ED 242 066   EA 016 588

AUTHOR   Miskel, Cecil; Cosgrove, Dorothy
TITLE   Leader Succession: A Model and Review for School
                Settings.
PUB DATE   Apr 84
NOTE   44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                American Educational Research Association (New
                Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070) -- Reports -
                Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference
                Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Administrator Role; *Educational Environment; *Effect
                Size; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership;
                Leadership Responsibility; Leadership Styles;
                Literature Reviews; *Models; *Occupational Mobility;
                Power Structure; Predictor Variables; *Principals;
                Research Design; Research Methodology; *School
                Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS   *Leader Succession

ABSTRACT
                Recent research casts doubt on the commonly held
notions that administrators affect student learning through
instructional leadership and that changing administrators will
improve school performance. To help construct a model for examining
the process of leader succession that specifies a number of major
school process and outcome variables associated with such succession,
a literature review of succession factors based on two fundamental
categories proposed by G. E. Gordon and N. Rosen (1981) is provided.
The first of these categories, "Prearrival factors," focuses on
reasons for succession, the selection process, and leader reputations
and orientations. The second category, "Arrival factors," focuses on
demography, school structures and processes, educational programs,
successor actions, community environment, and school effectiveness.
On the basis of literature reviews on each of these factors, it is
argued that principal succession may have only marginal effects on
subsequent school processes, structures, and outcomes. In conclusion,
three longitudinally based empirical approaches to administrator
succession--qualitative case studies, actuarial studies, and
naturally occurring field experiments--are recommended and Gordon and
Rosen's recommendation that leadership succession research replace
more traditional leadership studies is affirmed. (JBM)

LEADER SUCCESSION: A MODEL AND REVIEW FOR SCHOOL SETTINGS

Cecil Miskel

Dorothy Cosgrove

The University of Utah

2

LEADER SUCCESSION: A MODEL AND REVIEW FOR SCHOOL SETTINGS.

Cecil Misk i and Dorothy Cosgrove, University of Utah

In recent years a high level of interest h..s been expressed by scholars and practitioners about the effects that school administrators, especially principals, have on educational programs. A number of current writers speculate that principals and superintendents play critical roles in determining the levels a. l quality of school procesces and outcomes, e.g., Sergiovanni (1981), Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980), Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), Edmonds (1979), Lipham (1981), and Hallinger and Murphy (1982).

While it seems reasonable to believe that administrators make a difference, none of the investigations in the review by Shoemaker and Fraser (1981, p. 178) of effective schooling research set out explicitly to study the role of principals, but most of the writers concluded principals were clearly important in determining the effectiveness of schools. In fact, studies cited for principal effects, e.g., Wellisch, MacQueen, Carriere, and Duck (1978), have focused for the most part on the effects of compensatory educational programs or other interventions rather than on the effects of principals or other administrators. Moreover, the school effects studies typically report some kind of association--modest correlation coefficients or phenomenological impressions--between some characteristic or behavior set of principals and student achievement, or other positive school outcomes.

Recent observational studies of principal behavior, e.g., Kmetz and Willower (1982), Martin and Willower (1981), and Morris, Crowson, Hurwitz, Porter-Gehrie (1981); superintendent behavior, e.g., Pitner and Ogawa (1981) and Duignan (1980); and other administrator behavior, e.g., Sproull (1981), cast some doubt on the seemingly accepted generalization that administrators exert direct effects on curriculum and instruction in their schools. These

2

studies indicate that the roles of administrators are characterized by variety, brevity, and fragmentation with little direct involvement in the instructional process. In other words, the behavior exhibited by administrators does not provide obvious support for the common notion that principals or other administrators effect student learning through strong instructional leadership.

As a generic organizational phenomenon, changing of administrative incumbents produces naturally occurring instabilities which allow administrator effects to be assessed with powerful longitudinal designs. In schools, the replacement of principals or superintendents is a disruptive event because it changes the lines of communication, realigns relationships of power, impacts decision-making, and generally disturbs the equilibrium of normal activities. Conventional wisdom holds that changing administrators will improve school performance. In contrast, Brown (1982, p. 1) argues that because of its disruptive effects, succession will have either no causal impact or negative impact on organizational effectiveness. Even if limited effects are found, succession of leaders provides a naturally occurring set of events that should produce relatively large variations in organizational components and provide excellent opportunities for researchers to assess administrator effects on school performance. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is threefold: (a) to construct a model that specifies a number of major school process and outcome variables associated with administrator succession, (b) to review the succession literature for each component, and (c) to suggest a variety of research strategies to examine administrator succession and effects of leaders on school processes and outcomes.

4

Administrator succession is the process of replacing key officials in organizations (Grusky, 1961, p. 261). Changing leaders can represent a psychological impact of a new-personal style, a new definition of the situation, a new communication network with the environment, or a jolt to the system which opens its members' minds (Child and Kieser, 1981). In other words, when members are recruited, particularly principals, teachers and other professional personnel, new bodies of knowledge, skills, and behaviors are imported which often serve as sources of new ideas in schools (Baty, Evan, & Rothermel, 1971, p. 430).

Early investigations of managerial succession focused primarily on the rate of succession, length of tenure, and associated organizational factors (Pfeffer and Leblebici, 1973). For example, Grusky (1961) and Kriesberg (1962) found succession in top executive positions was more frequent in large, bureaucratic organizations, but Gordon and Becker (1964) disputed their findings. More recent studies have tended to focus on succession and subsequent changes in organizational factors. A thread that runs through the history of the research, i.e., Grusky (1960, p. 107), Birnbaum (1971, p. 133) and Brown (1982, p. 1), is that administrative succession leads to instability and conflict which, in turn, should influence organizational processes and performance.

A Model for Leader Succession

As a guide to research, Gordon and Rosen (1981, pp. 240-253) proposed a succession model that is based on prearrival and postarrival factors. An elaborated and modified version of their work for school settings is presented in Table 1. For analytic purposes the factors are divided into a set of events that occur before the arrival and entrance of the successor into the

5

situation, and a second set of events that occur once the new leader has taken office and begins to act. A third set of factors are listed in Table 1 as indicators of succession effects. The indicators of succession effects essentially represent changes in the prearrival and arrival factors which can reasonably be expected to vary as the result of changing administrators. Considerable bodies of literature surround each of the factors and subfactors given in Table 1, and those most closely related to schools will be discussed in the following sections of the paper.

Table 1

A Model for Leader Succession

Prearrival Factors	Arrival Factors	Succession Effects
Reason for Succession	Demography	Changes in
Selection Process	School Structures and Processes	Reputations
		Orientations
Reputations of Leaders	Educational Programs	Arrival Factors
	Successor Actions	
Orientations of Leaders	Community	
	School Effectiveness	

Prearrival Factors

Reasons for Succession

Death, retirement, termination, and relocation. A number of reasons account for changing administrators. Among the reasons are death, retirement, forced removal through demotion or firing, voluntary resignation, promotion, transfer, or advancement. According to Grusky (1960), the reasons for

succession can be environmentally controlled, as in death, illness, or movement to a more advantageous position; or succession can be directly controlled by the organization, as in promotion, demotion, or dismissal. The successor confronts different consequences depending on the reason for the vacancy. For example, death prevents the transfer of accumulated knowledge of the predecessor to the new leader and immediately destroys the influence of the predecessor. Consequently, discontinuity exists into the organization with rapid and extreme policy changes often occurring. In contrast, if the predecessor remains on the scene, a stabilizing influence on the successor's orientation toward change likely occurs. In the case of a predecessor advancing to a superior position, the outside recognition of his or her skills is an indicator of successful policies. The successor may feel a reluctance to initiate immediate changes and, because of the apparent inheritance of a well run organization, may not receive due credit for improvements he or she does implement.

