

2003

Licensed, but not leading: an analysis of individuals with Iowa secondary administrative licensure who do not hold administrative positions

Theron J. Schutte
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schutte, Theron J., "Licensed, but not leading: an analysis of individuals with Iowa secondary administrative licensure who do not hold administrative positions" (2003). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 1460.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/1460>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Licensed, but not leading: An analysis of individuals with Iowa secondary
administrative licensure who do not hold administrative positions

by

Theron J. Schutte

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Program of Study Committee:

Donald G. Hackmann, Major Professor

Jackie M. Blount

William K. Poston

Mack C. Shelley

Arthur A. Smith

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2003

Copyright © Theron J. Schutte, 2003. All rights reserved.

UMI Number: 3105103

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3105103

Copyright 2003 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation of
Theron J. Schutte
has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Program

For the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Assumptions of the Study	9
Delimitations	9
Definition of Terms	9
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Historical Perspective	13
Characteristics of Today's Principal	15
Role of the Secondary School Principal	17
Challenges	21
Low compensation/salaries	24
Stress in school administration	27
Negative dealings with students, parents, and lack of community support	32
Demanding nature of the work, responsibilities, and time	33
Geographical limitations	35
Lacking adequate preparation	37
Recruitment of quality applicants	40
Lack of female administrators and minorities	42
Administrator Shortage	48
National concern	48
State of Iowa concern	49
Career Motivation	50
Possible Solutions	55
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	60
Introduction	60
Research Questions	61
Statistical Procedures	61
Population of the Study	63
Development of the Instrument	63
Validation of the instrument	64
Human subjects release	65
Instrument Distribution and Data Collection	65
Analysis of the Data	66

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	67
Introduction	67
General Characteristics of the Sample	67
Demographic data related to respondents	68
Statistical treatment of data	74
Research question 1	75
Research question 2	82
Pursuit of the secondary principalship	84
Research question 3	85
Research question 4	94
Summary	98
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	100
Introduction	100
Summary of Problem, Methodology, and Findings	100
Findings	101
Limitations	104
Discussion	105
Motivating factors	105
Barriers	110
Preparation for the job	115
Implications	117
Recommendations for Further Research	121
Conclusion	123
APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	126
APPENDIX B. HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL FORMS	136
APPENDIX C. SURVEY INVITATION LETTER	144
APPENDIX D. SURVEY REMINDER NOTICE/POSTCARD	146
APPENDIX E. SURVEY RESPONSES/CATEGORIES	148
BIBLIOGRAPHY	164
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	179

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Responding educator demographics	69
Table 2. Demographic profile of respondents	71
Table 3. Factors that motivated respondents to attain secondary principal licensure	77
Table 4. Factors that motivated respondents to attain secondary principal licensure (Pareto scoring)	80
Table 5. Spearman's rho correlations on male and female rankings of what motivated them to attain secondary principal licensure	81
Table 6. Number of times respondents applied for secondary principal positions within the last five years	82
Table 7. Application frequency by gender	83
Table 8. Respondents' pursuit of the secondary school principalship	84
Table 9. What changes to the secondary principalship would make the job more enticing to the respondents?	86
Table 10. Barriers toward respondents seeking a secondary school principalship	87
Table 11. Spearman's rho correlations on male and female rankings of barriers toward seeking or attaining a secondary principalship	93
Table 12. Barriers toward respondents seeking or securing a position as a secondary school principal (themes)	95
Table 13. How adequately respondents felt their administrator preparation programs prepared them to pursue a career in secondary school administration	96
Table 14. How motivated respondents were to eventually assume an administrative position when they began and completed their administrator preparation program	97

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Strong leadership is a characteristic of effective schools. Building administrators are the primary educational leaders in the schools, managing school resources, setting the academic tone, and hiring and evaluating teachers. Principals also serve as primary conduits of communication among other administrators, students, parents, and members of the community.

Numerous studies and commission reports attest to the fact that exemplary principals stand at the center of exemplary schools (Educational Research Service [ERS], 2000; Jackson & Davis, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Patterson, 1997; Smith & Piele, 1989). In addition, the school effectiveness research of the past 20 years repeatedly affirms the principal's role in school success (Austin & Reynolds, 1990; Boyer, 1983; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1991). As the instructional leader, change agent, school manager, personnel administrator, and problem solver (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Vandenberghek, 1995), this role is paramount to the quality of life and learning in schools (Restine, 1997).

