis were categorized into those that are assimilated or accommodated into a principal's schemata, a cognitive emotional approach was considered when

categorizing responses (attribution of control interacting with emotion); and a physiological

approach was also identified (fight or flight).

Credibility, Validity, and Trustworthiness

    Pilot Questionnaire Validation. A pilot questionnaire was first administered to 5 adults

within the field of education who are not principals as well as 5 adults outside the field of

education. Those within the field of education were teachers, professors, and administrators that

were not principals. Those outside the field were from a broad perspective of employment (e.g.

finance, web-design, law, administration, investment). After completion of the questionnaire,

the following questions were asked to address construct validity (Jaeger, 1990): Did this

questionnaire provide you with an opportunity to describe an unexpected event that happened in

your career? Did this questionnaire "look" like a questionnaire on surprise events in your

career? Did the questionnaire solicit memories and feelings that you were able to describe given

the questions? Did the questionnaire allow you opportunity to describe your responses (both

what you did and how you felt)? Did you feel as though you could easily remember the event

(e.g. it was not hard to recall the relevant details)? Did you feel as though you could easily

remember your responses to the event? Did you feel as though you could easily remember your

feelings about the event? If any responses were "no", the questionnaire would have been re-

evaluated, revised, and re-administered to an additional 10 people until all responses were "yes".

Unfortunately, according to Jaeger (1990), no single piece of evidence is sufficient to fully

establish the construct validity of a measurement procedure, but no other published, standardized

or validated single questionnaire to date, within this domain is available. This was noted in the

limitations but the above validity assessment was relied upon at the least, to minimally demonstrate content and external validity.

Credibility. Within the questionnaire, the questions on "how well am I recalling this event" as well as "when did this event occur" provided a baseline for a description of the accuracy of the event. Given it is the perception of the principal that was in examination, most educated adults accurately portrayed their own perceptions.

Regarding my own biases, these were limited given the questionnaire was conducted on-line and with both close-ended and open-ended questions. Since I shared many similarities with the participants, it was critical for me to maintain objectivity. The on-line system completely separated my history/current situation from influencing the responses (e.g. if I were to have written their responses down over the phone). Further, it was extremely important to note that the initial questionnaire was anonymous and thus, people had no barrier to expressing what they really believed about themselves and not just what they thought they should say.

Verbatim transcripts of the interviews were made which first allowed for the collection of rich data (Maxwell, 2005) and allowed for the respondents to review the data if they so desired. As reported in the data collection methods, the transcript could have been sent to the respondent to review of if the respondent felt that any aspect of the interview was inaccurate, they had an opportunity to modify or correct. This did not occur however; none requested the transcripts.

Ethical Issues

No ethical issues needed to be considered within the questionnaire portion of this project. The information was completely anonymous and participation was 100% voluntary. This information was made clear on the questionnaire itself along with the human subjects consent

information (confidentiality and protection of privacy). Further, participants included adults who all had at least a college degree – all of whom were able to make informed decisions. Regarding the qualitative interview, one important ethical concern was that participants shared personal and career experiences that included their own thoughts and feelings and reflected upon their efficacy as a principal. The following was made very clear to all potential respondents: 1) all identifying information linking the respondent to the responses was destroyed after the interview, 2) no judgments were made within this research project. Thus, evaluation of principal efficacy was not part of the research questions, and 3) information was presented verbally to interview participants about confidentiality and the protection of their privacy. Furthermore, both the questionnaire participants and the interview participants received an electronic version of the written consent form along with an informed consent that was collected via email. All those participants who participated in the qualitative portion of the study will receive feedback of the findings.

Management of My Role. In conducting this study, I felt it was important to present myself as a principal who had lived through the unexpected. It was important to establish myself as a person who shared similar experiences and maintained an interest in investigating ways to help develop and prepare incoming principals. This was relayed in the initial emails.

Further, I also felt it was important to present myself as a principal who was furthering his career by not only educating himself but providing a possible new concept into principal training programs. This allowed the principals to relate to me on a similar level and at the least, appreciate my efforts, as the number of Ed.D.s in California clearly does not meet the needs of the administrators (CPEC 2000, p. 16).

The main challenge in this project was getting a principal to take the time to complete the questionnaire and even further, to volunteer for the qualitative interview. This challenge was definitely overcome by the fact that I am part of the same district as the respondents and this personal connection motivated them to give their time. Further, given the rich nature of qualitative interviews and responses, nine scenarios provided extensive and informative data.

Summary

The state of the principal profession is in dire need. The position has a high turn-over rate and is currently filled with people who are young and inexperienced because there are a lack of available people who are willing to endure the high stress and daily surprises that they are ultimately responsible for. To date, there is little research investigating the effects of surprise events in a principalship on the behavioral responses, the emotional responses, and the sustainability of principals. Further, principal preparation programs across the nation at the most prestigious universities do not include theories or training on how to "expect the unexpected" and the responses to these events.

The results of this project provided a fairly clear picture of the breadth of events that occur in high school principalships as well as principal's responses to those events both emotionally and behaviorally. A second component of the study, as a result of the qualitative interview approach, provided insight into principals' thinking processes in a reflection on surprise events. Indeed, the project provided broad generalizations through survey methodology and questionnaire but the interview provided the specific stories and the step-by-step thinking of the principal in these situations that the questionnaire alone could not convey. The mixed

method design allowed this study to maximize the strengths and diminish the weaknesses of both methods (Johnson & Onwuegbuzi, 2004).

The impact of this study could be far reaching. I already have the commitment from my own district of 33 schools (25,000 ADA) to incorporate the results of the study into a district-wide principal training program, but the impact of this study could extend far beyond the walls of a single school district. I believe this project could form the basis of an additional curricular focus for principal preparation programs, as well as a series of articles and professional development workshops sharing the results. Ultimately, it could produce a book of case studies highlighting the experiences, reactions and successes and failures of principals faced with dealing with unexpected events.

In conclusion, this study provided a fairly comprehensive picture of the types of surprises faced by principals, their understanding of those events, and their feelings about themselves given these salient events. It will, in turn, increase the probability that new principals will be more prepared and more adept at their positions – leading to more sustainability and efficacy.

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings

Introduction

Following the research methodology described in Chapter 3, electronic questionnaires via Survey Monkey were sent to 10 pilot subjects to establish content and external validity and to 13 middle and high school principals in a mid-sized Unified School District. All ten pilot subjects responded and 11 of 13 middle/high school principals responded. A follow-up qualitative interview was conducted with 8 of the 11 respondents who gave consent. The more narrow scope of the sample allows for a greater focus on the qualitative interview results.

Pilot Questionnaire

The pilot questionnaire was administered to establish content and face validity of the questionnaire (Jaeger, 1990) to 5 adults within the field of education who are not principals and 5 adults outside the field of education. Further, the pilot study served as a "run through" to catch any glitches in the questionnaire, the on-line system, and the data mining. This sample was selected because it was posited that if adults from a broad range of backgrounds could answer these questions, it would add support to the belief that the questionnaire does elicit memories of surprise events in their careers. We also selected 5 adults from the field of education to assure the content of the questions were clear and reasonable. All 10 adults also set a precedent that the questions were answerable, understandable, and that the Likert scale seemed reasonable. All 10 queried responded to the questionnaire request. The 5 adults within the field of education included one college professor, two high school teachers, and two elementary school teachers. The 5 adults outside the field of education were a computer programmer, an attorney, a graphic

designer, a business executive, and a program director. The average age of the respondents was 43.1 years and there were 6 males and 4 females. The respondents answered all of the questionnaire questions but in addition, provided feedback on validation questions. The following are the validation questions with the responses: Did this questionnaire provide you with an opportunity to describe an unexpected event that happened in your career? Yes = 100%; Did this questionnaire "look" like a questionnaire on surprise events in your career? Yes = 90% and "I believe so" = 10%; Did the questionnaire solicit memories and feelings that you were able to describe given the questions? Yes = 100%; Did the questionnaire allow you an opportunity to describe your responses (both what you did and how you felt)? Yes = 100%. It is to be noted that one responded suggested a larger Likert Scale (e.g. 1-9) for this response; Did you feel as though you could easily remember the event (e.g. it was not hard to recall the relevant details)? Yes = 100%; Did you feel as though you could easily remember your responses to the event? Yes = 100%; Did you feel as though you could easily remember your feelings about the event? Yes = 100%.

Given the positive responses to the pilot questionnaire, the actual questionnaire without the feedback questions was considered externally valid and sent to the target sample.

Target Sample – Response Rate

A total of 13 middle and high school principals received the first short initial email notifying them of the upcoming questionnaire. All 13 were then sent the second email with the link to the questionnaire one week later and then after one additional week, a polite reminder was sent. Approximately 3 weeks after the initial information email was sent, 9 respondents completed the questionnaire (69%). Two weeks later, the final email was sent thanking the

respondents and providing a link in case the remaining 4 changed their minds about responding. About 2 months after the "Thank You" email was sent, two more respondents completed the questionnaire. Thus, after approximately 12 weeks, a total of 11 respondents completed the questionnaire (85%). An online web-based response rate of 60% or greater is determined to be "very good" (DIIA, 2007),

Quantitative Questionnaire Respondents

Demographic Information.