Consistent early longevity in an organization indicates involuntary succession or firing (James and Soref, 1981). Longevity is the age of an administrator at the time of succession and is early to late relative to normal retirement age. The likelihood of involuntary succession is inversely related to some assessment of performance. Allen, Panian, and Lotz (1979) cite several examples of succession being prompted by poor performance. In team sports, a change in managers is often precipitated by the deterioration of performance by the team. Since these slumps are usually temporary, the team appears to improve because of the new manager. Gamson and Scotch (1964) claim that the replaced manager is "scapegoated" because succession has no long-term effect on performance. Instead, the regression effect explains the apparent improvement in team performance.

Using a dynamic process called status degradation, Gephart (1978) explained how involuntary succession of leaders can produce administrative compliance. In status degradation, a group such as a school board, discusses the behavior of a person who is seen as breaching compliance demands associated with the rules of the organization. Dissatisfied members of the group state that compliance with rules is necessary to continue the existence or functioning of the group. The leader's resistance to compliance with important group conventions results in attempts to formalize solutions to the compliance problem. A decision follows to remove the deviant member from office. The new successor, being aware of the process that resulted in the removal of the predecessor, tends to be explicitly consistent with rules for which the degraded leader was sanctioned.

Selection Process

Participants. A variety of actors participate in the selection process. In some organizations, incumbents select their successors who are then approved by a governing board. In other situations, the predecessor may have limited influence and not actively participate in the selection process, although recommendations and suggestions may be given. In other settings, the subordinates may propose a candidate who is then either legitimized or not by higher officials. Superordinates may recommend choices which are evaluated and compared by the subordinates and then sent back to the higher officials for a final decision. The nature of the selection process has important implications for the effectiveness of the organization (Gordon and Rosen, .1981).

In schools, candidates for principalships usually begin as teachers who come to the attention of their principals by volunteering for committees, handling discipline problems, and spending extra time at school. The

principal then becomes a mentor, encouraging the teacher to pursue

administrative certification and providing opportunities to become more

visible at the district level. Having attained a broad reputation, the

teacher often becomes a vice principal or curriculum coordinator. Then as

principalships become open the candidate can apply, and if patient enough,

will obtain an appointment in time (Baltzell and Dentley, 1983).

In seven out of ten districts studied, the selection participants were

the superintendent, senior administrators (including deputy superintendents,

personnel directors and long-term principals), and school board members

(Baltzell and Dentler, 1983). The superintendents play a primary role in

choosing future principals as a means of managing large systems that depend on

principals to carry out decisions and plans. The senior administrators are

chosen to participate because their judgments are valued by the superintendent

to be as keen as his or her own. School boards generally do not choose

principals directly because they are primarily occupied with the critical

roles of setting policies and defining community expectations.

Based on experimental studies with college students, Gordon and Rosen

(1981) reported that elected leaders have more influence than appointed ones.

While an election procedure of subordinates is not used in a school settings,

teachers could be allowed to have input into the selection of a new principal

by helping to determine selection criteria, participating in interviews,

meeting the candidates or influencing final decisions.

Assessment centers or outside agencies may be used in the recruitment of

potential candidates. Their purpose is to provide rigor, structure, and

standardization to evaluation procedures designed to look at candidates'

performance on operationally defined skills (Baltzell and Dentler, 1983). The

value of an advertised position increases when difficult entrance requirements

are used. The group or organization appears to be more attractive and may
create additional work motivation among prospective leaders who succeed in
passing the tests and among future subordinates who are aware of the stringent
requirements.

To predict the future actions of leaders, the sponsors who facilitated
the selection of that individual must be considered. Newly designated leaders
do not function totally independently of their benefactors (Gordon and Rosen,
1981). Successors are often chosen for their level of independence and astute
leaders quickly learn how those around them expect them to function. The
sponsor may continue to influence policies and budgets or give direction to
the future course of the organization.

Source, When current members of the hiring organization are promoted,
they are said to be insiders. When successors are selected from an entirely
separate organization, they are outsiders.

Under certain circumstances, Birnbaum (1971) suggests that an insider can
be the better choice of a successor than an outsider. One example would be a
situation in which there exists a tremendous intraorganizational conflict that
only an candidate from within could fully understand and have the ability with
which to cope. Outsiders joining the organization at difficult times may
unintentionally "step on toes" or be unable to discern the source of the
problems because they lack appropriate historical perspectives.

Colleges and universities use a selection process which is intended to
reduce conflict within the organization and to maximize organizational
stability (Birnbaum, 1971). In selecting a new president, vertical promotions
are avoided in an attempt to prevent unproductive competition between
subunits. Instead, candidates tend to be selected from similar institutions
whose characteristics would result in comparable socializing experiences for

potential leaders and thus facilitate the smooth assimiliation of the new

leader into the organization.

Baty, Evan, and Rothermel (1971) examined the types of individuals who

are recruited when an organization decides to search for an outsider.

Recruiting new members can provide a healthy importation of new knowledge and

skills and become the catalyst for innovation within the organization. This

structural complementarity can be a useful function of recruitment. They were

surprised to find, however, that colleges of business in universities tended

to recruit faculty from graduate programs that were similar to themselves in

philosophy of curriculum, structure, and size of student body. Hiring from

similar organizations leads to a homogeneity that may represent a significant

failing for many institutions.

A related concept, that of inbreeding, also lends itself to the

encouragement of traditionalism, reluctance to explore new methodologies or

theories, and a weakening of a school's ability to attract students. It is

positively correlated with the degree of top-heaviness in the faculty

structure and with curricula that emphasize specialized techniques (Baty,

Evan, and Rothermel, 1971).

All educational institutions have a network of relationships that provide

both scholarly and friendly connections with other, usually similar schools in

the academic community (Baty, Evan, and Rothermel, 1971). Not only does this

establish a channel for the flow of knowledge, but also becomes a source of

information about potential faculty members. The recommendation of a trusted

and valued colleague is much more meaningful than a letter written by an

unknown source. Recruitment from within the network of relationships is often

perceived as a compliment to both the receiving and the sending institutions,

the former because it has been successful in attracting away a skilled and

knowledgeable professional and the latter because it has provided the necessary training and experience to have enhanced the career of its member.

When an organization trains several people to fill future vacancies in the organization as they become available, a surplus often results. A surplus frequently results in dissatisfied employees who believe that they should have been selected for a vacated position. The qualified, but unchosen individuals often either leave the organization or remain as frustrated and unsupportive workers. To avoid the negative aspects of promoting insiders, Birnbaum (1971) favors seeking candidates from external sources.