Principals are crucial to the development and maintenance of effective schools. Without their leadership, efforts to raise student achievement cannot succeed. Anderson (1988) notes:

Amidst the accumulating body of research on effective schools and the current call for school reform, the principal has emerged as the key person in school improvement efforts. A principal's leadership is among the most crucial elements necessary for school success, and a successful school almost always boasts of having an outstanding principal. (p. 7)

In spite of the abundant evidence documenting the essential nature of building-level leadership, principals appear to be leaving the profession in droves (Barker, 1996; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; School Administrators of Iowa [SAI], 1997; Williams & Portin, 1996). These individuals today are called upon to tackle tough curriculum standards, educate an increasingly diverse student population, shoulder responsibilities that once belonged at home and or in the community, and then face possible termination if their schools do not show instant results. The exodus prompted by these increased responsibilities has resulted in talk of a leadership crisis that has flooded legislators' hearing rooms, filled the pages of current school leadership journals, and has been cited in numerous reports of national school leadership organizations including the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). These documents and testimonies attest not only to a growing trend of administrators leaving their positions but also to a concern that few individuals are applying to fill these vacant positions.

The exodus from the principalship is coming at a time when the United States' Department of Education has projected record numbers of public school enrollments in the 21st century, as well as a 10-20% increase in the need for school administrators through 2005 (National Center For Education Statistics, 2000). In January 1998, a joint NAESP/NASSP study conducted a national telephone survey of 403 superintendents, who were hiring officials in school districts with 300 or more students (ERS, 1998). Over half of the respondents acknowledged that they were facing significant shortages of quality principal applicants. Although the shortage appeared most acute at the secondary level (grades 6-12)

and in urban settings, it was a problem across the board—encompassing elementary, middle, and high school principalships in rural, urban, and suburban areas.

State administrator organizations, including those in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Iowa, have undertaken survey research to assess the reasons for this shortage and have attempted to develop campaigns to address it (New England School Development Council [NESDEC], 1988; McAdams, 1998; SAI, 1997; Sheldon & Munnich, 1999). The first regional study of principal supply and demand was conducted by NESDEC in 1988. According to the NESDEC report, when examined on the basis of numbers of qualified residents within the state, the supply of prospective principals appeared more than adequate to meet the current and future demands. However, New England school district officials reported experiencing a reduced pool of quality applicants for administrative openings.

In Pennsylvania, it also appears that the normal laws of supply and demand have been suspended. Trend data indicate that more educators are earning administrative certificates, but fewer individuals are applying for available positions (McAdams, 1998). National and state principals' associations acknowledge that while applications for principal jobs are down, this phenomenon is not due to the fact that there are not enough well-educated and certified candidates. Although a large percentage of principals are expected to retire in the near future, the problem is exacerbated by a declining number of teachers with principal licensure seeking administrative positions. Furthermore, many individuals who are enrolled in principal preparation programs do not intend to seek a position upon completion of the degree (Jordon, McCauley, & Comeaux, 1994).

A study conducted at the University of Minnesota reinforced these findings (Sheldon & Munnich, 1999). Within that study a significant supply of administrative candidates were identified, but many seemed unwilling to fill vacated administrative posts. If this trend is confirmed throughout the nation, the call to provide leadership to the nation's schools during the 21st century may go unanswered.

In 1996, a statewide conference consisting of Iowa educators and administrators met to discuss administrator shortage concerns and developed a report to the School Administrators of Iowa Executive Committee (SAI, 1997). This report acknowledged declining numbers of applicants for superintendent and high school principal/athletic director combination positions in the state of Iowa. In addition, the report confirmed that there were hundreds of individuals currently endorsed in educational administration within the state who were not seeking school leadership careers.

At a time when the demands for improving the nature and quality of educational experiences for Iowa's youth are greater than ever, fewer and fewer educators are choosing to go into the field of school administration. Consequently, Iowa could soon join the growing number of states experiencing a K-12 leadership crisis. In cooperation with the Iowa Department of Education, SAI surveyed all superintendents, assistant superintendents, building principals, assistant principals, Area Education Agency (AEA) chief administrators, and AEA division directors who were 50 years of age and older (SAI & Iowa Department of Education, 1999), to determine their retirement intentions. The results were staggering: 610 of 674 administrators intended to retire by 2003. In response to these findings, the Iowa Department of Education (1999) issued the following statement:

Iowa has a long history of educational excellence, and skilled administrators at all levels have been a major reason for that success. Now, a shortage of qualified school administrators is affecting Iowa—a shortage that could seriously hinder the state's ability to build on its tradition of excellence and create schools to meet the needs of its citizens in the 21st century. (p. 1)

Adding to the Iowa Department of Education's call for concern was a survey conducted by the Center for Social and Behavioral Research at the University of Northern Iowa. That survey found that, due to changes made in the Iowa state retirement system, 50% of Iowa's superintendents were projected to retire by the year 2004, with one-third intending to retire by 2003 (Else, 1999).