As stated earlier, 11 principals responded to the quantitative questionnaire. The principals' range of experience was between 3 months and 7 years and 1 month ($M = 49.4$ months, $SD = 29.4$ months). There were 3 females and 9 males. The average age of the principals was 46.6 years ($SD = 5.94$ years) with an age range from 36 to 53 years. All but two principals had been at only one school and the other two had been at two schools as principals. They all responded with one unexpected event; three occurred within the 2010-11 year (27%), two within the last (2009-10) year (18%), three within the last five years (27%), and three occurred over five years ago (27%). Tables 1-4 describe the quantitative responses. Table 1 below shows that all the principals generally described themselves as effective and recalled their events very well.

Likert Ratings	1	2	3	4	5
Effectiveness as a Principal (least to most)	0	0	0	7	4

	1	2	3	4	5
				64%	36%
Recalling the Event (not at all to very clearly)	0	0	1	2	8
			9%	18%	73%
How well did principal resolve the event?	0	3	4	1	3
		27%	36%	9%	27%

Table 1. Quantitative Responses: Identification

In terms of resolutions, however, Table 2 below shows the principals were fairly mixed in that about a third felt the resolution was positive and effective and the others felt the resolution was somewhat ineffective and poorly resolved.

Likert Ratings	1	2	3	4	5
Control Over the Cause	9	0	0	2	0
	82%			18%	
Control of Behavior of Others	3	2	4	2	0
	27%	18%	36%	18%	
Control of Emotional Responses of Others	7	1	1	2	0
	64%	9%	9%	18%	
Control of Own Behavior Response	1	0	1	3	6
	9%		9%	27%	54%
Control of Own Emotional Responses	1	1	2	2	5
	9%	9%	18%	18%	45%

Table 2. Quantitative Responses: Control

In terms of control, most felt they had no control over the event but most also felt that they had control over their own responses (both their behavior responses and their emotional responses). The principals felt that they had moderate control over other's behaviors but most interesting was the fact that most principals felt that they had little control over the emotional responses of others. In terms of impact, the principals felt extremely emotionally impacted by these serious events (as indicated by the others impacted as well) but some felt a little less professional impact (Table 3 below).

_____

Likert Ratings	1	2	3	4	5

_____

Impact on those involved	0	0	1	2	8
			9%	18%	73%
Impact on Principal as a professional	0	0	2	1	8
			18%	9%	73%
Impact on Principal Emotionally	0	1	0	0	10
		9%			91%

Table 3. Quantitative Responses: Impact

Finally, Table 4 below shows that nearly all principals identified that these events were situations in which they were untrained and unprepared. Some felt they may have been warned but the warning did not help. The one responder who identified that she was warned and that the

warning partially helped, listed her surprise event as health and emotional breakdown during her

first year as a principal.

_____

Response	YES	Partially	NO
Did you expect this?	0	2	9
		18%	82%
Training?	0	1	10
		9%	91%
Warning	0	3	8
		27%	82%
Did the warning help?	0	1	2
		33%	66%

Table 4. Quantitative Responses: Preparation

Findings on the Research Questions

     Research Question 1: The unexpected event. According to the principals sampled, what

were the unexpected events they encountered in their careers as principals?

     The events described by the 11 principals will be presented by the theoretical framework

that underlies the type of event and the reaction of the principals.

     Using the theoretical model of the <u>schemata-theoretic framework</u> (Mandler, 1984;

Rumelhart, 1984; Taylor & Crocker, 1981; Meyer, Reisenzein, & Schutzwohl, 1997), seven of

eleven of the principal's surprise events were clearly characterized by what can be defined as

discrepancy between the principal's schemata of a certain person and the reality.   The events are

described first. Please note that the gender (M/F) and the level of principalship (MS/HS) are included to reference the scenario.

1) A teacher cheating: "Entire school's CST test scores were invalidated by one teacher giving out answers to students in her classes." (M/MS)

2) A teacher leaving their post and putting students in an unsupervised and potentially dangerous situation: "We had an evening PTSA event and the band and chorus were scheduled to perform. The music teacher was new and did not let the students or parents know about the event in a timely manner so many students did not attend. The missing students created a musical disaster as critical instruments were missing. The music teacher was very upset at the end of the evening. My assistant principal and I spoke with him, offered support in the form of a future meeting to discuss how to better communicate with parents and then he went to the band room. After securing the front of the school, office, café and restroom, my assistant principal and I went to the parking lot together to leave. We noticed the band room was still opened and that the lights were on and we could hear music coming from the room. We assumed that the teacher was still there. We did not realize that he had left campus immediately upon exiting the café. The music was coming from students who were just "hanging out" inside and the room was not secure. A parent was unable to find her child when she arrived at the school. She was furious that I had not been responsible enough to ensure that all students were safe at the end of the evening." (M/MS)

3) A parent significantly involved in a school-based club having intercourse with students: "Booster club president arrested for having sex with players on football team. Her son and daughter were students at the school. The arrest prompted high media attention and I was

surprised as reporters came onto campus to try and interview students as I was simultaneously finding out about the information." (M/HS)

4) A coach raping a young student: "An Asst. Girls basketball coach and LACOE instructional assistant was on the campus and was arrested and eventually convicted of raping a 16 year old, popular girls basketball player. This was a highly charged issue, lots of parent and student emotions, lots of staff finger-pointing and questioning, and the media very interested in situation. All the information hit me at once as he was arrested." (F/HS)

5) Student athletes stealing and vandalizing: Three students broke into a local middle school and were arrested for stealing and vandalism. (M/HS)

6) A classroom assault. A student severely physically assaulted a teacher and a student in the middle of the class. (M/HS)

7) A lying parent: A parent had completely invented a situation with his child and another group of students. The report of this information was an incredible surprise. (M/MS)

Clearly, a new principal could not expect these behaviors and most come into the position with a positive (at best) and realistic (most generally) view of those members of the school community (teachers, parent volunteers, coaches, students, and family members). Indeed, the cognitive dissonance identified by each of the principals in these situations was stated very clearly:

"Student athletes are going to get in trouble, I knew that but what surprised me was the *level of crime* these students engaged in – I was devastated." (M/HS)

"I suppose I could have imagined a 'coach behaving inappropriately' with a student but I *never* imagined a rape." (F/HS)

"It truly *never* occurred to me that a teacher could walk away like that." (F/MS)

65

"This was so rare, there is *no way* to ever predict that someone would give students answers to state tests." (M/MS)

"This was one of those things that you see on TV but *never* think is going to happen in reality." (M/HS)

"I had no idea this was going to happen. I knew something like this *could* happen but I was so surprised by the parent's accusation when it did." (M/MS)

"This student was new to the school, didn't have a record, and I *would have never assumed* that this kid was prone to violence." (M/HS)

The principals' emotion in these situations was palpable. Six of the seven rated the emotional impact as significant. The one that rated his emotional impact low was the principal of the Booster Club parent situation and that principal stated that at the time, "I was more in disbelief, stunned but I learned quickly to not take sides and stay void of emotion."

From a cognitive-behavioral perspective, two of the situations described can be categorized as problem solving events. These events were identified by the principals as situations where a surprise event occurred but the principal was not there first hand to receive the information by the primary participants. Thus, they were provided information from someone else and thus, had an opportunity to engage in cognitive processes, thus affecting their ability to deal with the outcome. The first event was a facility break down described as a broken water main that cut-off all water to the school first thing in the morning. The second event was a student attempted suicide. Clearly, the principals had time to mobilize, problem solve, and communicate with those involved. Further, it is extremely clear how the principals worked through the attribution of their control along with their emotions. Although the first scenario is

long, it is exceptional how well this middle school, male principal expresses his emotion as it intertwines with his discovery of information and problem solving.