Careful socialization permits an outsider to harmonize well in a new organization. Birnbaum (1971) outlines three techniques of socialization that are helpful in preparing administrators to adapt to their new environments. Through training, the individual learns particular skills that will be required on the job. This process usually occurs informally and gives the organization an opportunity to impart organizational values. During this training, administrators must also break from former loyalties and adapt to the existing climates.

Since most educational organizations do not use a formal training process, they must rely on an apprenticeship to aid socialization. A successful official within the organization informally supervises the newcomer to ensure that critical values and skills are learned. Internships appear to be more effective in conveying values and teaching routinized tasks than in teaching technical skills.

More commonly, screening procedures are used to select people who will not need much socialization because they already understand the roles they are about to play. In addition to reducing the need for training, the new leader's familiarity with organizational expectations helps to reduce

conflicts within the organization. Birnbaum concludes that the selection of outsiders who have been socialized in a similar institution results in less conflict than the selection of insiders, thereby producing many of the stabilizing advantages of each possibility.

As important as the source of the successor is the essential role that perceptions play in influencing the outcome (Gordon and Rosen, 1981). These researchers assert that the subordinates' perceptions of the legitimacy of the selection process, that is, whether the successor is to be an outsider or an insider, form the basis for the group's view of what is acceptable. Additionally, the successor's perceived characteristics, even though they may vary from his or her actual characteristics, play a part in determining how smoothly the successor and the group will develop their new association.

Frequency. The frequency with which an organization goes through the selection process may be based on past performance, longstanding ritual, or may be completely unrelated to performance. Regardless of the reason for succession, high rates of succession may influence the development of an authoritarian, task-oriented leadership style (Gordon and Rosen, 1981). Moreover, Eitzen and Yetman (1972) found a curvilinear relationship between longevity and organizational effectiveness. That is, as the length of time in the position increased, coaches experienced increased effectiveness for a period of time followed by decreased performance. Explanations for changing effectiveness level include the following: once individuals have been successful, they are taken for granted; they rest on previous accomplishments; or they become complacent. When decline begins, shifts to new positions may rejuvenate enthusiasm, enabling the individuals to prove themselves once again.

Reputations of the Leaders

Change Agent? Leaders are often expected to be change agents in an organization. Guest (1962) found that when a new leader has a reputation as a change agent and he or she joins an organization in which the subordinates do not agree with the need or the direction of the changes, it becomes very difficult for the leader to develop or maintain solidarity in the organization.

Change was an important factor in differentiating between outsiders and insiders in elementary school principal successions (Ganz and Hoy, 1977). Outsiders tended to view a change as a major component of their decision-making. Outsiders view changes in jobs as necessary for advancement; they often thought that the superintendent was looking for changes in their schools when they were hired; and they felt that they had better ability to persuade their superiors of the need for change than their insider counterparts.

Carlson (1961) states that insiders relate to an organization differently than outsiders and the choice should be determined by the preferred outcome. School boards who are basically pleased with the current administration expect insiders to give a stabilizing performance, keeping things substantially as they are. On the other hand, school boards expect outsiders to give a creative performance that promotes significant changes.

Competence. Gordon and Rosen (1981) found that the group's perception of the successor's capabilities and attractiveness is related to the degree of difficulty encountered by the successor in gathering information. The reputation of the leader has important ramifications for the effectiveness of the organization.

Leadership style. Part of the reputation of a successor is based on leadership style. Helmich and Brown (1972) used leadership style as one of

five potentially confounding variables that were controlled in their study of

corporate succession. Style was unrelated to whether an individual came from

inside or outside of the organization. Later, Helmich (1977) reported that

outside successors were generally more task-oriented than insiders and that

leaders with initial authoritative styles will usually modify their behavior

in order to persuade and coordinate group efforts. Gordon and Rosen (1981)

concluded in their review of the literature that leadership style varies with

the individual as different strategies are employed upon assuming command.

The impact of leadership style may be most important as a function of the

perceptions of the subordinates. When the perceptions of leadership behavior

were widely shared, the succession tended to occur with greater stability.

Career-goals influence the way in which leaders approach new positions

(Gordon and Rosen 1981). The aspirations and motivations that individuals

bring to their jobs often help to explain why and how the leader will behave.

A certain position may be perceived as a "stepping stone" to key positions

higher in the organization. Subordinates can look at the promotion record of

new leaders and predict what their career goals might be. Whether leaders

plan to have long tenures or will seek new positions shortly affects both the

way the jobs are done and the way that subordinates view their leaders.

Orientations of Leaders

New leaders bring unique orientations to their organizations based on

personal beliefs, attitudes, and ideology. The types and impact of these

viewpoints have been discussed by several researchers, and a major factor in

determining the orientation appears to be the source of the leader--inside or

outside the school district.

Source. The orientations that successors possess toward factors such as

their careers, personnel, programs and change are related to whether they are

insiders or outsiders. Carlson (1961) distinguished between these two types of professionals as being either place-bound or career-bound. Place-bound leaders consider their place of employment to be more important than their careers and want to be promoted only if a position is available in the home school district. Career-bound administrators value their careers above the place of employment and are willing to move to assume higher positions such as a superintendency.

The source of the successor effects the extent of organizational instability that results from changing leaders. The degree to which an individual is either integrated into the existing social structure or begins as a social stranger is determined by the source of the selection. Examining both insiders and outsiders, Grusky (1960) found that ongoing groups have well-defined informal structures with sets of norms and implied understandings regarding policies and procedures. The informal structures provide a frame of reference for judging successor actions. An outsider, who does not know of the exact informal relationships, is often perceived as having a disruptive influence and symbolizes unwelcome change. The result may be isolation from critical sources of information about the inner workings of the organization. However, insiders also have the potential to produce disruption. Even though they have been integrated into the group, they may become isolated from cliques to which they did not belong and may strengthen commitments to previously loyal colleagues. As a result, rivals may raise doubt about the legitimacy of the insider's promotion.

Weighing the knowledge and isolation factors and examining several organizations led Grusky to conclude that an insider produces less short-term instability to the organization than is created by an outsider. Allen, Panian, and Lotz (1979) agreed with Grusky's conclusion, but added that past

performance is the best predictor of future performance of organizations such
as schools and accounts for more variance than either succession of leaders or
other personnel changes.

Promotion from within is not necessarily functional and outsiders may
produce better results (Gordon & Rosen, 1981). For example, Hoy and Aho
(1973) concluded that inside promotions of high school principals have
distinct disadvantages. In their study, outsiders as compared to insiders
were found to be less authoritarian, exhibit greater emotional detachment in
difficult situations, have teachers who are more satisfied with their jobs,
run schools with higher esprit and morale, have faculties who are more loyal,
participate in leadership roles in professional organizations more often, be
seen as change agents more frequently, and be perceived as having greater
influence with their superiors.

Seeking managers from the outside does not always solve problems. Guest
(1962) studied succession in an automobile plant and compared his findings
with those of Gouldner (1954) in at a gypsum plant. In both cases, the
successors came from external sources which gave them certain common
advantages. Each was able to evaluate the plant operations with neutrality,
unrestrained by previous personal commitments. There were no long-standing
friendships to consider which allowed them each to be committed only to their
superiors. In Gouldner's study, succession led to an increased tension and
decreased performance, whereas in Guest's research, succession led to
increased productivity and decreased interpersonal conflict.