Other demographic indications show that each school year finds more school administrator openings than the previous year. At the same time many Iowa school districts receive "less than half to one-third the number of applicants they would have expected five to ten years ago" (SAI, 1997, p. 1). Various statewide education organizations have studied a variety of current licensure and demographic factors that they believe substantially affect, or influence, Iowa's looming crisis in educational administration (SAI, 1997). As Ronald M. Rice, Executive Director of the Iowa Association of School Boards, put it, "We are most concerned about having highly qualified people to move into the superintendency and all other administrative positions. We can't deliver on higher accountability unless we have strong and qualified professional leadership" (Lee, 1998, p. 8).

Recent studies identify numerous factors that may discourage people from applying for the principalship (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; ERS, 1998; Montana School Boards Association, 1999). Principals work long hours, and the job can be stressful. They have multiple constituencies—students, teachers, parents, community, the school board, and the superintendent—and feel that they are always on call to respond to the needs of these

groups. Accountability pressures are mounting in many states and districts, especially with the implementation of high-stakes testing, and many principals feel that they are not in control of many factors that could result in low performance by their students (Brewer, 2001; ERS, 2000; King, 2002). They view their salaries as out of balance with the responsibilities, which they also believe serves as a barrier to encouraging experienced teachers who are often well salaried to move into the principalship (McAdams, 1998).

Principals and individuals holding administrative licenses may pursue other jobs because there seems to be a general feeling that the rewards simply do not justify the aggravation. Principals view their jobs as consisting of more work, more pressures and frustration, greater demands, and more responsibilities than when they initially assumed their positions (Institute of Educational Leadership [IEL], 2000; Kochan, Jackson, & Duke, 1999; Public Agenda, 2001). Given the stress, long hours, insufficient salary, numerous job responsibilities, perplexing daily problems, negative interactions with people, and a general lack of appreciation for the position, it is not surprising that administrators are considering leaving the principalship (Jordan et al., 1994; NESDEC, 1988).

Statement of the Problem

Iowa is facing a leadership crisis in K-12 education. At a time when the demands for improving the nature and quality of educational experiences for Iowa's young people are greater than ever, fewer and fewer educators are choosing to go into school administration (SAI, 1997).

Many professionals who hold secondary principal licensure are choosing not to be employed as secondary school administrators. Of the approximately 385 individuals in the

state of Iowa who fit this criterion (IDE, 2002), insufficient data have been collected upon which to base a discussion of what state and local policy may be most effective in attracting prospective secondary school administrators. The need exists to identify those factors that discourage licensed individuals from seeking administrative positions.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were to: 1) investigate the reasons why individuals licensed to be secondary administrators are not entering the profession, and 2) identify factors that might motivate them to consider administrative appointments. This information will be shared with state-level policy makers, local school boards, administrators, university faculty, and professional organizations to provide greater insights into solving the looming administrator shortage in Iowa. Similar doctoral dissertations recently have been completed on the Iowa superintendency shortage (Smith, 1999) and the Iowa elementary principal shortage (Laing, 2001). This additional information, specifically concerned with the Iowa secondary principalship, may provide further assistance in reformulating policy and practice that would increase the probability of attracting more highly qualified candidates for secondary principal openings in Iowa.

Specifically, this study seeks to determine what factors motivate or discourage licensed principal candidates from pursuing a career in secondary administration in Iowa. The focus of this study was limited to the state of Iowa as it is intended to complement the previous research conducted on the superintendency (Smith, 1999) and the elementary principalship in Iowa (Laing, 2001).

The researcher also was interested in learning what factors influence respondents' perceptions and opinions of school administration, and more specifically the secondary principalship, as a career. Finally, the researcher ascertained how many Iowans, who possess administrative licensure, have sought or are currently seeking a secondary administrative position. For those not currently seeking an administrative position, it was important to find out what they perceived as significant barriers toward this career change. The research findings could be used to recommend policies and practices that would encourage these people to seek secondary principalships as well as to suggest areas for further study.