"Approximately 2 weeks into the school year of my first principal job, one of our custodians let me know that a water main broke and the city would have to shut off the water to the entire school to fix the break. The shut off would occur sometime in the next hour and I did not know if it would be off for a few hours or a few days. To confirm the vagueness of the situation, I went to talk to one of the employees. He relayed the same message to me. I asked if he could talk to his manager about getting us a more concrete time frame and some porta-potties, as my custodian had suggested. This initial interaction took about 5-10 minutes, I believe. I was uneasy since I had never been in a situation like this and was trying to figure out what this even meant. My anxiety was not high at this point because initially I did not know what the potential ramifications could be. Having a little bit of a handyman background, I then realized that if all of the water was shut off from the school, the approximately 675 students and 40 staff members would have no place to go to the bathroom. It was at this point that my anxiety jumped significantly. I had no idea how to solve the bathroom issue. I only knew this was being put on me whether I like it or not and, as principal, I had to find answers. I felt paralyzed for several minutes. A few minutes later, my custodian said no porta-potties and the water would be shut off some time in the next hour, but they still did not have any idea for how long. This information did not help the situation at all. I wanted answers and got nothing. I was angry. Dealing with this situation by myself thus far, I really wanted to have someone to bounce ideas off of or brainstorm or just game plan. My stress level was growing extremely high and I did everything I could to not let anyone know. Even though I had no answers for the problem, I knew I did not want anyone to panic and make the situation worse. This situation was getting

67

difficult to handle by myself. I generally work better when collaborating with colleagues. Not having anyone to work with on this increasingly difficult situation was only adding to my anxiety. I then called one office at the district level because I knew that office often dealt and supervised facility related problems. The main contact was in a union negotiating meeting. I then called the second district office of my direct supervisor. He was in a meeting with high school principals. At this point I knew I had at least needed to run this situation by someone who might have dealt with a similar situation. I still had no answers and it felt like a clock was ticking fast. I asked his secretary to pull him from the meeting I knew he was leading. While I waited, I called the city to try again to get them to bring out porta-potties. I felt they were a part of the problem, had access to a potential temporary solution, and should use it. I finally called a help line, which only passed on the information. They could not even transfer me to the right person. I felt extremely angry at the city since they seemed to be a part of the problem, had a potential solution, but wouldn't use it. By this time, my supervisor had called me back. He did not have any solutions either. He did share that this happened to another middle school in the middle of the day. They chose to send everyone home. That caused massive chaos. This information only set another boundary for me and raised my anxiety more. I realized then that releasing students was not an option. I had to have a better solution. My supervisor said he would see if he could come up with anything and call back in 15 minutes.   Now about 20 minutes into the situation, I called together my two custodians and one security guard. I called them together because I knew they knew the school best and would be the ones helping me work through the situation. I got everyone caught up. One of them indicated we did have two porta-potties in the back corner of the property that soccer teams use on weekends. These porta-potties were at least 150 yards from the nearest building. Knowing the potential sanitary conditions of a

porta-potty, I felt like I should see for myself the condition inside if we were to potentially ask students to use them. Gratefully, the porta-potties were extremely clean and I felt comfortable having kids go to the bathroom there. I was then called to the office to speak with district personnel. The district office had already gone ahead and rented 2 porta-potties from a local rental company. I was told they would arrive some time in the next couple of hours. I then called my supervisor, and let him know of the plan. We had two functional porta-potties and two more on the way. We were going to lock up the bathrooms and let teachers know of the situation. In the meantime, my custodian had filled up several five galloon buckets of water before the shutoff for the cafeteria to use for cooking lunch. Also by this point, the city had shut off the water completely without giving us any warning related to a time frame. I was now about 30 minutes into the situation. I had a plan, but had to get information out to students and teachers. A 15-minute break was coming up in 20 minutes where 700 students and staff might need to use the bathrooms. I did not want to do an announcement on the P.A. system because I felt it might add panic or stress unnecessarily to people. Since the assistant principal teaches a class during this period, I had the security guard cover her class for the remainder of the period. The assistant principal and I then went class to class, letting teachers know of the situation and having them release kids before the break that had to go to the bathroom. We stationed staff at the porta-potties for crowd control. The two additional porta-potties arrived shortly thereafter. The water line was eventually fixed in the afternoon, about four hours after the beginning of the situation. The students that needed to use the porta-potties were fine. Amazingly, I did not receive one concerned parent phone call."

The second scenario from a cognitive-behavioral perspective was an attempted student suicide.

"My event is actually two major events with a series of related conferences and meetings", reported a male, high school principal. "About two years ago, a student attempted to commit suicide on campus during the school day by trying to leap off a 3rd story walkway. A group of teachers and students intervened and were able to wrestle the student to safety. There was a series of conferences and meetings that followed this event in which I led discussions with the parents and a team of other support staff, and in every instance, the father made light of the attempt as it just being chalked up to teenage angst, and his son just wanting attention over a girl not wanting to be his girlfriend. No matter how graphic I was in describing the horror of what we experienced, the dad never wavered, and due to his persistence a few months later I was told I had to re-enroll his son. Just a couple of months later, the student attempted suicide in the same manner, from the same location, and was rescued by the same group of teachers. In my follow up meetings with the parents, the dad remained in denial and continued to make light of the circumstances. Eventually, they withdrew the student on their own and enrolled him in a school out of state, and they refused to tell us of the location."

Finally, the last two events can be categorized in a psychological framework. The unexpected-event hypothesis (Frensch et al., 2003) describes a person's state of awareness of one's own knowledge through the search for the cause of the unexpected event. For example, one female, middle school principal stated that she was incredibly surprised by her declining health in her first year. She had stated, "After my first year of being a principal, my health had completely deteriorated. Although I had been accustomed to working 12-14 hours/day (I had in the previous year helped open a brand new school and done the preparatory work a year before the school was built), the desire to make my own school everything I had envisioned almost killed me. During the last 2 weeks of the school year and summer months following I was

hospitalized and saw several specialist doctors. I had been at my deathbed and received a second shot at life." Indeed, this principal spent an entire year searching for the cause of her declining health, "Initially I have to say that I failed to react properly. I continued to put in extra hours, not really being able to eat or sleep from all the stress, and pressed onward to all the numerous work that needed to be done. I was always on an adrenaline rush but basically my body completely shut down. When I was hospitalized and the doctors told me that I almost died, it was a true wake up call for me and my family." Throughout the year, this principal identified her health and the stressors of a first year as being her own responsibility -- her own locus of control. She continued to work harder and continued to deteriorate both in the position and in her health. The principal stated that the key facts that contributed to her inability to resolve her situation that first year was "lack of communication, honesty due to fear of rejection and judgment of my abilities." Further, this principal was the *only* principal that stated that at the time, she had *no* control over her own behavioral responses and *no* control over her own emotional responses. She clearly identified the mismatch between what she felt during the year (all internal locus of control, she felt she should have been controlling the situation) and how she perceived the event in retrospect.

A second male, middle school principal described being forced into facilitating a school-wide Professional Learning Community his first year as a principal with "NO training." The principal stated, "I spent an entire week, day and night, researching and educating myself on exactly what a PLC was and assembling materials for the teachers … emotional state = FEAR. I did not know any previous training the staff had received, I was angry at being put in this situation, so the anxiety was overwhelming, the unexpected process almost killed me." The principal identified more and more information throughout that week to psychologically form a hypothesis about the event, "This was not my fault, I had no way of knowing this would happen,

71

and so I quickly became an 'expert' on the subject and charted the course for the school." Thus, this principal established this event as an external locus of control and thus, was able to organize and mobilize and "fight".

As mentioned, across all of the events, the impact on the principal was on the higher end of the Likert Scale ratings; however, the descriptions of the events and the Likert Scale ratings show a fairly significant impact on others as well. Further, all of these events were of external locus of control. None of these principals felt that they had caused these events to occur but the following analysis of the qualitative interview sheds light on their emotions and self-efficacy.

Qualitative Interview Findings

Eight of the eleven respondents from the quantitative portion of the questionnaire agreed to be interviewed (7 males, 1 female; 5 high school principals and 3 middle school principals). The interviews took between 30 and 45 minutes each. The interviews were recorded and the interviewer also took notes. One of the five high school principals provided one additional surprise event in his interview. The principal described a year in which three teachers died. The event was external to the school and the principal and the event involved significant cognitive-behavioral responses. Thus, Research Question #2 and #3 are based upon 9 surprise events.

Research Question #2. The reflection on the event. In what ways do principals reflect back upon the elements of the event, what do they say they learned from these events, and if they could have predicted the event to some degree, would that have assisted in their response?

Using social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997), the principals' reflections on the events will be categorized by self-efficacy (positive/negative) and outcome expectancy (good/poor). In all of the qualitative interviews, the principals described their own capabilities to organize and

execute what was needed as extremely positive. Every principal stated very clearly that they felt

they solved the immediate problem extremely well. Some examples of positive self-efficacy are

as follows:

"The more people I talked with, the closer I got to a solution. You could almost draw the

quadratic graph y=x^2 (from 0) of my ability to function and problem solve. I had slow

movement and problem solving at the start, but as I collaborated with more people my

effectiveness in handling this new situation increased fast… The resolution was extremely

good once I got going." (M/MS)

"I responded well because I made it my priority to take care of other people." (M/HS)

"There was a lot of finger pointing and blaming on the staff but I felt that it was my job to

help the staff, the parents, and community deal with the aftermath and move forward. I

was successful." (M/MS)

There were, however, two clear groupings of outcome expectancy and resolution with all

principals feeling self-efficacious but in some cases (N = 3) the outcome and resolution was

poor/negative while in the other group, the resolution was strong/positive.

The first case, described by a male high school principal, where the outcome was *negative*

was in the teacher assault case. There was a call on the radio that there was an emergency in the

classroom; the student was verbally assaultive, had a knife, had stabbed another student, and had

attacked the teacher with fire and pushed her down. The principal was very nearby and was one

of the first people to arrive at the classroom. Students had already begun to restrain the

assaultive student and the principal and the other campus security were able to restrain the

student, keep him in the room, and remove all the other students to the next-door classroom.

