

NEWLY APPOINTED PRINCIPALS IN GREECE AND CYPRUS: COMPARING ROLES, CHALLENGES, AND REQUIREMENTS

Anastasia-Athanasoula-Reppa Athens School of Pedagogical and Technical Education
(ASPETE), Athens, Greece
Angeliki Lazaridou Athens School of Pedagogical and Technical Education
(ASPETE), Athens, Greece
Linda Lyman Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, US

INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, numerous studies of the school principalship around the world have shown that the role is highly demanding, multi-dimensional, and a critical determinant of school performance and effectiveness. As a result, many countries have developed programs to prepare educators for the demands and challenges of school leadership. Such programs target not only those who aspire to the principalship but also those who are already in school leadership positions.

In Greece (including Cyprus) there is a dearth of such programs – and the time is ripe for determining what shape such programs ought to take.

The focus of the study reported here, therefore, is to investigate how newly-appointed school principals feel about the job, how they see the role, what conditions they think should be in place to make them more effective and efficient, and what obstacles they encounter. To these ends, we collected data from newly appointed principals in Greece and Cyprus using a survey. In this paper, we present selected initial findings from this ongoing study of Greek and Cypriot school principals and compare them to findings from the North American literature on the same subject.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

PRINCIPALS

A school principal's role is multi-dimensional, demanding and affects school performance and effectiveness in any country, including those with and without specific preparation programs. Whereas Greece and Cyprus may lack programs that prepare school leaders for the demands and challenges of school leadership, programs in the United States are increasingly criticized as inadequate to prepare new principals for the position. As early as 1987, the National Commission for the Advancement of Excellence in Educational Administration called for sweeping changes in the preparation of administrators. "The lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators" was one of the problems identified (Lugg & Shoho, 2002). One of the latest critiques of principal preparation programs in the United States came from Arthur E. Levine (2005), president of Teachers College, Columbia University. Coursework in preparation programs for principals is again called irrelevant. The critique is part of a larger study of schools of education.

Scholarship in the United States addresses the complexity of the principalship and how educators could be better prepared to undertake the role. "Today's rookie principals do see themselves as providing leadership in their schools' curricular and instructional programs, but a staggering array of problems deter them from devoting continuing attention and energy to the task" (Alvy & Robbins, 1998, p. 36). For example, the role has grown to encompass involvement with social-service issues, and working closely with external community agencies in response to problems associated with changes in society. Greater community involvement than in the past is a given, as principals are expected to work closely with such community groups as parent advisory councils and interest groups (Meyer & Macmillan, 2001). Principals must manage the budget, answer to

accountability issues, and lead reform efforts. “Today’s principal is expected to simultaneously be an instructional leader, change agent, and manager, while the role continues to expand” (Brock & Grady, 2002, p. 64).

In various studies of first year principals in the United States, common themes have emerged. These include issues such as role contradiction, external and interpersonal relations, external and internal politics, and socialization as the number one struggle (Alvy & Robbins, 1998; Bredeson & Hart, 1996; Morford, 2002; Pristash, 2001; Schmidt, Kosmoski, & Pollack, 1998). The transition from a teacher to a principal involves an intricate process of learning and reflecting while undergoing socialization into the new role identity (Banks, 2000; Ferrigno, 2003). In addition to the transition process, many new administrators experience tremendous role strain as they encounter the difficulties in balancing their new careers with their personal lives (Vandiver, 2002). Bredeson (1993) states that for new principals substantial changes in identity and new understandings of tasks, behaviours, norms, and cultural values require a period of role adjustment. The issue of role strain is typical for all administrators but is particularly intense for newly appointed administrators. In order to survive, they must be able to manage the role contradiction, or stress and emotional exhaustion will master them (Brock & Grady, 2002). Over time, some principals are able to handle the various roles and aspects of the job more efficiently, but the issue of role strain is always prevalent.