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide this study:

1. What factors initially motivated principal candidates who are licensed as secondary school administrators in Iowa, but do not serve in administrative roles, to seek licensure, and do these factors vary by gender?
2. How many principal candidates have actively pursued careers in secondary school administration? What factors would motivate these individuals to pursue careers in secondary school administration?
3. What do principal candidates view as significant barriers toward their seeking a secondary principal position? Do these perceptions vary by gender?
4. How adequately principal candidates feel their administrator preparation programs prepared them to pursue a career in secondary school administration? Do these perceptions vary by gender?

Assumptions of the Study

This investigation was based on the assumption that a sufficient number of subjects (educators who have secondary administrative licensure but are not currently serving in that capacity) would willingly respond to the questionnaire to yield statistically significant data. It is further assumed that each respondent would complete the questionnaire and any follow-up interviews fully and honestly. Finally, it was assumed that perceived barriers to seeking a secondary administrative position, as listed in the questionnaire, would have a relationship or effect upon those individuals who are endorsed to serve as secondary school administrators but are choosing not to do so.

Delimitations

Delimitations of this study include:

1. The respondents were limited to educators who are secondary principal license holders, who reside in the state of Iowa, but are not currently serving as school administrators.
2. The data represented the perceptions of respondents at the time of the data collection. Data for this study was from the calendar year 2001-2002 and reflected the perceptions of principal candidates who hold secondary principal licensure during that year only. The findings do not necessarily reflect how similar populations might respond at other times.

Definition of Terms

The following working definitions are provided for this study:

Area Education Agency (AEA): refers to one of 15 intermediate school agencies that were created by the 1974 Iowa legislature. These agencies are under the jurisdiction of

the Iowa Department of Education and provide a broad range of services to school districts located in the agency's geographic area in order to ensure equal educational opportunities for all children. Funding for these agencies comes from legislatively controlled state-aid and property taxes; federal and state grants; and the sale of services and materials (General Assembly of Iowa, Volume 2, Chapter 273.2, 2001).

Iowa Secondary Principal Licensure: Requires a minimum of a master's degree in secondary administration and at least three years of teaching experience; refers to those principal candidates who are licensed to serve as principals of schools containing any combination of grades 7-12 (Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, 2002).

Phase III: Part of the Educational Excellence fund established by the Iowa legislature in 1987. The goal of Phase III is to enhance the quality, effectiveness, and performance of Iowa's teachers by promoting teacher excellence. The intent was for this enhancement to be accomplished through each district's development of performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans requiring additional instructional work assignments which may include specialized training or differential training, or both (General Assembly of Iowa, Volume 2, Chapter 294A.12, 2001).

Principal Candidate: An individual who currently possesses secondary principal licensure in Iowa and is involved in some aspect of K-12 education but is not serving as a secondary principal or school administrator. Excluded were individuals with secondary administrative licensure in Iowa who were currently working in the positions of superintendent, assistant or associate superintendent, principal, administrator, administrative assistant, assistant dean/director, assistant principal, curriculum director, or dean of students.

SAI Executive Committee: The executive committee consists of seven SAI members who are elected by other members of SAI.

SAI Representative Council: The representative council is comprised of five representatives from each of the 15 Area Education Agencies in Iowa. This group is responsible for making SAI policy.

Secondary Principal: Provides leadership and is responsible for overseeing the total program of the secondary school for which he/she is assigned. A secondary principal may be responsible for a middle school, junior high school, high school, or some combination thereof (American Association of School Administrators & The National School Boards Association, 1981).

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literally scores of definitions of educational leadership have been advanced in the literature. Some writers emphasize change or moving forward, while others see the leader as a facilitator or helper. Patterson (1997) states that “to lead is to influence others to achieve mutually agreed upon and socially valued goals that help an organization stretch to a higher level” (p. 5). One of the shorter definitions was offered by Scott Thomson, former executive director of the NASSP: “Leadership is best defined as getting the job done through people” (Smith & Piele, 1989, p. 2). The common denominator among all leadership definitions is that leaders know how necessary and important leadership is to moving their organizations forward.

Traditional leadership theory was more about management ideology than it was about leadership (Murphy, 2001) and provided outdated notions about leadership. It viewed leadership as orderly, stable, and short-term, and envisioned leaders who are cool, aloof, analytical, and controlled. In contrast, contemporary leadership theory describes leadership as challenging the process, shaking things up, and changing things (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Smith & Piele, 1989). It is about looking for long-term, future-oriented solutions. It requires having vision and a sense of direction. Leaders of today project inspiration, passion, intensity, caring, and kindness. Leaders do not control through manipulation and coercion; they empower others to act.