They notified the police and within a very quick amount of time, the student was arrested and

taken off campus. The principal resolved the immediate assault situation extremely well. What he couldn't resolve was medical care, psychological care, and income protection for the long-term substitute who was the teacher at the time. The principal felt the district could have done something to assist the teacher but did not. That caused the principal to seriously re-evaluate his ability to remain in a position where one cannot take care of his own staff. Further, the principal was driven to tears when he stated that he felt, "very jaded by this incident and have lost some sense of positive outlook on the organization (district) and this will have a permanent impact on me."

The second case involved the students in the high school that had engaged in a felony theft. Early on in the process, the male principal, "took expulsion off the table too soon." When additional information had been learned about the extent of the students' crime, the students should have been expelled but the principal felt it was "too late to go back" and thus, the "consequences did not match the severity of the crime." That was "very dissatisfying to him and the entire community." Further, the principal felt "blamed" for the disciplinary action that was taken because the student was high profile by being related to prominent members of the community and the staff, were athletes, and the vandalism was racist in nature. To complicate the situation, the investigating officer attempted to cover up the situation because the officer had a son in the school. The principal felt very strongly pressured to go lightly and was actually threatened by one of the police officers who said to him, "wait and see what happens." The principal felt "scared about retribution."

The third case that did not resolve well involved the two suicide attempts. The reason this did not resolve well was because the male, high school principal felt the student was not ready to return to school and needed additional psychiatric care, and the principal felt that the parents

were in denial about their son's mental state. He had serious concerns about the well being of the student. The principal could "not find any way to prevent the student from returning to school." The second time it occurred, he was angry. He also found out that the parents knew there were two prior attempts and that the parents withheld the boy's health history and medication information from the school. Further, after the second attempt, the parents pulled the boy out of school abruptly and moved to a different location without notification. The principal stated, "I felt that I had done what I could but that it wasn't enough." He also stated, "if I had found a way to help the boy, I could have prevented the second attempt." Further, the principal felt concerned about the well being of the boy as he does not know where he is or how he is doing.

In terms of *positive* outcomes, although there were scenarios where there was no way to reverse the outcome (e.g. a rape, a death), the situation was handled with great precision by all involved (e.g. principal, staff, administration, family, and the police). For example, one female high school principal stated, "I needed to protect the students and brace the school for the media storm that was about to hit and that I did a very good job telling the other players on the team, getting the students off campus, and communicating with parents. I made 40 plus phone calls so the children that would be most impacted by this would be protected. The staff was made aware and the perpetrator was arrested and eventually prosecuted."

The additional scenario of the teacher deaths (not included in the quantitative data) again exemplifies that although the end result was tragic, the situation was handled well. This scenario also offers additional insight as the male high school principal had, essentially, an opportunity to practice his response. Although no less tragic, on the 2nd and 3rd occurrence, there was "less anxiety and emotional issues." Further, the principal had confidence that what he was doing was

the "right thing," based on the success of his prior responses. He was able to proceed in the 2nd

and 3rd occurrences with more certainty that what he was doing was correct and appropriate.

A final example was the Booster Club Parent situation at the high school. This was notable

because the media impact was immense, the closeness of the event and the aftermath to the

student population, the split response of the campus, and the community outrage. The male

principal had to protect the 12th grade victim and the 10th grade student of the parent who was the

accused. The principal felt he responded to the setting event well and the follow-up was

effective.

In terms of what the *principals learned some selected comments include:*

Don't make commitments before all information is gathered (theft, training)

Know your policies and procedures for negative events (theft)

Make deeper connections within the community (police, athletics) (theft)

Dig deep and get more information about students that show any risk behaviors (attempted

suicide)

Problem solve to change the environment in any areas of concern (suicide, water main,

Booster Club Parent)

People will try to do unethical and inappropriate things to make themselves look better. Do

what you think is right, not necessarily what is easiest or makes you look good (theft).

Your reaction as the leader impacts the whole school (Booster Club Parent, training, test

scores)

Despite best intentions and best efforts, there is sometimes no justice (teacher attack)

One must seriously evaluate whether they would be willing to stay in a position if they could

not take care of their own people (teacher attack).

Be aware that events that impact you as a principal also significantly impact the participants. Realize how damaging and difficult these situations are for those directly involved (teacher attack, Booster Club Parent).

Be more aware overall; fully expect that adults will abuse the students, and be immediately suspicious of small warning signs (rape, Booster Club Parent)

Do not internalize issues that do not directly relate to you (rape).

Respond calmly, rationally, and certainly because you'll know the right path to take. Stick to the facts (rape, water main, Booster Club Parent).

Without losing compassion, remove yourself from the event and problem solve (rape, Booster Club Parent).

Find positive ways to compensate for the negative situation to re-build (test scores).

Control your own emotions for the sake of leadership and successful resolution (death of teachers).

Focus on your staff's hierarchy of needs (people's own emotions) and make the people the first priority (death of teacher, teacher attack, test scores).

Learn to shape the way you speak to others; sensitive, factual, clear (death of teachers, water main, Booster Club Parent).

Communication and collaboration is critical. You are not alone (water main).

Research Question #3. The principal's self-efficacy. In what ways did the unexpected events experienced (including the principal's control over the event or the outcome of the event and self-efficacy) influence the principals' view of their professional performance?

Five principals felt that even though they had no control over the event, they had control over the outcome and they felt positive about their performance that led them to the outcome.

They clearly identified that their performance continued on a positive track as a result of these experiences.

"Although it took longer the first time to figure out what to do, having multiple attempts allowed me to do things better and better in each situation. Again, albeit tragic, I felt very positive and validated by the strength of my response, I felt effective as a principal, and the staff view of my responses defined me as an effective leader." (M/HS)

"I felt validated. My good resolution was the key factor leading to feelings of effectiveness." (M/HS)

"In the face of the challenges, I felt good about standing by my principles regardless of the difficulty." (M/HS)

"The school suffered greatly (no money, no scores, no improvement) but I maintained emotional disconnection, managing conflict, and picking up pieces of the event. It was difficult but I found ways on campus to compensate and in the end it was a confidence builder for me." (M/MS)

Four principals had significant emotional impact. Although they were efficacious and appropriate, their own emotions overwhelmed their ability to function at their best.

"Didn't have anything like this on my radar and am now fully aware that I need to be on alert for mistreatment of children and I would have liked to be more in-tune, in-touch but didn't know to be. I feel like there may have been red-flags that might have been seen, and it didn't mean that in retrospect I missed a warning sign, it means that there *might* have been and I need to be sure to catch them. I controlled my reaction to this on the outside but on the inside, I could not. I lost sleep and had 24/7 anxiety for a long time after the school year ended. It created huge doubt about my personal ability to deal with issues and that I had

tons of self-doubt. I felt competent as an assistant principal but not at all as a principal and this one event was a major contributor to my own self-doubt and feelings of ineffectiveness." (F/HS)

"I was at a loss and extremely anxious. The anxiety was overwhelming. I often didn't know the answers to the questions people were asking me. I felt isolated and alone, I felt I had no resources, I didn't know the staff well or the site well, my approach to the training was not optimal and actually was in conflict with the topic and what approach should have been used. Because of my emotions and my lack of knowledge, my execution was horrendous. Because I didn't do it to the degree I had hoped, it took longer for me to feel comfortable in my role and to build rapport with the teachers. I felt like I couldn't get past being in survival mode and this then shaped the rest of my year. I felt very ineffective throughout the entire year. I had mixed feelings about myself: Good that I made it through it but terrible because I didn't do a good job. I was shaken but then I was motivated." (M/MS)

Summary

Thirteen middle and high school principals within a mid-sized unified school district received an e-mailed electronic questionnaire simultaneously. Of those school principals receiving the questionnaire 11 responded providing the researcher with a strong response rate. It was found that the majority of the principals were easily able to recall and report upon an unexpected event in their principalship that they had little control over (and variable control over others involved). Further, although these principals felt they were generally effective in their positions, these surprise events were truly a surprise and the events significantly impacted their own behaviors and emotions. Most events were categorized by the concept that people did not fit

the schemes of the principals and thus, the principals were greatly surprised by the event. This forced them to re-evaluate their schemata about certain members of their school's community. Those who did that successfully were able to prepare themselves for future events. Other principals used more cognitive behavioral techniques and worked through their emotions with problem solving and collaboration. Finally, a few were psychological in their approach and went deeper into their own attributions of the event.

Follow-up qualitative person-to-person interviews were conducted with eight consenting principals. The rich data provided an insight into the details of the events, the emotions and behaviors of the principals, and the outcomes. A generally even amount of both positive and negative outcomes were reported. Given the nature of all the surprise events, no principal identified control over the situation but many felt strongly about their own efficacy which has led to strong positive feelings about themselves. Principal frustration and emotion was related to both negative outcomes and locus of control.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Introduction

The aim of this action research was to examine if my own experiences and surprises with a number of extremely salient events as a new principal were unusual. Indeed, they were not. Clearly, it was easy for 11 school principals (out of 13) to recall and describe serious unexpected events they encountered as a principal. They described the event and the resolution, the situational and emotional impact on all involved, and their own behavioral and emotional responses. Events ranged from being unprepared to provide an important training, to declining health, to facility break-down, to the most serious events that include physical and emotional harm to others.