Fullan (1998) asserts that role stress and conflict due to demanding roles are products of the past decade’s reform movement and that the work of school principals is growing increasingly complex and overwhelming. In attempting to alter the relationships between schools and the communities they serve, many groups are working to advance their vision of how to educate our children: “...government policy, parent and community demands, corporate interests, and

ubiquitous technology have all stormed the walls of the school. The relentless pressures of today's complex environments have intensified overload" (Fullan, 1998, p. 6). If principals are to succeed at dealing with these conflicting interests, a clear vision of how these competing interests can be transformed into a common direction should be a priority. Setting these priorities will require managing the competing interests. In the following section we briefly outline some of the major challenges newly appointed principals face.

NEWLY APPOINTED PRINCIPALS

How do new principals feel about the job they are about to enter?

The first time administrative position gives leaders situations where many things will be experienced for the first time. This transition period is referred to by Hart (1993) as the organizational socialization period. During this period, principals experience a plethora of emotions as they try to determine answers to questions and face problems for which they do not yet know the answers. As the teacher moves up the professional ladder into the principalship, there is much to learn about educational administration. Unfortunately, there is no playbook to guide the rookie administrator through the daily encounters that shape the career of the school principal. Each situation an administrator encounters is unique to that principal, building, district, and culture. "Changing educational careers requires an individual to relinquish the comfort and confidence of a known role – such as being a teacher – and experience the discomfort and uncertainty of a new, unknown role – being a principal" (Ferrigno, 2003, p. 470).

How do new principals see their role?

"Leadership within a school is a dynamic process of negotiation that takes into consideration the demands of the moment, the institutional structure, and the historical definitions of power and relationships" (Smulyan, 2000, p. 6). Among the role descriptors of the principalship from the

National Policy Board for Educational Administration, are these: “instructional leadership, organizational leadership, strategic leadership, and community and political leadership” (Goodwin, Cunningham, & Childress, 2003, p.28).

What conditions should be in place to make their job more effective and efficient?

The research literature highlights the importance of a strong mentorship for new principals (Podlubny, 1999; Reynolds, 1999) regardless of age; however, in most districts mentoring simply does not occur unless the principal seeks out help. Principals must draw upon their colleagues for help through mentoring and networking. Experienced principals can have a positive or negative impact on the socialization of those transitioning into the job for the first time. For example, “Some female principals have found difficulty in this area because they are the minority within the administrative club” (Alvy & Robbins, 1998, p. 50). Beginning principals do not always have supportive relationships with their experienced colleagues (Daresh, 2001). In the ideal socialization process, role identity is enhanced by the way an administrator is treated by his or her peers (Ferrigno, 2003).

Overload, stress, and role conflict are the bane of many leadership positions. Fullan (1997) recognizes that these obstacles can be overcome, but this must happen in a rational manner by prioritizing core values and how best to work to achieve them. For school principals, Fullan (1997) states, overload and role conflict can best be overcome by understanding that:

...we are going to implement a few things especially well, and implement other priorities as well as we would have anyway, which is to keep them from getting out of hand. We will look for ways of integrating or aligning components that might otherwise be fragmented. (p. 29)

What obstacles do principals encounter along the way?

The topic of socialization as it relates to the new administrator’s success is one of the most crucial areas for administrators to consider as they take on the principal’s role (Alvy & Robbins,

1998; Brock & Grady, 2002; Daresh, 2001; Duncan, Seguin, & Spaulding, 1999; Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995; Ferrigno, 2003; Loper, 1994; Morford, 2002). Socialization occurs both to the norms and the culture within a particular school district, and to the profession of administration. Beginning principals struggle to understand how principals are supposed to act, what they are supposed to know, and what they are supposed to do (Banks, 2000; Daresh, 2001; Morford, 2002). They have preconceptions that have developed through observation of previous administrators during their teaching careers (Morford, 2002). The only real way to learn the role is live the position.

Often the administrator is the newcomer working in a school that has established routines and traditions. A mentor can help significantly with the task of becoming socialized into the role of administration, the norms, culture, practices, and procedures of the school (Daresh, 2001; Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995; Ferrigno, 2003).

Although there is ample literature and research evidence that attests to the continued challenges and role ambiguities of school principals in North America, interest in those matters has only recently surfaced in the Greek scene. However, a number of research projects have now been conducted. In the following section we report on the selection criteria for school principals in Greece and Cyprus.