The gypsum plant manager faced some unique problems, however. First,
there had previously been a tradition of promoting from within the local
organization, so that this outsider was not perceived as legitimate. Second,
his predecessor left behind a core of intensely loyal supervisors. The office

of manager did not itself carry authority with the workers. Instead, authority had been based on loyalty to the person, and the successor could not count on being automatically accepted. Upon succession into office, each manager inherited a social system that shaped the kinds of administrative actions to be taken. Each was influenced by the existence or nonexistence of hostilities brought on by the selection process itself. Guest concludes that these significant differences in context are largely responsible for the striking variance in outcome at each plant.

There are two basic methods of change that are used to turn the advantage to an outside successor (Helmich and Brown, 1972). The first is Gouldner's (1954) strategic replacements wherein successors fill key positions with individuals who are loyal and familiar with their styles of leadership. This procedure enables outsiders to select others who will revolve around them and who will be supportive of their authority and policies. The second method of change is to alter the number of positions in the executive ranks. This enables successors to become free of unindustrious workers, bring in loyal colleagues, and quiet those who might oppose their policies. Kotin and Sharaf (1967) suggests that outsiders expand the top level staff more often than insiders because it is easier than facing the problems created by reassigning or replacing existing staff.

In a simulated business setting, Grusky (1969) compared the actions of managers with respect to assistants whom they chose to take along with them to a new job and assistants who were already working there. During the transition period, the new executives and their assistants attempted to integrate the inherited personnel into the system, but they eventually became relegated to a less significant role. Again, the executives were able to surround themselves with loyal people to provide reliable and strong support

of their policies and authority. This same strategy can be seen in school settings in which principals take along top notch teachers. Teachers who were the right hand of the previous principal may find themselves displaced by other favored teachers who transferred with the principal.

Personnel. Grusky (1960) found that top officials in an organization need to have a policy of administrative neutrality in handling personnel in order to maintain morale and organizational effectiveness. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) evaluated recent studies on successful schools and found that effective principals were not so much neutral towards teachers as skilled at recognizing the unique style and needs of each teacher, rather than just a select few. This orientation towards teachers resulted in giving encouragement and acknowledgement of good work, which in turn, helped the teachers to achieve their own performance goals.

In their review of the effective schools literature, Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982) found three other orientations of leadership that distinguished effective principals from their peers. The first area involved goal emphasis. Facilitating student achievement through the setting of performance standards and instructional goals, coupled with an optimism that students were capable of meeting these goals typified effective principals. These principals were skilled at decision-making and at mobilizing power within the school district in order to garner support for curriculum changes and other innovations. They effectively identified power structures in the community and were able to maintain appropriate relations with parents. Finally, they were skillful at coordinating and controlling the instruction in the school. They spend more time observing the work of teachers, are more supportive of their efforts to improve, and devote more time to evaluating teachers and programs.

Predecessor departure. Grusky (1960) states that two sets of circumstances influence the orientation of successors. The first is the conditions under which the predecessor left the organization. For example, if a predecessor remains on the scene, he or she will have a stabilizing effect on the amount of change initiated by the successor. If, on the other hand, the reason for succession was the death of the predecessor, rapid and dramatic changes are often brought about by the successor. The second set of circumstances is the amount of important organizational knowledge to which the successor has access. A controversial successor is likely to encounter some roadblocks to gaining information from wary subordinates or associates.

Mandate. Several researchers have noted that successors often are given, or perceive that they are given, a mandate upon taking over a new position (Gordon and Rosen, 1981; Grusky, 1960; Guest, 1962; Helmich, 1977; Helmich and Brown, 1972). The mandate is usually made by superordinates who want to see a change in personnel, the structure of the organization, programs, or leader responsibilities. Successors may be told to get rid of "dead wood", "clean house", improve productivity, expand the operations, reduce expenditures, or essentially maintain current practices. In schools, principals often draw their sense of mission from their selection experiences (Baltzell and Dentler, 1983).

School superintendents who moved up the internal ranks of a school district rarely make major changes quickly. However, superintendents who are recruited from the outside are much more likely to receive a mandate to break established patterns and make structural or personnel changes (Carlson, 1961).

A leader may be expected to make some functional changes in the role as it was played by the predecessor (Gordon and Rosen, 1981). This may mean taking on additional roles or dividing the role and sharing it with others.

In some cases, the successor will be given support in making strategic replacements to provide personnel who will be loyal and helpful in bringing about the mandated changes (Gouldner, 1954).

In order to induce a desirable person to accept a position in an organization, superordinates will sometimes allow special conditions or make concessions during the bargaining process. The newly appointed leader may then have control over or have access to additional resources. This exchange is made in order to encourage the person to accept the position and carry out the organization's goals.

A mandate for change has some effects on the organization. If the successor is promoting significant changes, the staff will generally feel more insecure and under inspection (Grusky, 1960). They may be suspicious of the forthcoming "progress". While both the staff and the successor may know that changes in policy or personnel are expected, the staff may still be uncomfortable with the new rules or procedures, may withhold expression's of warmth, and may adversely react to the uncertainties which are introduced into their previously satisfactory surroundings.

Arrival Factors

Demography. The demography of an organization, or its composition in terms of age, sex, educational level, length of service, race, experience, and maturity, has effects on both the rate and type of administrative successions that will occur. These in turn have impact on organizational innovation, adaptation, and performance (Pfeffer, 1983).

Size. A number of researchers have attempted to clarify the question of the impact of the size of an organization on the succession rates of its top officials (Grusky, 1961; Kriesberg, 1962; Gordon and Becker, 1964; Perrucci and Mannweiler, 1968; Pfeffer and Leblebici, 1973; and Brown, 1982). Earlier

studies found that the frequency of succession was positively related to size
of the organization, while later studies either failed to replicate the
findings or looked at other variables to help explain which organizations have
high succession rates.

Kriesberg (1962) and Grusky (1961) both found that high succession rates
accompanied large organizations. Kriesberg's work showed that heads of large
departments at the state level tended to have shorter tenure than heads of
smaller departments. His explanation was that this was a result of
bureaucratization and a difference in career patterns between the two sizes of
departments. Grusky's explanation for this phenomenon was that bureaucracies
treat succession rationally and with routine, so that greater size
necessitates an increase in bureaucracy. Also, in order to be flexible and
adapt to the environment, bureaucracies need periodic successions at the top.
However, Gordon and Becker (1964) attempted to replicate Grusky's study and
found no direct relationship between the size of the organization and
succession. They point to problems in defining size and determining which
levels of administration to study.

Perrucci and Mannweiler (1968) examined these earlier studies and judged
that the relationship between size and succession was assumed and not
demonstrated. Not pleased with the previous explanations, they conjectured
that greater pressure builds for raising doubts about the performance of key
officials in larger organizations and that these organizations can also
provide the means for efficient removal and recruitment processes. In their
own study, Perrucci and Mannweiler (1968) found general support for the
relationship between large organizations and high succession rates, but the
statistical significance level was limited, and the relationship was not
monotonic. Middle-sized institutions had lower succession rates than either

large or small organizations. They felt that the effect of size needs additional' explanations in terms of particular processes that link size to succession. Such factors include organizational complexity, the integration of different parts of the organization through the elaboration of rules and procedures, and growth rates.