Everyone knows the importance and necessity of leadership. Why do some companies, teams, and schools succeed when others fail? The credit or blame most often goes to the manager, coach, or principal. Research has revealed that good leadership is

important to achieve educational excellence within schools (Austin, 1979; Edmonds, 1987).

The importance of the principal's leadership role in achieving academic excellence in schools is not a new idea and may be best reflected in a 1972 report from the Senate Select Committee on Equal Education Opportunity:

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He/she is the person responsible for all of the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is his/her leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism, and the morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. He/she is the main link between the school and the community and the way he/she performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school. If a school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place; if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching; if students are performing at the best of their ability one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success. (p. 305)

Today's school organizations continue to seek strong leaders who will move them forward.

Historical Perspective

The practice of educational administration in America is only a few centuries old. Prior to 1850 in the United States, most schools, both public and private, tended to be small with only one or two teachers. Thus, there was little need for full-time principals to handle administrative matters beyond the classroom. Administrative decisions, regarding personnel, finances, and the daily operation of schools, were made by school boards (Wood, Nicholson, & Findley, 1979). As towns grew larger, local school committees found that one and two teacher schools were inefficient, so smaller schools were combined and as the schools became larger, more and more authority was given to the head teachers. During the period of 1840-1870, school committees in larger cities felt the need to delegate administrative responsibility. As schools grew larger and problems became more complex,

head teachers began to acquire additional duties. In addition to tasks associated with instructional leadership, they assumed managerial duties of hiring staff, maintaining the school building, and handling finances. The school principalship developed into an official post as the head teacher assumed increasing responsibility for the administration of the local school. As these head teachers were relieved of their teaching responsibilities, the word “principal” came into common use (Wood et al., 1979). By 1870, the continued growth of cities resulted in school systems that increasingly grew in size and complexity.

The three aspects of the principal’s work—instructional leader, manager, and political leader—still constitute the basic elements of the role. However, principals today are finding that with demands on student achievement and expectations for sharing decision-making, the job is taking on new dimensions (Hausman, Crow, & Sperry, 2000; Whitaker, 1996). These demands began in 1983 when the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) presented their report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, to the nation and the United States Secretary of Education. This report was given in response to the widespread public perception that something was seriously remiss in the American educational system because of declining test scores. The end result has been an increased emphasis on principals being instructional leaders and having a higher degree of accountability concerning their schools’ academic performances.

As pressure grows for schools to be more accountable for ever-higher standards, educators simultaneously are struggling to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population and deal with a number of issues, such as school safety, that would have been unimaginable just a decade ago. The principal’s role is increasingly being defined in terms of instructional leadership, a concept that first surfaced in the late 1980s but that has a very

different meaning today (Hausman et al., 2000; IEL, 2000). Research repeatedly has identified instructional leadership as a characteristic of effective schools (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Edmonds, 1987; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The instructional leader of the 1980s was presented as an efficient, task-oriented, top-down manager, instead of one who was focused on curriculum and instruction. Today's ideal instructional leader is portrayed as a democratic, community-minded leader who builds consensus around a vision rooted in agreed-upon standards for student learning, with a commitment to being accountable for results (Lashway, 2002).

The demands placed on principals have changed but the profession has not changed to meet those demands, and the tension is starting to show. No matter how desirable it is for principals to be instructional leaders, their managerial responsibilities are not going away. Someone still must order supplies, reconcile budgets, and make sure the buses arrive on time. Given the existing demands on the principal's time, it seems unrealistic simply to add a whole new layer of expectations to the principal's already difficult role. According to a recent Report of the Task Force on the Principalship, "Principals increasingly say the job is simply not doable and the conflict between the rapidly growing job demands and a shrinking pool of qualified candidates portends a catastrophe" (Task Force on the Principalship, 2000).

Characteristics of Today's Principal

To understand the present-day school leadership crisis at the secondary principal level, one needs to understand who typically serves in the role. Recent studies have been conducted at both the high school (NASSP, 2001) and middle levels (Petzko et al., 2002).

In a 1995 report from the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), a thumbnail sketch of the public school principal was provided. The average principal was: male, 47.7 years of age, and earned an annual salary of \$54,857. Within this study the number of elementary principals outnumbered secondary principals by a ratio of nearly three to one. Unfortunately, this study did not differentiate between secondary and elementary principals.