Eight of the principals were willing to seriously reflect back upon their events with insight via a follow-up interview. They provided detailed information on how events unfolded, their thinking and emotions, and the things they would have done differently. For example, the detail in which the principal who reported on the water-main break in his second week of the principalship, exemplifies how his anxiety and emotions nearly over-powered him, but with problem solving and collaboration with not only people at his school but colleagues in the district and community contacts, he was able to achieve a positive response.

In all, principals were unable to predict these events but if they had been, they said they would have been significantly better prepared to handle the aftermath. For example, albeit tragic, having multiple deaths of faculty members in one year allowed one principal the opportunity to really practice resolution strategies. Further, even if a new event did not occur in subsequent years, principals reported that they were more watchful and had learned to search for

signs that might lead to other unexpected events. A few principals clearly stated how they were now more suspicious and savvy about people and circumstances given their prior experiences.

In light of these findings, it is extremely clear that surprise events are a common occurrence in principalships. Knowledge of the event (awareness, knowledge of your surroundings), preparation (knowing who to talk to, having done it before), and insight (knowledge of your emotions, behaviors, and the situation) can be key components into positive resolution. A tremendous amount can be learned from these scenarios both in terms of what is possible (by simply hearing about the scenario itself) and what can be done to help principals be better prepared.

Lessons Learned

Through the in-depth understanding of the breadth and impact of unexpected events, I was able to reveal patterns in the data that could help new principals be better prepared beyond what even highly regarded principal training programs prepare them for. This section will focus on the lessons I learned about how to improve professional training programs by integrating what I discovered through the qualitative questionnaire and what we know about training programs. The interviews that I conducted with these principals were actually a forced collaboration; I was actually assisted in my goal of trying to identify what should be taught to new principals by the principals themselves. They were each insightful and passionate about telling me the ways they felt principals should be better prepared. I use both their feedback and my own insights to establish the lessons to be learned.

Ways to be better prepared as reported by the reporting principals. This theme emerged from the interviews very clearly and certainly. Every interviewed principal emphatically told the

interviewer that they understood the goal of this interview and wanted to contribute to the topics

for principal training programs. The following are direct quotes from the principals about what

should be added/included in principal training programs to help prepare them for the possibility

of these impacting surprise events.

Opportunities

- Let the assistant principal get experience in dealing with crisis. The principal (rape) stated that she was an AP for 5 years and had crisis situations but the principal (at that time) handled the situations and she was not privy to the details and the process. APs need opportunities to be involved, because "these kinds of things do happen but are almost always handled by the principal and district office."

- Sensitivity practice. Administrators need lots of experiences learning to be sensitive to the population they work with – time and awareness are critical. There is also a need for all district office administrators to have spent time as site-principals; otherwise they cannot guide administrators through crisis and end up with low credibility and effectiveness.

Training and Support

- District leadership and support. All administrators should be prepared for situations like these, coming down from the district. Policies, protocols, and awareness of issues should be centrally provided through trainings. District leaders should train all principals on what they are expected to teach and execute.

- Mentoring. Mentorship styles of professionals vary, and because of administrator shortages and turn-over, administrators need to be prepared more quickly for the principal role. This means that principal mentorship of APs and aspiring leaders

needs to be more consciously planned. Train APs to transition to the principal role before they are principals. They are going into a stand-alone position that requires specific training.

- Administrator preparation programs. There is need for additional instruction for parent communication, dealing with the media, making relationships with the media, generalized problem solving (what you learn about a broken pipe can be related to all kinds of occurrences) and crisis/scenario instruction.

- Focus on People. Although one principal felt that his instinct to care for and support people came naturally, it can be taught and should be an element of administrator training. Teacher and student death is a very real possibility for any school.

- Hear Stories/Case Studies. Administrators have to be made aware of the stories of others to continue to take away as much of the element of surprise as possible. Administrators must be engaged in discussions about possibilities. There have to be more "what if" conversations, case studies, and walk-throughs. Scenarios and case studies have to be presented to administrators, and possible response and resolutions must be discussed in advance.

- Conflict Resolution Training. Administrators need actual conflict resolution training as emotions run high in those involved. Anger, resentment, sadness, etc. are volatile emotions and a principal is often placed in the position of mediator.

Collaboration Counteracts Isolation

- Know Who to Call. It is important to know who has had experiences with surprise events that can share solutions and offer support. Further, it is critical to have a list of people willing to support principal's resolution attempts.

- Peer Relationships. Principals should build a network/team within and outside immediate surroundings. This offers a natural counterbalance to any feelings of isolation even before surprise events arise.

- Communication Skills. Develop and practice communication skills that allow for clear and concise presentation and engagement with others. This opens lines of communication again to develop and build relationships with others.

Personal

- Stand by your principles, adhere to a higher code, think of people first.

Ways for principals to be better prepared. It seems impossible to more eloquently produce any additional concrete methods of how to better prepare new principals. I add, however, that if these lessons above are to be taught to others, a theoretical and empirical framework must be used to organize the presentation. Without the benefit of a literature review, these principals still touched upon a number of key concepts. For example, the Educational Leadership Constituent Council mentions a number of relevant issues: collaboration or "no man is an island", ethics (adhering to a higher code), cultural sensitivity, and managing the organization which includes both knowing your facilities, the policies, and the way things work in organizations that touch you.

Further, the suggestion that as many examples and case studies be provided to "walk through" is excellent but ambitious. Instead, I suggest that categorization of a few examples and case studies allows for the principal to form a theoretical basis for predicting events. For example, any event in which a person's behavior surprises you (e.g. a coach is actually a rapist) involves schemata theory – the idea that a schemata is formed about a particular person but

surprise occurs when information is learned that goes against your original schemata. Thus, principals learn to re-consider their ideas about people around them – making them more aware. Further, once the event is categorized, the principal can then embark upon the appropriate task analysis (Gardner, 1985) that can lead to resolution. Indeed, you identify the cause of the surprise and then break it down into its simpler components. To break down the objective, the principal must identify the pre-situation, the actual components of the event, and the outcomes of the event. This is grounded in learning theory, which proposes that learning is defined as a change in an individual caused by experience (Mazur, 1990). For example, the manner in which the middle school principal broke down the situation, collaborated, and identified his options in the water main situation can be easily applied to any other catastrophic situation (e.g. earthquake, dangerous person on campus).

Finally, I suggest that conflict resolution training as well as district support be conceptualized as part of Rotter's research on the locus of control. Locus of control refers to the extent to which individuals believe they can control events that affect them (Rotter, 1954) and this can be key in helping principals maintain appropriate emotional and behavioral responses to situations. It is critical for principals to identify and realize their role in certain situations, particularly when they are involved in conflict resolutions and issues with higher divisions.

Unexpected Findings

Given my own experiences with surprise events, I was an example of "practice" when it came to not being surprised by the responses of others. Firstly, the breadth of these events was expected given I had so many within the same "categories" myself. I clearly understood my own immersion phase into the position and the fact that the first few years involves learning the role

as well as being surprised as one makes sense of the onslaught of demands (Day & Bakioglu, 1996; Reeves, et al., 1998; O'Mahony & Matthews, 2003).

Second, the emotional and behavioral responses of the principals were generally strong, which, given my general personal knowledge of these adults, I was not surprised. In terms of behavior, these principals made decisions and balanced responsibilities. These principals reflected and thought extensively about their emotional responses and the consequences. Further, they were all still currently principals or supervised principals and thus, their success in handling these situations has led to their longevity. This concept of positive self-esteem and efficacy is supported extensively in the literature (e.g. Bandura, 1997; McCall, 1997). Indeed, these principals all considered themselves effective and had positive self-efficacy. (Bandura, 1997; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998).

Only one component of the data surprised me and that was how intense principals' emotions were when their efforts towards resolution remained unsuccessful yet they felt as though they were still somehow responsible. In theoretical terms, the emotions of the principals were intense and persisted when the outcome expectancy of the event was negative and the principal was unable to separate locus of control. When a principal feels as though they should be resolving a crisis situation more appropriately yet they are unable to do so, they could be at risk for depression. As mentioned, external vs. internal control interacts with expected and unexpected events and predicts depression. Although depression is not wholly caused by locus of control, an expectancy variable (e.g. internal attribution and unexpected events) is associated with increased depression (Flett, Blankstein, & Kleinfeldt, 1990). The principals who felt frustrated, had no control, but felt as though they should (and fought and fought to gain some control), were significantly emotionally affected and could be at risk for depression if this type of situation

87

occurred again. Indeed, one principal even cried during my interview as he recalled and expressed the story and his frustration. It was extremely surprising to me that an effective principal could continue to feel such strong emotions when the control was so clearly not his but *he* perceived that the control should have been his and thus, strong negative and self-defeating emotions resulted.