SELECTION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN GREECE AND CYPRUS

In both Greece and Cyprus, the selection of school principals has been based on criteria that, more often than not, did not correspond with the skills and abilities that new principals needed for the effective administration of schools. Instead, principal selection has been the result of a “game” that has powerful political dynamics (Athanasoula-Reppa 2001 and 2005). In this game, the strongest emphasis is placed on the interview with a candidate. In fact, more often than not,

the interview is the factor that overshadowed all other considerations. This has been particularly true of Greece. However, it should be noted that the two countries are now in a period of major restructuring of processes for the selection of school principals. In the following sections we will report briefly on the most current criteria and procedures used in both countries for the selection of school principals.

Greece

Applications for the principalship can be submitted by anyone who has completed at least eight years in educational service and who has at least five years of teaching experience.

The criteria for selection are of three types:

1. Training and work experience (assessed in terms of a points system) – the academic and pedagogical training of the candidate, teaching experience, and experience in administrative work.
2. Work evaluations – performance evaluation reports.
3. Appraisals by the Selection Council – based on data in the candidate's files, information in the résumé and the documentation the candidate provides, as well as information from the Council's interview of the candidate. The documentation component provides descriptions of the candidate's work, participation in the production of instructional materials, service to the community, studies not counted under the point system, and any other activities that provide evidence of the candidate's academic, pedagogical, administrative, and professional accomplishments.

Candidates who do not attend the oral interview are excluded automatically from the selection.

Our examination of the law that stipulates the above criteria (Presidential Decree 25/2002) leads us to conclude that “professional conduct” and “teaching experience” elements are given most

emphasis (22 units) and the academic/pedagogical expertise elements carry less weight (14 units). In addition, it seems that a candidate's personality and general conduct are valued more than his/her academic and pedagogic expertise (20 units). In short, the objective and measurable criteria are valued less, whereas political affiliations, personal characteristics, and other subjective criteria are valued much more and are based on the judgements of the Selection Council.

At this point it is worth noting that the Selection Council consists of five-members, two of whom are elected and the rest appointed. Therefore, the power dynamics are determined by the appointed members. (Athanasoula-Reppa, 2005) It is also worth noting that a year of administrative experience in the vice-principalship (which is considered an apprenticeship for the principalship), counts for only half a credit/point (0.5) – to maximum of two years or one credit/point. Furthermore, the fact that experience in assistant principalship is not a prerequisite for promotion to principalship, reveals how insignificant one's administrative experience is in becoming a principal in the Greek education system.

In sum, in the Greek educational system one does not necessarily have to have the technical and professional capabilities that reason would say are required for the exercise of administrative, managerial, and leadership roles in the country's schools (Athanasoula-Reppa, 2005).

This indifference to the development of school administrators and the enrichment of their capabilities is reflected also in the fact that candidates for the principalship do not, in either their basic studies or their professional training, participate in systematic programs or practical exercises related to issues in the administration of schools.

What then could we do in the Greek educational system to ensure that we have more effective school principals? Research and experience in other parts of the world support five thrusts:

- a. Academic preparation of principals through basic training and postgraduate work.
- b. Professional development programs.
- c. Apprenticeships.
- d. Mentorships.
- e. Participation in special programs offered collaboratively by Faculties of Public Administration and Academic Departments, Pedagogic and Public Administration as well as work in natural conditions of school unit.

In other words, there needs to be preparation before, during, and after the selection of principals.

Cyprus

Applications for school principals can be submitted only by those who have served as *Assistant Principals B* for at least two years and subsequently as the more senior *Assistant Principals A* for at least one year. Thus, all aspiring principals have to have a minimum apprenticeship and preparation for the role.

A teacher who wants to become *Assistant Principal B* has first to be evaluated by the Committee of Evaluation (Inspectors). Teachers are evaluated after completion of their twelfth year, and every second year thereafter, on a scale of 0-40. These evaluations cover the following four factors:

- a. Professional training.
- b. Effectiveness on the job.
- c. Organization, administration, human relations.
- d. General behaviour and actions.