With the possible exception of salary, it does not appear that trend data for the state of Iowa differ greatly from national statistics. The *Annual Condition of Education Report* released by the Iowa Department of Education (2001) provides a profile of the typical Iowa secondary school administrators (including high school, junior high school, and middle school principals and associate principals) during the 2000-2001 school year. The average age of Iowa's secondary school administrator was 47.8. Although females held only 17% of these positions, the total number of female administrators increased approximately 20% over the past 10 years. The average length of administrative experience was 21.5 years, with 12 of those years being within the district in which they worked. The average salary for head principals was \$61,212, and an assistant principal's average salary was \$60,526.

In a study conducted by the School Administrators of Iowa and the Iowa Department of Education (1999), it was determined that 35.9% of current Iowa school administrators intended to retire by the year 2003. A large percentage of those people planned on retiring in the year 2003. Who will be filling their shoes?

How many people are in the pipeline to earn secondary administrator licensure in the next few years? The School Administrators of Iowa's best estimate in 2000 was that approximately 417 people would receive their secondary administrative endorsement over

the next five years from Iowa colleges (SAI & IDE, 1999). This supply of new principal candidates does not guarantee that these people actually will take a job as a school administrator, however. According to the Iowa Department of Education (2002), 385 educators in Iowa held secondary school principal endorsement but were serving in some other capacity in K-12 public education. Are these people interested in filling the shoes of retiring administrators? If not, why not?

Role of the Secondary School Principal

Historically, many students, parents, and community members have had the impression that the secondary principal is everything to everybody. Most school patrons have viewed him/her as the key person for getting most everything done. However, Clarke (1995) believed “the notion of the principal who acts as the all-knowing patriarch of the school and who wisely solves all problems is passé” (p. 9).

The principal’s role has changed over time, becoming more demanding in response to societal changes and school reform efforts (Kochran, Jackson, & Duke, 1999; Pounder & Merrill, 2001). Using metaphors, Beck and Murphy (1993) have described major changes in the role expectations of the principal over time: values broker in the (1920s), scientific manager (1930s), democratic leader (1940s), theory-guided administrator (1950s), bureaucratic executive (1960s), humanistic facilitator (1970s), and instructional leader (1990s). This trend has continued as “the school restructuring reforms of the 1990s have further identified the principal as a transformational leader who must be involved in school problem finding and problem solving, shared decision making, decentralized leadership, and systemic change” (Pounder & Merrill, 2001, p. 35).

School leaders can expect an increasingly complex and demanding job. Today's secondary principal has to manage far more than the administrative tasks traditionally associated with running a school (Checkley, 2000; Copland, 2001). Cooley and Shen (1999) found that nearly 62% of educational leadership students they surveyed indicated the nature of the work was a consideration in applying for an administrative position. Job responsibilities for most administrative positions include student discipline, attendance, teacher evaluation, supervision of co-curricular activities, and a myriad of other assignments. Student discipline, drug and alcohol abuse, teacher-administrator conflict, and increased public skepticism continue to complicate the administrator's role, responsibilities, and the nature of administrative work. Pearlstein (1999) observes that "a principal is no longer an educator. She/he is the CEO of a small corporation, a social worker, a cop, a defendant in lawsuits, and more and more often a fall guy" (p. B01).

Over the past 10-20 years, the job responsibilities of the secondary principal not only have changed dramatically but they have also multiplied (NASSP, 2001; Quinn, 2002). No longer is the principal just the building and staff manager. Today's principal must be a legal expert, health and social services coordinator, fundraiser, public relations consultant, parental involvement expert, and security officer. In addition, they are expected to be technologically savvy, diplomatic, with top-notch managerial skills. On top of all this, the principal's most important duty is supposed to be the implementation of instructional programs, curricula, pedagogical practice, and assessment models. Stronge (1993) characterizes this view of educational leadership as one that "draws a rational relationship between managerial efficiency and instructionally effective schools" (p. 5). Principals, as instructional leaders, must tackle tough curriculum standards, serve an increasingly diverse

student populations, shoulder responsibilities that once were addressed at home and/or in the community, and then face possible termination if their schools do not show instant results (NASSP, 2001).