Limitations

There were two main limitations to this study. The first involved the questionnaire and interview instruments. Although the pilot questionnaire was subjected to a rigorous face and construct validation, there were no other instruments available to truly externally validate its credibility. Further, the questions in the interview were also not validated.   In terms of the interview, however, it is to be noted that rich and empirically supported information was gained and the purpose of the study was attained. Further, the Likert scale ratings from the e-questionnaire were excellent quantitative ratings that lent consistent support to the qualitative findings.

The second limitation was related to the fact that no principal felt he or she was ineffective. This could imply that all the principals who were faced with surprise events, in general, felt generally positive about their own behaviors in the wake of these surprises. It would have been interesting to identify former principals who have left the field and truly dissect whether surprise events contributed to their exit. As a result of this limitation, it is unclear the impact that surprise events and feelings of ineffectiveness may have on one's ability to remain in the position. Retaining principals is a challenge (Gates, Ringel, Santibanez et al., 2006) and an ex-principal could have shared their reasons.

Impact and Implications

Although the impact of surprise events on *losing* principals is not clear, the impact on *retaining* principals seems to be very clear. The responding principals in this study became stronger, smarter, more savvy, and more aware of the possibility of difficult circumstances. This information can significantly impact the field of the principalship. Although principal training programs prepare principals well for the every-day occurrences; no one prepares a principal for the long hours, stress, expectation level, and surprises (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003). Training an incoming principal to recognize, analyze, collaborate, and problem solve surprise events could greatly impact the success of their first year – which is the year in which decisions and outcomes can shape their careers (Parkay, Currie, & Rhodes, 1992). This leads to a positive cycle. Successful initial experiences provide them with positive self-evaluations, keep them in the position, and lead to more experiences that they can handle successfully, which then lead to stronger and stronger feelings of self-worth. The result is an experienced, effective, and career principal which impacts school effectiveness (McEwan, 2003). A successful principal positively impacts the entire school community.

Clearly then, the implication is that principal training programs, in-services and conferences should include training for principals on surprise events.

Next Steps

Informing Others. Given the extensive depth of the information but the limited sample (one district), it is critical that the first step be to impart the information to my district. Indeed, a district representative has committed to providing in-service time to this researcher for a

structured "surprise event" training. Second, for a broader reach, it is critical to also convey this information to other new and aspiring principals. Thus, the same in-service will be submitted to a statewide association (ACSA) for presentation at their next conference. Third, to take this information to aspiring principals enrolled in administrator training programs, the researcher will offer lectures to local Education Leadership Programs. Finally, a scaled version of this dissertation will be submitted to The Educational Leadership Journal with the hopes that other states, districts, and training programs will consider embedding "surprise event" training into their curricula.

Future Research. A state or nation-wide questionnaire could be carried out using the e-questionnaire used in this study. This study would not include a qualitative portion but could identify a very strong database of surprise events and methods of resolution. Further, a larger sample allows for more statistical analysis on feelings of efficacy, control, and impact.

As touched upon earlier, it is recommended that a qualitative investigation be conducted of former principals (those who were once principals but left the position). Although studies exist (using survey methodology) on why people leave a principalship (e.g. Gates, Ringel, Santibanez et al., 2006); it remains unclear how certain events shaped those principal's feelings and behaviors. Given the findings of this study, targeting part of the interview to investigate surprise events could lead to additional insight and further justification for the impact and importance of these events.

Conclusions

I have been a principal for 8 years and I feel strongly and positively about my abilities to both emotionally and behaviorally handle every component of my position. I truly feel that the

events I described in the introduction to this dissertation (which happened in my *first* years) and my ability to successfully navigate those events heavily shaped my career and significantly contributed to the fact that I have remained in this position. Although there are a number of established reasons why a principal may or may not remain in a position, I feel that those equalize across the field. Long hours, high demands, community pressures, etc. are all predictable and consistent as defining characteristics of the job. People choose to not enter into the position because they know full well that these are the issues. "Sure, be a principal, give up your nights with your families, take on all the responsibility, get little recognition and limited pay," I've heard so many people say. Surprise events, however, are just as they are termed… they are a surprise. They go beyond the "baseline" of the position and provide the principal with make-or-break situations that impact the principal in such strong behavioral and emotional ways that it can, in turn, make-or-break their careers.

It is critical for all aspiring principals and principals to feel strongly and positively about their ability to handle surprise events to provide them with the self-confidence to go on in the position and be effective. It is critical for them to expect the unexpected.

Appendix A

Email #1

Hello! I am a high school principal in Los Angeles and I will be sending you an email in about a

week asking you to participate in a questionnaire about unexpected events in your principalship.

We were not trained for these events and I would like to learn about the possibilities such that I

can shape training programs and teach others how to behaviorally and emotionally respond to

such crazy things that can happen as a principal. This is a research project to fulfill the

requirements of an Ed.D. I would be extremely grateful if you would consider participating and

completing this upcoming questionnaire.

All responses are completely anonymous!

Watch for it in your inbox in a couple of days!

THANK YOU!

Appendix B

Email #2:

Hi,

I am a high school principal in the Los Angeles area and I am writing to ask you to *participate in a questionnaire* on the unexpected events that have happened to you as a principal.

My interest is gathering information on unexpected occurrences during a principalship. Unexpected events would be defined as things that are outside the realm of typical preparation programs (budget, personnel, teacher training, instruction, observation techniques). I'm trying to gather information on unexpected events that surprised you, that did not have clear solutions, took an emotional toll, or was not something that anyone had ever told you might happen. In my short career thus far, I have had a number of extreme and surprising events shape my further behaviors and my thoughts about myself (e.g. having my basketball coach arrested for having intercourse with a 14 year old, or having students conduct a walk-out in protest of a decision).

So… sit back, relax, and reflect on the memories that have remained salient in your mind because they were so out of the norm or simply put, surprising or traumatic or paralyzing. Please briefly (15 minute questionnaire) tell me about those memories by clicking on the following link to go to the questionnaire.

Remember: ALL responses are anonymous!

Appendix C.

The On-Line Questionnaire.

Unexpected Events

Do you consent to participate in this questionnaire? Remember, all responses are anonymous

unless you indicate otherwise. YES   NO

Section1: Demographic

1. How long have you been a principal?

2. How many different schools have you been a principal at?

3. What is your gender?

4. What is your age?

5. How would you rate your current effectiveness as a principal.

0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

   0 – not at all effective, I'm struggling, re-evaluating myself as a principal

   3 – neither ineffective or effective – getting by

   5– most effective at my position as compared to peers

Section 2: Describing the event

1. Please try to recall up to 5 unexpected or surprising events[1] in your career as a principal

   that directly required your response. Describe each unexpected or surprising event.

   Please include in this section, the description of the event, the responses (behavioral and

   emotional) of those involved (not yourself). (Please note, how *you* responded is in the

   next section)

   Event #1.

2. How well am I recalling Event #1?

0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

   0 – not at all, hard to remember

   3 – recalling with some accuracy but with some forgetting

   5 – recalling very clearly

3. How recent was this event.

THIS YEAR   LAST YEAR   LAST 5 YEARS   OVER 5 YEARS AGO

Section 3 – Principal response

1. Please recall *your* response to the events listed above. Include your actual behavior and your emotional responses.

2. As you recall the event and your responses, break down the situation and consider the key factor or factors that either helped the event resolve well or not resolve.

3. Please rate how well you resolved the event

0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

   0 – not at all effective, the resolution was extremely poor

   3– neither ineffective or effective – it had both positive and negative components

   5 – I did an excellent job and the resolution was the best it could have been

Section 4: Control

1. Please identify if you felt you had control over the cause of this event

0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

   0 – no control

   3– moderate control

   5 – complete control

2. Please identify if you felt you had control of the behavioral responses of others to this event

    0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

        0 – no control

        3– moderate control

        5 – complete control

3. Please identify if you felt you had control of the emotional responses of others to this event

    0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

        0 – no control

        3– moderate control

        5 – complete control

4. Please identify if you felt you had control over your own responses to this event

    0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

        0 – no control

        3– moderate control

        5 – complete control

6. Please identify if you felt you had control over your own emotional responses to this event.

    0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

        0 – no control

        3– moderate control

        5 – complete control

Section 5: Impact

1. Please identify the impact (a qualitative construct – did this affect the atmosphere, the overall emotion, the working capability both emotionally and physically of those involved) this event had on those who were involved

0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

0 – no impact

3– some impact

5 – significant impact

2. Please identify the impact this event had on you are a professional

0 -------------- 1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5

0 – no impact

3– some impact

5 – significant impact

Section 6: Expectation

1. Had you expected something like this to occur at any level (e.g. "I knew this was going to happen and what surprised me was the extensive reaction," or "I had no idea this was going to happen but the reaction was bigger than I thought," or "I had no idea this could happen and the reaction was bigger than I thought".)? Check one.

YES   AT SOME LEVEL   NO

1a. Please explain

2. Had you known that something like that was going to occur, how would that have changed the occurrence's impact on you and how would it have changed your reaction and how would that have changed the resolution. Please explain.