Promotion to *Assistant Principal B* is based on the points the candidate has earned on the following criteria:

- a. Mean of grades earned in the last two evaluations multiplied by four.
- b. Mean of grades of the last decade of evaluations.
- c. Years of service (one point for every year).

Other qualifications earn points as follows:

- a. A second degree gets 2 units.
- b. A postgraduate study gets 3 units.
- c. A doctorate gets 5 units.

Also, a candidate for *Assistant Principal B* must be interviewed by the Committee of Educational Service (1 chairman and 4 members) which is appointed by a Ministerial Council. The committee can give up to 5 points. These points are based on such measurable criteria as:

- a. Knowledge of pedagogical and methodological subjects (1point).
- b. Comprehension of the role and responsibilities of the principal (1 point).
- c. Critical analysis of administrative and organizational problems in relation to the duties and the responsibilities of the role (1 point).
- d. Effectiveness in communication and sufficiency of documentation (1 point).
- e. Personality – comfortable presence, adaptability, flexibility (0.5 point).
- f. Language proficiency – vocabulary, syntax, expression (0.5 points).

Those who get the highest scores are promoted to the level of *Assistant Principal B*. Usually, *Assistant Principals B* are teachers who already have been evaluated three and four times. Evaluations for the position of *Assistant Principal A* also take into account evaluations done at the level of *Assistant Principal B*. For promotion to the position of *Principal*, evaluations at both levels A and B are taken into consideration. After promotion to the principalship, principals are required to attend the Program of Training for Principals that is provided by the Pedagogical

Institute (15 meetings). Assistant Principals attend a similar program as well (26 meetings). In addition to the *Assistant Principal A* and *B* apprenticeships, Cypriot principals attend a special seminar before taking up their new duties, which means that socialization and integration into the new role goes very smoothly.

There are two critiques that may be made of the Cypriot system for the appointment of principals. The main disadvantage of that system is the importance it attaches to years of service. Because of this we often see capable members of the educational community excluded from the principalship when colleagues with more years of experience take available openings. Also there is a general perception that the evaluations of inspectors are biased (Artemiou, 2004).

CONCLUSION

Clearly, the educational systems of Greece and Cyprus differ radically in the criteria they use for selecting principals – even though the roles and duties of principals in the two systems are the same. The Cyprus system seems to be more effective, mainly because of the apprenticeships and the preparation it provides to aspiring and new principals. But it is disadvantaged by the points system that favours those with more years of teaching experience – which can result in people getting promoted in the principalship just months before their retirement (Pasiardis 2004).

INVESTIGATION OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP IN GREECE AND CYPRUS

METHOD

Data for the study were collected using a 14-item questionnaire. The questions reflect the most recent literature on school principalship and some of the most important issues, obstacles and challenges principals encounters. The participants were newly appointed principals in Cyprus and Greece. A total of 28 questionnaires were collected from Cyprus, which represents the total number of newly appointed principals for one year, whereas 31 questionnaires were collected

Q1: Rank the following factors in terms of their importance in determining administrators' effectiveness. 1 = most important ... 4 = least important.

On this question, the mean scores for the two groups were as follows:

Factors related to effectiveness	Greek principals' mean ranking	Cypriot principals' mean ranking
A. Knowledge of laws and regulations	3.1*	3.0
B. Graduate studies in educational administration	3.7	3.0
C. Experience	1.4	2.7

* Lower mean = more importance, higher mean = less importance

To begin, it should be noted that for the graduate studies and experience factors, the range of means for the Cypriot principals was greater than for the Greek principals; this indicates greater variability in the opinions of the Cypriot principals about the contribution of these two factors to a principal's effectiveness.

That having been said, these statistics show some interesting contrasts in the views of the Cypriot and Greek principals. Specifically, the Greek principals thought that experience and leadership traits contributed most to a principal's effectiveness. The Cypriot principals also thought that these factors were most important – but put leadership traits ahead of experience. The other two factors – knowledge of laws and regulations, and graduate studies in educational administration – were considered less important by both the Greek and Cypriot principals. In addition, of particular interest is the fact that, in general, the Greek principals seemed to be notably less impressed with the utility of graduate studies in educational administration. We wonder what this says about the state of graduate programs or working conditions in Cyprus.