Administrative Intensity. Freeman (1979) studied administrative intensity, or the relative numbers of administrators and production workers. He found that organizations with large memberships have proportionately fewer, rather than more, administrators. This finding fails to substantiate the hypothesis that complex, large organizations require a disproportionate amount of leadership in order to prevent dissolution. One factor that did seem to affect the number of top officials was growth rates. In looking at school districts in California, he found that changes in enrollment generally resulted in a slight increase in administrative intensity.

Socioeconomic Factors. Rowan and Denk (1983) made an interesting observation in their study of socioeconomic factors and achievement levels in schools. They used proportions of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) as an indicator of the socioeconomic composition of schools. Succession events were found to result in decreased academic performance when AFDC proportions were low and increased achievement when proportions of AFDC students were high. Changes in basic skills performance were not evident until the second year of a successor's tenure. Explanations for this finding include the following: a strong mandate to improve scores on basic skills in low SES schools, ease of changing instructional practices in these schools, and changes in the classroom affect low SES students to a greater extent than other students.

Length of Service. Organizations with long lengths of service
distributions should tend to experience less frequent successions. These
successors will generally be insides rather than outsiders because the
organization has many senior members to contend for any vacancies that rise.
Since most of the members of the organization have worked together for a long
time, their relationships are stable, predictable, and reflect many shared
expectations and behaviors. Maintaining this stability would require inside
successions so that the new leaders are familiar with the culture of the
group. The result will be a reduction of conflict and a lower rate of
succession.

Age. Ages of a group's members can be a significant factor in the
functioning of an organization. Gusfield (1957) described a situation in
which the older personnel in an organization were able to maintain control as
new, younger members were hired. Many of the younger members resigned and new
recruitments were hard to find. This conflict between cohorts caused a
weakening of the organization and a decline in membership. McCain, O'Reilly
and Pfeffer (1981) found support for the prediction that the demography of a
department affects its turnover rate. When organizations hire on a regular
basis, the successors become integrated in an orderly manner. New members
merge smoothly with slightly more senior members who are quite similar.
Through these contacts, they also begin to make connections with even more
senior members. In contrast, when there are large gaps between the new
recruits and the existing personnel, there is an increase in communication
failures due to differences in perceptions, values, and beliefs.

Connerton, Freeman, and Medoff (1979) studied the demography of the coal
industry's work force as it related to the problems encountered by the union.
Age and educational background were important factors in explaining why

negotiating a national contract was difficult. With an increased need for workers, the industry began to hire large numbers of new workers who were younger and better educated than the current workers. High levels of conflict developed based on wide differences of opinions between the two groups which, in turn, increased the turnover rate.

Cohorts. Pfeffer (1982) concludes that cohorts have a profound affect on mobility and career patterns in an organization. When a large cohort enters an organization over the course of time, the high level leadership positions become filled, leaving few opportunities for entrants who follow. When an opening does arise, intense competition results because there are many qualified persons available. However, many of these transitions will have low costs in terms of conflict because the demographic characteristics of the successor and the organization already match.

School Structures and Processes

After reviewing the literature, Gordon and Rosen (1981) concluded that evidence exists for the generalization that replacement of the leader has implications for group processes in organizations. Similarly, Meyer (1978) posited that the most reasonable, indeed obvious, hypothesis is that change in leadership is associated with change in organizational configurations and processes. Correspondingly, stability in leadership positions accompanies organizational stability. Meyer found small but consistent relationships between the stability of leadership and stability of organizational structures and processes.

Hierarchy and Formalization. Grusky (1960) examined the formalization of organizations and its relationship with succession. He refers to formal structure as the patterns of interrelationships and hierarchy of the offices in an organization. This structure directs the behavior of the workers within

a framework of acceptable practices. Formal structures can be differentiated by the type of distribution of authority they employ. Where there is a high degree of centralization, the hierarchical lines are clear and succession brings about instability. In an organization in which there are several, independent branches of authority, a change in leadership has fewer ramifications for policy changes and much of the insecurity and tension of a changeover are avoided.

Grusky (1960) suggests several circumstances in which an organization will experience instability following the succession of a leader. Organizations in which the social relationships between the various hierarchical levels of the organization are typified by their friendliness and openness, those in which succession occurs towards the top of the hierarchy, and unsuccessful organizations find succession to be disruptive and destabilizing. Despite the problems faced by the organization during a transition, Grusky points out that instability can force the organization to adapt to its environment and thus prevents stagnation.

Complexity. A leader's impact on an organization is influenced by the degree of complexity in the organization's formal structure. (Lieberson and O'Connor, 1972). Highly complex organizations have a variety of constraints that decrease and soften a leader's ability to make decisions and formulate goals.

Technology. While the technology used in industry and business is often clear and produces predictable results, Freeman (1979) noted that the technology of learning remains largely uncertain. Explaining why a technique works well or poorly, or describing the circumstances under which either one occurs is generally impossible. The result is that schools rely on the professionalism of teachers to choose methodologies for their classrooms. The

inability of schools to concretely justify curriculum decisions subjects them to criticism from the public.

Culture. Organizational culture is emerging as an important concept in the study and understanding of organizations. Possible relationships between succession and culture have not been examined directly and systematically, but several authors have addressed topics related to culture that begin to shed some light on how a shared ideology towards leadership might affect the organization. Dimensions such as climate, expectations, attitudes, values and communication help to explain this phenomenon.

Climate. Brookover and others (1978) described school climate as involving common beliefs regarding the norms and expectations for appropriate behavior within the school. When climate indicators of expectancy of learning and commitment to learning were high, achievement levels were also high. Socioeconomic and racial variations did not necessarily determine school climate or produce predictable levels of achievement.

Job satisfaction is related to organizational climate. In their review of the literature, Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) found that variations of performance and satisfaction are produced as perceptions of climate change. Further, communication patterns and the use of formal rather than informal channels were found to be related to the degree of restrictiveness in the climate.

Expectations, Attitudes, and Values. Expectations, attitudes, and values affect the ways in which subordinates evaluate their leaders. Jackson (1953) reported that workers' judgments of their leaders were based on accepted group norms and would vary as the leaders' behavior varied. When the workers expressed resentment about the transfer of their leaders, Jackson's explanation was that they had developed a great attachment to the predecessor

that was not immediately transferred to the successor. Gordon and Rosen
(1981) offered an alternative explanation. Since succession did not occur on
a regular basis, the workers did not perceive the reason for the transfer to
be legitimate. In either interpretation, the shared beliefs of the group were
strong and their expectations were based on group norms.

A change in roles almost without exception is accompanied by a change in
reference groups (Lieberman, 1956). While the previous reference groups
continue to have influence, new ones also emerge. The result is new
attitudinal orientations, perceptions, and vested interests. Former teaching
colleagues of a newly appointed principal often comment that he or she now
sounds just like the Central Office.