3. Have you ever had any training on what to do in situations such as the one you described?

       Check one: YES   SOME   NONE

4. Had anyone ever warned you that something like this might happen?

       Check one: YES   SLIGHTLY   NO

4a. If so, did that warning help?

Section 7 – Further contact

Can we contact you via telephone for a short interview to learn more about your responses?

YES   NO

If yes, please provide an email address and telephone number. Please note that at this point, your responses will not be anonymous if you provide your contact information.

THANK YOU!

[1]The questionnaire tool will allow each question to be repeated if the respondent has multiple events. The tool will allow up to 5 events and repeat all the questions related to that event. For the purposes of this proposal, I did not repeat each question for each possible 5 events.

Appendix D.

The Interview Protocol

Open-Ended Interview:

Thank you for allowing me to contact you.

Your events were incredibly interesting. I'd love to hear more about them. Is there one you'd

like to talk about (can remind them of the events they listed).

THE EVENT DESCRIPTION

Can you re-describe this event again please?

Can you break down this event… (Interviewer is seeking the "task analysis" of the event)

In hindsight, were there any components, hints, indicators prior to the event that you noticed?

Did you take action?

Did you think, in hindsight that you should have taken action?

During the event, what were some of the key components that required action (or that should

have required action and you did not?)

How would you describe the impact of the event on the participants (yourself, the teachers, the

students, the school, the community). How would you measure or define that impact? (e.g.

every student in the school was crying)

After the event, were there key components that required action (or that should have required action and you did not?)

INTERVIEWER: Use interpretive questioning at this point to review any things the interviewee might have missed… e.g. if interviewee identifies 15 boys in the girls bathroom as a "prior to event" component but doesn't elaborate, you will use the interpretive question to gain a reaction, "When the teacher noticed 15 boys in the girl's bathroom, would you identify that as a critical component of the larger event?"

THE PRINCIPAL'S FEELINGS ABOUT THE EVENT

INTERVIEWER: You are validating questionnaire with explanations. Be sure to use "ideal position questions" to get them to identify what they had hoped would have been an ideal response to the situation.

1. How well did you respond to the event? Please elaborate.
2. How much control did you have over the event? (In hindsight). Can ask if their feelings of control are different than how they felt during the event.
3. How much control did you have over the outcome of the event?
4. How much control did you have over the responses of others regarding this event?
5. How much control did you have over your own emotional responses to this event?

PSYCHOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

1. Did you expect something like this to happen? Had anyone (in any training situation) provided warning about situations like this?

2. How did this situation impact how you feel about yourself personally?

3. How did this situation impact how you feel about your effectiveness in your job?

4. Is there some way that you can think of, that might better prepare you for events such as these?

References

Aiken, J. A. (2002). The socialization of new principals: Another perspective on principal

retention, *Educational Leadership Review, 3,* 32-40.

Armistead, L., (1996, April). What to do before the violence happens: Designing the crisis

communication plan. *NASSP Bulletin*, pp, 31-37.

Aurin, K. & Maurer, M. (1993). Forms and dimensions of teachers' professional ethics: Case

studies in schools. *Journal of Moral Education, 22*, 277-296.

Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods.* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA; Wadsworth Publications

Company.

Baggett, W. O. (2007). Seven criteria for ethics assessments: Organizations can strengthen

ethics training programs by focusing on employees' sense of self-efficacy to encourage

specific positive actions. *Internal Auditor*, *On-line publication.*

Baker, B. (2007). *Understanding the labor market for school administrators.* Presented at the

annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration. Alexandria,

VA.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman Publishing

Banks, J. A. (1993). Multicultural education: Development, dimensions, and challenges. *Phi

Delta Kappan, 75*, 22-28.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school

leadership. Boston MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bowman, R. (1996). First year principals; a study of needs and concerns', *The Practicing

Administrator*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 20-23.

Brown-Ferrigno, T. & Muth, R. (2006). Leadership mentoring and situated learning: catalysts

       for principalship readiness and lifelong mentoring. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 14*, 275-295.

Bruneau, S. (1998). Adding PEP (Protocol, Ethics, and Policies) to the Preparation of New

       Professionals. *Ethics and Behavior, 8*, 249-267.

California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) (2000). *The Production and

       Utilization of Education Doctorates for Administrators in California's Public Schools: A

       Report in Response to Assembly Bill 1279, Commission Report 00-9 (December 2000),*

       Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2004). WestEd and the Association

       of California School Administration.

California Public School Directory (2010). Sacramento, CA: CDE Press

Callero, P. J. (1985). Role identity salience, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *48*, 203-215.

Capasso, R. L. & Daresh, J. C. (2001). *The school administrator internship handbook: Leading,

       mentoring, and participating in the internship program.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin

       Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*,

       279 – 310.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principal centered leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Creswell J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods

       approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crittenden, W. F., (2005). A social learning theory of cross-functional case education. *Journal

       of Business Research, 58*, 960-996.

Cullen, J. B., & Mazeo, M. (2008). *Implicit performance awards: An Empirical analysis of the labor market for public school administrators*. Paper in preparation.

Cushing, K. S., Kerrins, J. A., & Johnstone T. (2003) Disappearing principals: What is the reason behind the shortage of applicants for principal positions across the state and nation? It's the job, stupid! *Leadership*, *19*, 2-6.

Daresh, J. C. (1983*). Home-school-community relations*. In H. J. Klausmeier, J.M., Draper, J. and McMichael, P. (1998). Making sense of primary headship: the surprises awaiting new heads, *School Leadership & Management*, *18,* 2, 197–211.

DeMoulin, D. (1992). Demographic characteristics associated with perceived self-efficacy levels of elementary, middle, and secondary principals. Abstract of paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Denhan, C. & Lieberman, A. (1980). *Time to Learn*, Washington DC: US Department of Education.

Dexter, L. A. (1970). *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Dinkes, R., Kemp, J., and Baum, K. (2009). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2009* (NCES 2010–012/NCJ 228478). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC.

Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment (DIIA). (2007). University of Texas at Austin, Measurement and Evaluation Center. Retrieved 2/12/12 from

http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/assessment/iar/teaching/gather/method/survey-

Response.php.

Edmonds, R. R. (1981). Making Public Schools Effective. *Social Policy*, 56-60.

Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (2002). *ELCC Standards for Advanced*

Programs in Educational Leadership for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum

Directors, and Supervisors, Reston VA: ELCC care of National Policy Board for

Educational Administration.

Ellis, A. (2001). *Overcoming Destructive Beliefs, Feelings, and Behaviors: New Directions for*

Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy. New York: Promethius Books.

Fenwick, L. T. & Pierce, M. C. (2001). The principal shortage: crisis or opportunity?

Principal, 80, 24-28.

Fink, A. G. (1995). *How to analyze survey data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Frohreich, L. E. (1983). *The school budgeting cycle, 3rd edition.* Winneconne, WI: Wisconsin

Association of School Boards.

Gardner, H. (1985). *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic

Books.

Garrison, J. W., Parks, D. J., & Connelly, M. J. (1991). Defining the "Philosophical and Cultural

Values" Performance Domain, *Report for the National Commission for the Principalship*,

84-85.

Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., Santibanez, L., Guarino, C., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., & Brown, A.

(2006). Mobility and turnover among school principals. *Economics of Education Review,*

25, 289-302.

Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., Santibanez, L., Ross, K E., & Chung, C. H. (2003) *Who is Leading our Schools: An Overview of School Administrators and Their Careers*. Rand Education Institute: Rand Corporation.

Getzels, J. W. (1978). The communities of education. *Teacher's College Record, 79,* 660-682.

Gilman, D. A. & Lanman-Givens, B. (2001). Where have all the principals gone? *Educational Leadership, 58,* 72-74.

Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink*. New York, NY: Little Brown & Company.

Greene, Jennifer C., Caracelli, Valerie J. and Graham, Wendy F. 1989. "Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation design." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11(3), pp. 255-74.

Guterman, J. (2007). Where have all the principals gone? The acute school leader shortage. *Edutopia Magazine, The Readers' Survey Issue.* The George Lucas Educational Foundation. Retrieved September 2010 from http://www.edutopia.org/where-have-all-principals-gone

Hansen J. M. & Matthews, J. (2002), The power of more than one. *Principal Leadership, 3,* 30-33.

Hansman, C. A., Grant, D. E., Jackson, M. H., & Spencer, L. E. (1999). Implication of students' world views in graduate professional programs. *Education, 119,* 5510-535.

Hertling, E. (2001). Retaining principals. Eric Digest, 147. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, June 17, 2001, http:lleric.uoregon.edu./publications/digests digest147.htmi.

Hess F. M. & Kelly, A. P. (2007). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal preparation programs. *Teachers College Record, 109*, 244-274.

Hill, R. L., & Banta, B. (February 11, 2008). Principal flight on the rise in the age of

  accountability. *Austin American-Statesman*.