Q3: Rank the following factors in terms of their being impediments to school administrators' effectiveness.

On this question, the mean scores for the two groups were as follows:

Factors militating against principals' effectiveness	Cypriot principals' ranking	Greek principals' ranking
	Mean Rank	Mean Rank
A Prevailing climate, ethos, values, etc in education	2.5* 2	2.0 2
B Deficiencies in the legal framework for education	2.7 4	1.7 1
C Lack of expertise in management	2.4 1	3.0 3
D Workload	2.5 3	3.4 4

* 1 = Greatest hindrance, 4 = least hindrance

For the Greek principals, the greatest impediments were in the laws pertaining to education and the prevailing attitudes regarding education. Lack of expertise and workload were ranked lower as impediments to administrators' effectiveness. For the Cypriot principals, the average rankings did not vary as much, suggesting that in their eyes the four factors were of similar potency. At the highest level was lack of expertise; then came the prevailing attitudes toward education and workload; and deficiencies in educational laws were seen as the least important among the four factors presented. Thus the Cypriot and Greek principals stood in marked contrast as to the relationship between laws and principals' effectiveness.

Q4: Rank the following state resources in terms of their contribution to school administrators' effectiveness.

On this question, the mean scores for the two groups were as follows:

Factors supporting	Cypriot principals' ranking		Greek principals' ranking	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
A Moral support	3.4*	4	3.9	4
B Financial rewards for principals	4.4	5	2.9	3
C Professional development opportunities, graduate studies	2.3	2	4.2	5
D Laws favouring decentralization, greater autonomy for administrators	3.0	3	2.7	2
E Better resources (i.e., better teachers, supplies and equipment, etc.	1.8	1	1.4	1

* 1 = Most helpful, 5 = least helpful

Both the Cypriot and the Greek principals were in agreement that better resources would be the most helpful in increasing their effectiveness. But beyond that there was little correspondence in their views. The Cypriot principals put professional development opportunities at the second level of helpfulness, and greater autonomy for principals and supportive government/ministry personnel at the third level of helpfulness, and financial rewards for principals last. The Greek principals put greater autonomy and financial rewards for principals at the second and third levels, and more supportive government officials and professional development opportunities last.

Q7: Rank the following factors in terms of their reducing school administrators' effectiveness.

On this question, the nine factors presented in the questionnaire were ranked in descending order of importance as follows by the two groups:

Problems	Greek principals' ranking		Cypriot principals' ranking	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
A Centralization	3.2	9	5.8*	3
B Bureaucratization	3.4	8	3.8	7
C Lack of clear goals	4.2	7	3.4	8
D Incessant changes	5.4	3=	3.3	9
E Low financing	6.7	1	5.2	5
F "Civil servant" culture – minimal performance, outdated procedures, status quo	5.4	3=	5.0	6
G Lack of meaningful, fair evaluations	5.5	2	6.8	1
H Lack of a meritocracy	4.8	6	5.6	4
I Lack of professional development opportunities	5.3	5	5.9	2

* 1 = most problematic, 9 = least problematic

Similarities:

The lack of a meaningful, fair system for evaluating performance (and for making meritocratic appointments and promotions) was ranked high by both groups: 1st. by the Cypriots, 2nd. by the Greeks. Bureaucratization and lack of clear goals were ranked low by both the Greeks and the Cypriots (7th and 8th respectively)

Contrasts:

Incessant changes – High for Greeks (3rd), low for Cypriots (9th)

Centralization – A low concern for Greeks (9th) but the Cypriots ranked it much higher (3rd).

E1: What should be the primary role of the school principal?

In this question, four potential roles for the principal were presented and participants were required to rank them in order of desirability. The roles were:

Manager – Special category of civil servant with broadly defined responsibilities, professional identity, and own organization.

Supervisor – In charge of decision making, but in an ethos/ideology of cooperation and collaboration.

President of teacher group – Colleague teacher, chair who guides, monitors decision making.

Inspector – Transmitter/communicator and enforcer of the system's (government's) policies.