Role expectations are greatly altered by the type of institution in which
an individual functions (Birnbaum, 1971). Elementary and secondary, public
and private, high and low SES, are all conditions that shape the job to be
performed. Each combination of these factors formulates its own pressures,
cultural expectations, social issues, and values that contribute to
determining how the role of the administrator should be played and what type
of individual will best play it.

Communication. The frequency of communication is related to
characteristics of the school. Baty, Evan, and Rothermel (1971) looked at
schools of business and found that there were more interactions in schools
with large faculties, many doctorates, high prestige, and high faculty growth
rates. In addition, outstanding, productive full professors who enjoyed high
visibility in the academic community had high levels of interactions with
other similar institutions. This was not true of older full professors who
had not established themselves in the academic community and tended to have
curriculum emphasizing specialized techniques.

A network of role relationships or pattern of relationships that develop across settings or people can provide channels of communication between universities for the purpose of recruiting new faculty members or for furthering scholarly work (Baty, Evan, and Rothermel, 1971). The source of these exchanges is affected largely by the associations that are developed in graduate school and in professional societies.

Gordon and Rosen (1981) found that outside successors did not have the necessary sources of information needed to manage their groups. An explanation for this is that the combination of authority and strangeness closed these successors off to important informal communications that could provide information about the group or organization.

Networks of communication can change as a new leader in an organization becomes more and more familiar with the new setting. In Grusky's (1969) simulation study of business organizations, he found that the flow of communication for new leaders focused on inherited assistants because they provided a direct link to the operation of the organization under the previous leader. As time went on, however, the majority of the communication was between the new leader and his ally, whom he had brought with him to the new setting.

In Guest's (1962) analysis of two plant managers and their experiences as newly appointed leaders, he found that both men spent considerable time out in the shop in an attempt to bridge the communication gaps that had formed between the workers and the previous management. The purposes of this communication differed in the two settings. One leader sought to straighten out any shirkers and brought in trusted allies to aid in developing two-way communication between himself and the workers. These efforts were not successful in avoiding further problems over time. The other new manager made

29

a point to observe technical problems and to encourage subordinates to suggest improvements through interactions they initiated with superiors. He instituted a new mechanism for communication. Group meetings were called at all levels and departments for the purpose of solving business problems. A concomitant development was that workers felt support for their suggestions and complaints and were rewarded for their efforts. The final result was decreased conflict and increased productivity.

Guest's study of the second manager compared his interactions with those of his predecessor. While the frequency of interactions had not changed quantitatively, the character and content did change considerably. His predecessor's communications were typified by dealing with emergencies, whereas the new manager's interactions more often consisted of long-range planning. The direction of the communications also changed significantly. Instead of superior-originated interactions dominating subordinate-originated interactions, after three years under the new manager, they became almost equal. A tremendous reduction in expressed hostility from the workers towards the manager also occurred.

Grusky (1960) found that replacement of key officials can disturb communication and result in severe disorganization in milieu treatment settings. In this type of setting, the client and the staff members commonly develop affective ties through frequent interactions. A change in leadership in often disorienting to the clients and new lines of communication are hard to develop.

Communication was a prime factor in Gephart's study of leader succession (1978). He used a method of collecting data by analyzing conversations during group meetings to create a theory about how group members attribute causation to their leader's behavior and how they give meaning to and make sense of

problems in the everyday life of an organization. In this way, he was able to examine the microsociological processes that were occurring.

Educational Programs

Instruction. Principals in effective schools are perceived as being skillful in directing the programs in their schools, and are successful managers of resources (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee, 1982). As strong programmatic leaders, they pay particular attention to the instructional aspects of the classroom. Bossert et al. identified two ways a principal can attempt to manipulate the factors that affect student learning. The first is to work with individual teachers on problems specific to their classrooms. They favor a second alternative, which is to focus on the total school's instructional organization and try to identify factors that can contribute to improved instruction on the classroom level.

Innovation. While conflict is disruptive in the short-term, it may lead to changes that result in increased effectiveness and add to the long-term viability of the organization. If the organization is receptive to the new ideas of an outside leader, innovations and long awaited improvements may be possible. In schools, this could include curriculum, discipline procedures, education for specialized groups, responsiveness to the community's requests or demands, and working conditions for teachers.

Pfeffer (1982) postulates that succession offers an opportunity to spread technical innovation from one setting to another. As people move from one department to another or from one institution to another, they take with them their styles of administration and ideas for program innovation.

Program focus. Subordinates often have information and beliefs about the newly appointed leader before the individual assumes the position. Gordon and Rosen (1981) hypothesize that the closer the match between the actual and the

perceived characteristics of the successor, the gr ater the likelihood that a smooth relationship will develop after the successor and subordinates begin working together. For example, if teachers are accustomed to having their principal come from a certain background and they are not informed that the new leader has different qualifications and ex iences, the discovery after the principal arrives is likely to be accompanied by disruption.

Orientations to the job can also be a function of areas of specialty. For example, past experiences and training can prepare school administrators to be disciplinarians, morale boosters, curriculum leaders, public relations experts, or a myriad of other roles. These orientations will be reflected in the leader's interactions with the community, the teaching staff, and the students. Decisions about extra curricular activities, goals, program thrusts, and allocation of resources will be tempered accordingly.

Successor Actions

Behavior. Upon succession, new leaders behave in certain ways in order to meet the expectations of their superordinates and their subordinates (Gordon and Rosen, 1981). The first action they must take is to deal with any differences between themselves and their subordinates regarding the appropriate methods of meeting goals. Based on experiences over the course of prior successions, the group often develops perceptions about the correct means to a goal. The success of the new leader is affected by the reactions of the group as goals are pursued.

The second necessary action leaders must take is to create a mechanism for gathering information that is critical to the smooth operating of the organization. Among the many conditions affecting their ability to cope with this problem are the task, group size, communications with other similar

groups, availability and helpfulness of the predecessor, and the group's perceptions about the successor's capabilities.

Schneider (1983) has argued that reliance on situational variables, such as these, while ignoring personal traits has resulted in misunderstanding leadership behavior. Early studies showed traits to be useful predictors of leadership acquisition and effectiveness, but failed to recognize the importance of matching different traits to different kinds of settings. Schneider supports an interactionist view that specifies personal and situational variables that together create a profile of leadership behavior.

Use of Power and Influence. Gordon and Rosen (1981) suggest that succession offers an excellent opportunity to study the mechanisms by which power and influence become part of the leadership process. Possible questions to be posed in a succession study include questions about the group's perceptions of the leader's power and ability to sanction or reward, the ways in which power and the sources of power are modified, and how power affects the operation of the organization.

Community

Parental Expectations and Conflictual Issues. The society and the environment in which an organization operates place limits on the leader's influence. Lieberson and O'Connor (1972) suggest that a balanced approach to understanding organizations is to recognize that in addition to the traits of a leader, the movement of an organization will depend on constraints of the environment and of the organization itself. In schools, principals must work within the limits of available funding and resources, contract negotiations, laws and regulations, the state of instructional technology, and the demands of the community or special interest groups. High constraints and low

variation in leadership minimize a leader's effect on the organization
(Lieberson and O'Connor, 1972)

Pfeffer and Leblebici (1973) stated that the environment must be
considered in any viable explanations of the type or frequency of successions
in an organization. They found contextual factors to be systematically
related to issues of succession.