A recent study suggests that any initiative to address this shortage must include efforts to define the role of the secondary principal more realistically (ERS, 2000). Classified advertisements do not do a principal's job justice, the position is complex because it spans the boundary between internal and external environments. Hausman, Crow, and Sperry (2000) explain that "schools are no longer self-contained and isolated systems. They are nested organizations that have multiple connections with their environments" (p. 6). In addition to teachers, staff, and students inside the school building, school communities include parents, community members, district personnel, and other external entities that affect education. Principals also work in a context of multiple reform agendas. These reforms, coming from local, state, and national sources, increase the complexity of the principal's role by forcing him/her to focus on the demands that each force is making. They are feeling the effects of the public's changing expectations in the push to adopt new and expanded administrative roles, including those of accountable instructional leaders, constructive political leaders, and responsible managers (Seyfarth, 1999).

Leadership in schools requires far more than simple competence in discrete skills and tasks (Hart & Bredeson, 1996). Principals must see themselves more as negotiators of the environment and less as managers of a school system. Paul Houston, Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators, states that "school leaders need to shift their focus from the Bs—budgets, books, buses, bonds, and buildings—to the Cs—

communication, collaboration, and community building” (Houston, 1998, p. 44). Principals must focus intensely on their interpersonal skills, capacity to read and adjust to the environment, and ability to understand and cope with far-reaching issues. They must be politically astute, prepared to adjust their leadership styles, and ethically grounded (Hart & Bredeson, 1996). There does not appear to be a single set of administrative standards, related skills, and/or role definitions that will solve every problem facing school leaders today. A single, ideal portrait of the principalship does not exist, which adds to the complexity of this role. This concern may very well contribute to some educators’ hesitation in moving from their teaching positions into the principalship.

The standards-based reform movement has found its way into administrator preparation programs, in an effort to focus on effective leadership skills and student achievement (Murphy, 2001). The vision of today’s educational leader has possibly been captured in the “Standards for School Leaders” developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a group consisting of more than 30 state school officials and all the major professional organizations in the area of school administration (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). The standards, which were developed in 1996 by ISSLC, were designed to provide a common vision for effective educational leadership. The standards are:

- 1) A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

- 2) A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- 3) A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
- 4) A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and need, and mobilizing community resources.
- 5) A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
- 6) A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

According to Murphy (2001), "These standards may provide a future platform for the re-constitution of leadership preparation programs and for certification and the re-certification of school leaders" (p. 16).

Challenges

Why are literally hundreds of educators in Iowa, who are licensed as school administrators, not seeking employment as educational leaders? Research suggests several reasons educators with principal endorsements do not pursue administrative posts (Anderson, 1988; ERS, 1998; IEL, 2000, Restine, 1997).

The job itself may be a barrier to a principal candidate's motivation in pursuing such a position (Barker, 1996; McAdams, 1998; Restine, 1997; Winter, Rinehart, & Munoz, 2001). A principal's job is comprised of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload and requires a work week that is an average 55-60 hours (McAdams, 1998; Schiff, 2002). Along with required attendance at community meetings, the tremendous workload necessary with special education and other legal issues results in less job satisfaction.

Individuals endorsed to be principals, mainly teachers and counselors, perceive the role as undesirable because of the ever-increasing workload and demands (Barker, 1996; IEL, 2000; Jones, 2001; Lashway, 2002). The complexity of tasks, time demands, accountability and professional status have contributed to a less desirable opinion of school administration (McAdams, 1998).

Several themes surface through the review of data from national and state surveys. A joint NAESP/NASSP/ERS study (ERS, 2000) summarized the role of the principal as such:

Principals work long hours, and the job can be stressful. They have multiple constituencies—students, teachers, parents, the school board, and the superintendent—and feel they are always on call to respond to the needs of these groups. Accountability pressures are mounting in many states and districts, especially with the implementation of high-stakes testing, and many of the principals feel that they are not in control of many factors that could result in low performance by their school's students. They view the salaries they receive as out of balance with the responsibilities, and they view this as a barrier to encouraging experienced teachers who are often already high on the salary schedule to move into the principalship. (p. 33)

Being an effective building manager used to be sufficient for an administrator to be considered successful. As studies show the crucial role that principals can play in improving teaching and learning, it is clear that principals today also must serve as leaders

for student learning and are expected to make a difference by positively influencing school performance (Hallinger & Heck, 1996).