The two groups ranked these roles as follows:

Country	Role	Rank	Percent
Cyprus			
	Supervisor	1	54
	President of teacher group	2	21
	Inspector	3	14
	Manager	4	11
Greece			
	Supervisor	1	84
	President of teacher group	2	13
	Manager	3	3
	Inspector	Not selected	Not selected

The Greek and Cypriot principals' ratings of the roles were very similar, with the difference centring on the inspector role. The most desirable role was supervisor, followed by president of the school's teacher group. The manager role would have been the third choice for both groups were it not for their quite different assessments of the inspector role: the Cypriot principals favoured it over the manager role but *all* the Greek principals rejected it outright.

E4: What are the qualities or characteristics most required of the contemporary school principal?

In this question, five qualities for the principal were presented and participants were required to choose the one they thought most importance. The qualities were:

- A. Be supportive, motivational.
- B. Able to organize and monitor.
- C. Able to evaluate.
- D. Be “in charge”.
- E. Be the leader.

These qualities were ranked as follows:

Country	Quality	Mean rank	Std. Deviation
Greece	Be “in charge”	4.4	0.68
	Able to evaluate	3.8	0.86
	Able to be “the leader”	3.2	1.22
	Supportive, motivational	2.2	0.56
	Able to organize and monitor	1.5	1.20
Cyprus	Be “in charge”	4.9	0.63
	Able to evaluate	4.0	0.28
	Able to organize and monitor	2.7	0.79
	Supportive, motivational	2.2	1.14
	Able to be “the leader”.	1.8	0.98

Clearly, both the Cypriot and Greek principals thought that the most important quality was the capacity to communicate a sense of “being in charge”. At the next level was the “ability to evaluate” (with a notable level of agreement among the Cypriot principals – $SD = .283$). As to the remaining three qualities, the two groups assigned inverse priorities. Thus, “being supportive and motivational” was ranked fourth on average by both the Cypriots and Greeks. But as to the qualities “being the leader” and “able to organize and monitor”, the two groups were

diametrically opposed: the Cypriot principals accorded more in favour of “organizing and monitoring” (3rd) than “being a leader” (5th), while the Greek principals favoured “being a leader” (3rd) over “organizing and monitoring.” It should be noted, however, that the standard deviations for these two roles indicate that there was considerable variation in both groups’ assessments of their desirability.

INTERIM CONCLUSIONS

Although this study and the analysis of data are still in progress, we have been able to report selected findings from the 14-item survey. Based on these preliminary findings a few points are worth noting here. Despite the similar educational goals, Greek and Cypriot school principals view their roles quite differently. Greek principals value more experience vs. leadership traits as opposed to their Cypriot colleagues who think that leadership traits are more important than experience. This attitude of the Greek principals is a reflection of the way they get promoted to principalship, as described above. Also, Greek principals think that education laws and regulations are the greatest impediments to their jobs whereas Cypriot principals think that lack of expertise is what makes their job more difficult.

As a reflection of their selection process, Cypriot principals view professional development as the most important factor in increasing their effectiveness, followed by greater autonomy. In contrast, Greek principals view autonomy and financial rewards as contributing the most to their effectiveness. Here we note again a major value difference between the two groups. What is valued more by the Cypriot group, professional development, is what has been documented in the literature and research as a significant contributor to the effectiveness of principals in North America and elsewhere. It was also seen to be a necessary component of the training of principals in Cyprus.

In Greece, the notion of professional development is still low in the priorities of newly appointed principals (and in the wider academic community too). This is, it seems to us, yet another reflection of the deep-seated and outdated values that permeate the Greek education system, where the majority of university graduates believe that once they get their degree there is no need for further professional and personal development.

Another notable difference between the two groups is in their positions on the most important qualities of a contemporary principal. The Cypriot group views the ability to organize and monitor as the most important quality, followed by the ability to lead; in the Greek group the ability to lead was given the highest priority. So, even though the Greek principals acknowledge that “being a leader” is at the core of the effectiveness of school principals, they dismiss the means to achieve that, one way being through professional development activities. At the same time it is surprising to note that the Cypriot principals, although they viewed leadership traits as contributing most to a principal’s effectiveness, they ranked the quality of “being a leader” second to school effectiveness. It is also worth noting that both groups ranked “being supportive and motivational” as second-to-last in importance.