Meyer (1978) also recognized the importance of identifying environmental
constraints on an organization because of the consequences for the equilibrium
of the community. Attending to dependencies in a social system helps an
organization to deal effectively with limitations or be able to eliminate
them.

School Effectiveness

Brown (1982, pp. 1-4) concludes that the literature contains three basic
hypotheses and explanations for administrator succession and organizational
performance. The first is that succession should have a positive effect on
effectiveness. Based on the widely held belief or common sense notion in our
society about the ability of individuals to control organizational outcomes,
Brown reasons that attributions of leader causation of organizational events
are supportive of the idea that administrative change will be a positive
effect on performance.

In contrast, the second prediction is that succession creates so much
instability that organizational effectiveness suffers (Brown, 1982).
Gouldner's (1954) study and subsequent observations about the managerial
succession in a mining and manufacturing firm form the basis of this position.
He noted that an increase in tensions and declines in morale and productivity
accompanied the new manager. Grusky (1960) added credence to the position
that succession diminishes performance with a review of early case studies of

the process. However, Guest (1962) observed a succession that not only did not create instability, but significantly improved the unit's productivity. Brown (1982, p. 2) concludes that "the original motivation for the hypothesized links between succession, instability, and decreased effectiveness seems empirically thin and theoretically conservative in its attitude toward change."

The third hypothesis, advanced originally by Gamson and Scotch (1964), is that succession plays no causal role in organizational effectiveness. They argued that success is a function of organizational processes such as recruiting able personnel and acquiring resources that are beyond the control of first level managers. Consequently, any relationship between succession and performance is spurious. Gamson and Scotch proposed that succession should be seen as a scapegoating ritual performed during transitory performance slides. A shortcoming of this position is that it is based on managerial changes in athletic teams and may not be generalizable to other organizations such as schools.

Brown (1982, p. 3) concludes that the available data do not clearly support any of the competing theories. His own findings (1982, pp. 13-15) support the ritual scapegoating position advanced by Gamson and Scotch. Yet, Brown believes that evidence from comparative studies is most consistent with the notion that succession leads to a decrease in organizational effectiveness. After reviewing the literature, Gordon and Rosen (1981 p. 158) infer that chief executive succession in corporations will have differential effects on performance criteria, and the results will be moderated by a variety of organizational and environmental variables. Lieberson and O'Connor (1972) strongly support Gordon and Rosen. Based on these conclusions that instability created by administrator succession leads to differential

performance, support exists for the hypothesis that principal succession will effect organizational processes and outcomes.

Succession Effects

As portrayed earlier in Table 1, leader succession should be associated with changes in the reputation and orientation of the new administration and the various arrival factors which have been discussed. However, different levels of effects might reasonably be expected for principals and superintendents. While principals are able to influence school factors in a number of ways, many of the options open to superintendents are not open to principals. One only has to compare the mandates given to insider and outsider superintendents (Carlson, 1961) with the mandates of principals (Ganz & Hoy, 1977; Hoy & Aho, 1973) to understand the limitations placed upon new principals. Consequently, the paradox may be that even when succession is precipitated by inadequate performance, a change in principals may have only marginal effects on subsequent school processes, structures, and outcomes.

Research Methods

A variety of empirical approaches to administrator succession appear to be appropriate, but three longitudinally based methods are particularly recommended. Qualitative case studies in a number of diverse settings have provided excellent insights about the succession process and organizational leadership. Examples include Gouldner (1954), Guest (1962) and Gephart (1978). The advantages of the case analysis approach include an examination of microsociological processes that include naturally occurring communication events, a movement beyond formal conceptions of the organization to the consideration of informal phenomena which reflects the members' meanings and sense-making practices, and, finally, alternative theories of organizational succession developed by inductive construction of grounded theory (Gephart, 1978 p. 555)

A second approach that exhibits promise in describing and explaining succession effects is actuarial studies, that is, statistical examinations of existing data on managerial turnover and performance. Perhaps the best known actuarial studies have been made with athletic terms--baseball by Grusky (1963) and Allen, Panian and Lotz (1979), and basketball by Eitzen and Yetman (1972). However, Lieberson and O'Connor (1972) used data from Moody's Industrial Manual and Moody's Transportation Manual, and Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) used expenditure patterns for 30 cities during the years 1951-1968 to examine the influence of changes in leadership on performance. In the educational setting good data bases have been maintained by state departments of education and school districts which could be used for actuarial studies. Three recent examples using data from California are by Rowan (1982), Rowan and Denk (1983) and Ogawa and Hart (1983). While the actuarial approach suffers from the lack of ability to account for the participants' intentions and perceptions when the change is made, Gordon and Rosen (1981 p. 232) believe that this type of research allows investigators to address two important questions. What are the characteristics of the leader--alone and in the context of a group--which bear on effectiveness? What is the nature and impact of structural, higher-level decisions and processes which set the limits for leader's actions and influence attempts to be effective? Moreover, interaction effects, deemed of exceptional importance in studies of the principal by Rowan and his colleagues (1982), can be assessed.

The third approach that shows exceptional promise is naturally occurring field experiments. Examples of this approach are Jackson (1953), Lieberman (1956), Rosen (1970) and Miskel and Owens (1983). In contrast to the actuarial studies, the first three of the four studies revealed substantial impacts of the leader succession on the criterion variables. As observed by

Lieberman (1956, p. 386), field experiments that use longitudinal data tend to take advantage of natural changes among personnel in the organization and to examine a number of factors both before and after the modifications occur.

Because studies of leader succession have similar characteristics and goals of the principal effects and effective schools research, it is reasonable to expect that both groups would exhibit a number of conceptual and methodological weaknesses noted by Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982), Rowan, Dwyer and Bossert (1982) and Rowan, Bossert and Dwyer (1982). Therefore, leader succession research should be guided by the three standards suggested by Rowen, Dwyer, and Bossert (1982, p. 2) to insure that information on principal or administrator effectiveness is useful to the academic research and school practitioner communities. These criteria are: (a) descriptions of administrators' leadership behavior should refer to concrete, school-based activities that they complete; (b) measures of school effectiveness should be valid and reliable reflections of the diversity of school goals; and (c) research concerning leadership effectiveness should be longitudinal and comparative.

Conclusion

We agree with Gordon and Rosen (1981, p. 252) that leadership succession research should be substituted for more traditional studies of leadership. For example, cross-sectional studies of groups and administrators during periods of relative equilibrium do not reveal the full range of variation and complexity in schools and leadership. Gordon and Rosen believe strongly that the truly critical phenomena occur before the leader comes on the scene and immediately after arrival. They maintain that it is during the pre- and post-arrival phases that old resource allocation decisions are argued again, that suppressed ideological divisions over goals and performance are raised

for reevaluation, and that job responsibilities are redefined. It seems

reasonable to expect that administrator effectiveness will be more visible

during this relatively unstable period. Moreover, focusing leadership studies

during periods of change allows situational and personal variables to be

considered simultaneously from a longitudinal perspective. Finally, a

quotation from Grusky (1960, p. 115) shows the importance of succession to the

field of educational administration, "The universality of succession in formal

organizations and the tendency of the process to promote instability combine

to make this phenomenon of importance to organization theory."