Hillman, S. (1984). Contributions to achievement: the role of expectations and self-efficacy

  students, teachers, and principals: Abstract of paper presented at the annual meeting of

  the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Hillman, S. (1986). Measuring self-efficacy, preliminary steps in the development of a multi-

  dimensional instrument. Abstract of the paper presented at the annual meeting of the

  American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, California.

Hobson, A., Brown, E., Ashby, P., Keys, W., Sharp, C. & Benefield, P. (2003). *Issues for early*

  headship-problems and support strategies, Nottingham: NCSL.

Holloway, L. (April 15, 2001). As principals' ranks thin, group plans to train more. *New York*

  Times.

Hortsmann, G. (2006). Latency and duration of the action interruption in surprise. *Cognition*

  and Emotion, 20, 242-252

Huerta, G. C. (1999). Barriers to the implementation of multicultural education in secondary

  teacher preparation program. *High School Journal , 82*, 150-163

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders (ISLLCS) (1996).

  Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Interstate school leaders licensure

  consortium: Standards for school leaders. Washington, D.D.: Pearson Publishing.

Jaeger, R. M. (1990). *Statistics: A spectator sport* (2nd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Press.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm

  whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

Journal, 185(8), 37-39.

Kay, D. P. & Seguin, C. A. (2002). The perfect match: a case study of a first-year woman

 principal. *Journal of School Leadership, 12,* 608-639.

Kelehear, Z (2004). Controlling stress. *Principal Leadership, 5*, 30-33.

Kennedy, C. (2000). *Summary of responses to NAESP/NASSP/NMSA survey questions.*

 Washington, D.C.: Principals' Leadership Summit.

Kerrins, J. A., Johnston, T., Cushing, K. (2001). Take this job and fill it (ACSA and CAPEA

 survey on school principals, <u>Leadership,</u> 35, 24-38.

Kesson, K, Traugh, C., & Perez, F (2006),Teachers College Record Volume 108, Number 9,

 September 2006, pp. 1862–1880.

Kim, J. E., Fruth, M. J., & Bowles, B. D. (1976). *Home-school-community relations: The state*

 of the art. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Kinley, J. (2002). The principal advantage*. School Administrator, 59,* 24-25, 27.

Klausmeire, H. J., Lipham, J. M., & Daresh, J. C. (1983*). The renewal and improvement of*

 secondary education. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Kochan, F. K., Spencer, W. A., & Matthews, J. (1999). The changing face of principalship in

 Alabama: Role, perceptions, and gender. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

 American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec: Canada (ERIC

 Document reproduction Service No. ED 431-232

Kylen, B.J. 1985. What business leaders do before they are surprised. In R. Lamb & P.

 Shrivastava (Eds.), *Advances in strategic management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lipham, J. M. & Daresh, J. C. (1981), *The renewal and improvement of secondary education,*

 277-298. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Lipham, J. M., Rankin, R. E., & Hoeh, J. A. (1985). Principalship: Concepts, competencies, and

       cases. New York: Longman Inc.

Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation*

       and Analysis, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Luehmann, A. L. (2007). Identity development as a lens to science teacher preparation. <u>Science</u>

       <u>Education</u>, <u>10</u>, 822-839.

Manning, M. L. & Baruth, L. C. (1996). *Multicultural education of children and adolescents*

       (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Manthy, G. (August 27, 2000). Critical shortage of principals seen in Los Angeles. *Los Angeles*

       Times.

Mazur, J. (1990). *Learning and behavior* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

McAdams, R. (1998, August). Who'll run the schools? *American School Board Journal*, 37-39.

McCall, J. (1997). *The principal as steward*. Larchmont NY: Eye on Education Press.

McEwan, E. K. (2003). *Ten traits of highly effective principals: From good to great*

       performance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage University Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San

       Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Inc.

Mertens, D. M. (2007). Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice. *Journal of*

       Mixed Methods Research, 1(3), 212-225Maxwell, 2005

Meyer, W. U., Reisenzein, R., & Schutzwohl, A. (1997). Toward a process analysis of

       emotions: The case of surprise. *Motivation and Emotion*, *21*, 251-274.

Miles M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*

       (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Pres.

Miller, A. M. (2003). *Violence in U.S. Public Schools: 2000 School Survey on Crime and Safety, NCES 2004–314 REVISED. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Milstein M. M. & Krueger, J. A. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: what we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education , 72*, 100-106.

MiUndrae, H. (2004). A first-year principal's experience as a mentor has many benefits for all parties. *Principal Leadership*, *5*, 25-29.

Murdock G. P. and others (1982). *Outline of Cultural Materials*. (5th ed.) New Haven, CN: Human Relations Area Files.

Nesbary, D. (2000). *Survey research and the World Wide Web*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Oplatka, I. (2004). The principal's career stage: An absent element in leadership perspectives. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *7*, 43-55.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, *4*, 543-578.

Papa Jr., F. (2007). Why do principals change schools? A multivariate analysis of principal retention" *Leadership and Policy in the schools, 6*, 267-290.

Parkay, F. W., Currie, G. D., Gaylon, D., & Rhodes, J. (1992). Professional socialization: A longitudinal study of first-time high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*, 43-75.

Parkay, F.W. & Currie, G. D. (1992). Sources of support for the beginning principal. In F. W. Parkay and G. E. Hall (Eds), *Becoming a Principal: the Challenges of Beginning Leadership,* (pp. 70-84). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parkay, F.W. & Hall, G.E. (1992). *Becoming a Principal the Challenges of Beginning Leadership.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parkay, F.W. & Rhodes, J. (1992). Stress and the beginning principal. In F. W. Parkay and G. E. Hall (Eds), *Becoming a Principal: the Challenges of Beginning Leadership,* (pp. 103-122). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parkay, F.W., Rhodes, J., Currie, G. D. & Rao, M. (1992b). Beginning principals: who are they? What are their priorities? In F. W. Parkay and G. E. Hall (Eds), *Becoming a Principal: the Challenges of Beginning Leadership,* (pp. 51-69). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parker, M., Guarino, A., & Smith, W. (2003). Self-efficacy in a sample of education majors and teachers. *Psychological Reports*, *91*, 935-939.

Parks, S (1999). Reducing the effects of racism in schools. *Educational Leadership, 56,* 14-22.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation Methods.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Phelan, T., (1998). *Surviving Your Adolescents: How To Manage And Let Go Of Your 13-18 Year Olds.* Glen Ellyn, IL: Parentmagic Inc.

Prince, H. M. (2004). First-year Principal—And Mentor? *Principal Leadership, 5*, 26-29.

Quong, T. (2006). Asking the hard questions. Being a beginning principal in Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*, 367-388.

Robinette, H. M. (1991). Police ethics: Leadership and ethics training for police administrators. *Police Chief*, *58*, 42-44.

Rossmiller, R. Al, Lipham, J. M, & Marinelli, J. (1976). Managing financial, and physical resources. In J. M. Lipham & M. J. Fruth, (Eds.) *The principal and individually guided education, 201-228.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. New York, Prentice-Hall.

Rousmaniere, K. (2009). The history of the principal. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *41*, 3-8.

Roza, M., Cello, M. B., Harvey, J. & Wishon, S. (2003). *A matter of definition: is there truly a shortage of school principals?* Seattle WA: University of Washington Press.

Sahagun, L. (August 27, 2000). Critical shortage of principals seen in Los Angeles. *Los Angeles Times*.

Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Santee, R. & Jackson, S. (1979). Commitment to self-identification: A sociopsychological approach to personality, *Human Relations*, *32*, 141-158.

Shapiro, J. P, Poliner, & Stefkovich, J. A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas (2nd ed.). Topics in educational leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Sieber, J. E. (1992). *Planning ethically responsible research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Souryal, S. S. (1998). *Ethics in Criminal Justice: In Search of the Truth (2nd Ed.).* Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Squires, D., Huitt, W., & Segars, J. (1983). Effective classroom and schools: A research-based perspective. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R., & Sabshin, M. (1981). *Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions.* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Applied social research methods series, Vol. 46.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc. 185 pp.

Thomson, S. D. (1993). *Principals for our changing schools.* Columbia MO: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Troutman, Jr., P. L. (1997-98). The key role of school administrators in multicultural education: Unlocking the future of diverse students. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 15*, 9-17.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*, 202-248.

UCEA (2008). The revolving door of the principalship. *Implications from UCEA, 2008*.

United States Census Bureau (2008). School Enrollment in the United States: 2006, Population Characteristics. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration: U.S. Census Bureau publications

University Council for Educational Administration (March 2008). *Implications: The Revolving Door of the Prinicpalship*.

Wadsworth, T. (1988). 'A school leaders' professional development project. The first year: progress in researching the professional development needs of secondary school headteachers', *School Organization, 8,* 3, 315–30.

Wallace Foundation (2006). Wallace Perspective Report, *Schools Can't Wait: Accelerating the*

  Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs. Downloaded from

  www.wallacefoundation.org

Webster, L. (1989). *The Real World of Administration: Reflections of First and Second Year*

  Principals (ED 314 857). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Educational

  Resources Information Center.

Willmore, E. L. (2002). *Principal leadership: Applying the new Educational Leadership*

  Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. California: Corwin Press.