Finally, both groups considered the principal as being primarily a supervisor, in charge of the decision making process. What is worth noting here is that although the Cypriot group thought that the principal should be, to a large extent, the transmitter and enforcer of the central government policies, none of the Greek principals viewed the principal as a law-enforcer. This finding could be interpreted as a sign of dissatisfaction among the Greek principals with the degree of centralization of the Greek educational system (hence the desire for more autonomy), and with the continuous imposition of new laws and regulations that are decided at the Education Minister’s office and then passed down to the schools to be implemented.

Overall it appears that both groups, despite the differences in the ways they view the role, have similar values. Further, the principals in both groups seem to not appreciate fully the potential of their role. It would be interesting to investigate their views of leadership, as it appeared from this study that they may be confused about what “being a leader” really means. More efforts should be made by both countries to educate prospective principals to the significance of their role and the contribution they can make to their students’ and staff’s lives.

REFERENCES

Athanassoula-Reppa, A. (2001). The training of managers in the Greek educational system. In A. Andreou (Ed), *School organization and management*, pp. 131-146. OJELE/jne gsee – ADEDY.

Athanassoula-Reppa, A. (2005). Initial training and professional development of teachers in Greece. In the Proceedings of the congress *Growth of Educational Executives*, University of Cyprus and KOED, Nicosia, Cyprus

Alvy, H. B., & Robbins, P. (1998). *If I only knew: Success strategies for navigating the principalship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Banks, C. M. (2000). Gender and race as factors in educational leadership and administration. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 217-256). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bredeson, P. V. (1993). Letting go of outlived professional identities: A study of role transition and role strain for principals in restructures schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 34-68.

Bredeson, P. V., & Hart, A. V. (1996). *The principalship*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Brock, B. L., & Grady, M. L. (2002). *Avoiding burnout: A principal’s guide to keeping the fire alive*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Daresh, J. C. (2001). *Beginning the principalship* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Duncan, P. K., Seguin, C. A., & Spalding, W. (1999, April). *The perfect match: A case study of a first year woman principal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Ferrigno, T. B. (2003). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity, transformation, purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 468-503.

Fullan, M. (1997). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1998). Leadership for the 21st century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. *Educational Leadership* 55(7), 6-12.

Goodwin, R. H., Cunningham, M. L., & Childress, R. (2003). The changing role of the secondary principal. *NAASP Bulletin* 87(634), 26-42.

Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal success: Establishing leadership in schools*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Levine, A. E. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, D. C.: The Education Schools Project.

Lugg, C., & Shoho, A. (2002). UCEA Review revisits the work of the National Commission for the Advancement of Excellence in Educational Administration. *UCEA Review* 53(2), 1-2.

Meyer M. J., & Macmillan, R. B. (2001). The principal's role in transition: Instructional leadership ain't what it used to be. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in learning*, 5(13), 1-14.

Morford, L. M. (2002, April). *Learning the ropes or being hung: Organizational socialization influences on new rural high school principals*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Pasiardis, P. (2004). *Educational leadership*. Athens, Greece: Metexmio.

Podlubny, K. D. (1999). Support for success: A mentorship program for first-year school-based administrators (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Canada, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(05A), 0351.

Piedmont of North Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina Greensboro, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(04A), 1221.

Pristash, S. (2001). Give up, give in, or give it your best shot: Stories of three first-year elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of St. Thomas, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 05A.

Reynolds, M. L. (1999). An exploratory case study of mentoring relationships of selected principals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(04A), 0966.

Schmidt, L. J., Kosmoski, G. J., & Pollack, D. R. (1998). *Novice administrators: Personality and administrative style changes*. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED427387, EA 029509).

Smulyan, L. (2000). *Balancing acts: Women principals at work*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vandiver, J. L. (2002). An investigation into understanding how work requirements of principals affect their quality of life: A case study of five women principals in the Piedmont of North Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina Greensboro, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(04A), 1221.