REFERENCES

Allen, M. P., Panian, S. K., & Lotz, R. E. (1979). Managerial succession and organizational performance: A recalcitrant problem revisited. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 167-180.

Baltzell, D. C., & Dentler, R. A. (1983). Selecting American school principals. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Baty, G. B., Evan, W. M., & Rothermel, T. W. (1971). Personnel flows as interorganizational relations. Administration Science Quarterly, 16 430-443.

Birnbaum, R. (1971). Presidential succession: An interinstitutional analysis. Educational Record, Spring, 133-145.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives in school leadership, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 34-64.

Brookover, W. B., Schweitzer, J. H., Schneider, J. M., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 15, 301-318.

Brown , M. C. (1982). Administrative succession and organizational performance: The succession effect. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27, 1-16.

Carlson, R. O. (1961). Succession and performance among school superintendents. Administrative Science Quarterly, 6, 210-227.

Child, J., & Kieser, A. (1981). Development of organizations over time. In P. C. Nystrom and W. H. Starback (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design (pp. 28-64) Vol. 1. London: Oxford.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & McCarthy; M. M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 467-470.

Connerton, M., Freeman, R. B., & Medoff, J. L. (1979). Productivity and Industrial Relations: The Case of U. S. Bituminous Coal. Unpublished M. S., Harvard University.

Duignan, P. (1980). Administration behavior of school superintendents: A descriptive study. Journal of Educational Administration, 18, 5-26.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, March-April, 28-32.

Eitzen, D. S., & Yetman, N. R. (1972): Managerial change, longevity, and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 110-116.

Freeman, J. (1979). Going to the well: School district intensity and environmental constraint. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 119-133.

Gamson, W. A., & Scotch, N. A. (1964). Scapegoating in baseball. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 69-72.

Ganz, H. J., & Hoy, W. K. (1977). Patterns of succession of elementary principals and organizational change. Planning and Changing, 8, 185-196.

Gephart, R. P. Jr. (1978). Status degradation and organizational succession: An ethnomethodological approach. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 553-581.

Gordon, G., & Becker, S. (1964). Organizational size and managerial succession: A reexamination. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 215-222.

Gordon, G. E., & Rosen, N. (1981). Critical factors in leadership succession. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 27, 227-254.

Gouldner, A. (1954). Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Grusky, O. (1960). Administrative succession in formal organizations. Social Forces, 39, 105-115.

Grusky, O. (1961). Corporate size, bureaucratization, and managerial succession. American Journal of Sociology, 67, 261-269.

Grusky, O. (1963). Managerial succession and organization effectiveness. American Journal of Sociology, 69, 21-31, 72-76.

Grusky, O. (1969). Succession with an ally. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 155-170.

Guest, R. H. (1962). Managerial succession in complex organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 68, 47-54.

Gusfield, J. R. (1957). The problem of generations in an organizational structure. Social Forces, 35, 323-330.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1982). The superintendent's role in promoting instructional leadership. Administrator's Notebook, 30, 1-4.

Helmich, D. L. (1977). Executive succession in the corporate organization: A current integration. Academy of Management Review, 2, 252-266.

Helmich, D. L., & Brown, W. B. (1972). Successor type and organizational change in the corporate enterprise. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 371-381.

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, research and contingencies. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 255-280.

Hoy, W. K., & Aho, F. (1973). Patterns of succession of high school
principals and organizational change. Planning and Changing, 2, 82-83.

Jackson, J. M. (1953). The effect of changing the leadership of small work
groups. Human Relations, 6, 25-44.

James, D. R., & Soref, M. (1981). Profit constraints on managerial autonomy:
Managerial theory and the unmaking of the corporation president. American
Sociological Review, 46, 1-18.

Kmetz, J. T., & Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary school principals' work
behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 62-78.

Kotin, J., & Sharaf, M. R. (1967). Management succession and administrative
style. Psychiatry, 30, 237-248.

Kriesburg, L. (1962). Careers, organization size, and succession. American
Journal of Sociology, 68, 355-359.

Lieberman, S. (1956). The effects of changes in roles on the attitudes of
role occupants. Human Relations, 9, 385-402.

Lieberson, S., & O'Connor, J. F. (1972). Leadership and organizational
performance: A study of large corporations. American Sociological Review,
37, 117-130.

Lipham, J. A. (1981). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, VA:
American Association of School Principals.

Martin, W. J., & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high
school principals. Education Administration Quarterly, 17, 69-90.

McCain, B. R., O'Reilly, C., & Pfeffer, J. (1981). The effects of
departmental demography on turnover: The case of a university. Unpublished
M. S., University of Iowa.

Meyer, M. W. (1978). Leadership and organizational structure. In M. W. Meyer
(Ed.), Environments and organizations (pp. 200-232). San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass.

Miskel, C. G., & Owens, M. (1983). Principal succession and changes in school
coupling and effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Hurwitz, E., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1981). The
urban principal. Chicago: College of Education, University of Illinois at
Chicago Circle.

Ogawa, R. T., & Hart, A. W. (1983). School principals: A study of leadership
effects on organizational performance. Paper presented at the Annual
Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Perruci, R., & Mannweiler, R. A. (1968). Organization size, complexity, and administrative succession in higher education. The Sociological Quarterly, 9, 343-355.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in organizations. Boston: Pitman.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). Organizations and organization theory. Boston: Pitman.

Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.) Research in Organizational Behavior, 5, 299-357.

Pfeffer, J., & Leblebici, H. (1973). Executive recruitment and the development of interfirm organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, 449-461.

Pitner, N. J., & Ogawa, R. T. (1981). Organizational leadership: The case of the superintendent. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17, 45-65.

Rosen, N. A. (1970). Open systems theory in an organizational sub-system: A field experiment. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5, 245-265.

Rowan, B. (1982). Instructional management in historical perspective: Evidence of differentiation in school districts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 43-59.

Rowan, B., & Denk, C. E. (1983). Management Succession, School Socioeconomic Context and Basic Skills Achievement. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Rowan, B., Bossert, S. T., & Dwyer, D. L. (1982). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Rowan, B., Dwyer, D. C., & Bossert, S. T. (1982). Methodological considerations in studies of effective principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, New York.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Constraints on administrator discretion: The limited influence of mayors on city budgets. Urban Affairs Quarterly, 12, 475-498.

Schneider, B. (1983). Interactional psychology and organizational behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 5, 1-31.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1981). Forward. In Smith, S. S., Mazzarella, J. A., & Piele, P. K. (Eds.), School leadership: Handbook for survival. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What can principals do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 178-182.

Sproull, L. S. (1981). Managing education programs: A micro-behavioral analysis. Human Organization, 40, 113-122.

Wellisch, J. B., MacQueen, A. H., Carriere, R. A., & Duck, G. A. (1978). School management and organization in successful schools. Sociology of Education, 51, 211-226.