The School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) and Northern Trails Area Education Agency (AEA 2) co-sponsored a June 1996 retreat to investigate why more individuals were not pursuing the principalship. The 50 participants at this retreat consisted of school administrators, board members, parents, classroom teachers, college professors, search consultants, and representatives of the business community. Based on their discussions, the following factors were determined to contribute to the administrator shortage in Iowa:

- a) the increased expectations, complexities, and responsibilities of the school administrator's role;
- b) the increased responsibilities for building principals because of decentralization and site-based decision making;
- c) more meetings because of Phase III responsibilities (teachers receive extra compensation to attend, but school administrators do not);
- d) the stressful conditions of being a school administrator (challenges of balancing work and home);
- e) lack of needed resources and support;
- f) insufficient salaries and fringe benefits (especially the difference between the salaries of classroom teachers and beginning administrators);
- g) lack of information available about the positive aspects of school administration;
- h) failure of administrators to identify and recruit quality people into the profession;
- i) a state retirement system with disincentive for going into higher paid positions;
- j) the "glass ceiling" that exists for women and minorities to get hired as school administrators;
- k) the possibility that certification and preparation programs do not keep pace with present-day demands;
- l) a lack awareness about the administrator shortage that exists in Iowa; and
- m) an emphasis on the negative aspects of school administration (especially by school administrators themselves) (SAI, 1997).

The role of the principal is very difficult. Vincent Ferrandino (Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000), Executive Director of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), states that “the demands that are placed on administrators today are such that very few qualified people are willing to step up to the plate any longer and take on those responsibilities” (p. 2). Many principal candidates who possess the necessary credentials see the principal’s role as impossible—a stressful, thankless endeavor that does not pay nearly enough to compensate for the frustration.

Low compensation/salaries

One factor affecting the current lack of applicants possibly could be the salaries being offered to administrators. According to a 1998 ERS report, administrative salaries have remained basically static compared to average annual increases in teacher salaries. Differences between school administrator and teacher salaries are narrow when taking into consideration the school administrator’s longer work year, level of education, and experience. For the 1997-98 school year, the average teacher’s salary was \$40,133, while the average secondary principal’s salary was \$64,653. Teachers worked 187 days and earned \$215 per day, compared to 240 days worked by principals who earned \$269 per day (ERS, 1998). A recent study by ERS (2002) determined that there was as little as a 4% difference in salary for new assistant principals and a 23% difference for principals over relatively experienced teachers, when comparing average daily salaries.

The financial incentives for assuming an administrative position also have changed as a result of the dual-income family:

A household of two mid-career teachers—or a teacher and another professional—could easily have a family income of \$130,000 to \$150,000 a year. Assuming a person's first administrative position will increase his/her salary \$10,000, the total family income after taxes might increase by only \$6,000 on a \$130,000 base. This is not much of a financial incentive to uproot the family. (McAdams, 1998, p. 38)

McAdams (1998) discussed factors that discourage educators from pursuing an administrative position and ways this shortage can be resolved before it becomes a full-blown crisis. Financial issues were a factor he believes affect the number of applicants for administrative positions. McAdams (1998) notes, "With a marginal tax rate and the loss of supplemental income that teachers are often able to earn during their summer months, educators sometimes view a move up the career ladder as a hit in their pocketbook" (p. 38).

According to the executive directors of NASSP and NAESP (Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000), it is not uncommon for a principal to actually earn less than a veteran teacher. They trade in their 180-190 day work year for one that exceeds 220 days, take on enormous responsibilities and headaches, lose their job security, and earn just a little more or even less on a per diem basis than they would earn as teachers. While no one would dispute that teachers should be better paid, this compression of salaries has led to a very small differential between teachers and principals and between central office employees and superintendents (Cooley & Shen, 1999; Houston, 1998).

Teachers and others increasingly believe that the financial rewards of being a principal are not commensurate with the job's responsibilities (Asch, 1999; Barker, 1996; ERS, 1998; Williams & Portin, 1996). A study was conducted of 189 master's degree students enrolled in a mid-western university's educational leadership program. In this study, students completed a survey identifying factors that influenced their decision to

apply for an administrative position. Of the top 10 factors, salary commensurate with responsibility ranked number two.

A 1998 ERS study of 403 superintendents and central office personnel identified 60% of the respondents as having selected salary/compensation not sufficient as compared to responsibilities as the top-ranked barrier to pursuing an administrative position. A nationwide survey of 1,323 randomly selected principals disclosed "salary being too low" was the primary reason for concern about attracting quality candidates to the principalship (ERS, 1999, p. 1). More than two-thirds of the responding principals said they were concerned about the ability of public education to attract quality candidates to the field. Similarly, in 1999 the Montana School Boards Association surveyed Montana educators who held administrative certification but were not currently working as administrators. Those who did not intend to apply for an administrative job ranked as their most important reason "salary too low for job responsibilities" (ERS, 2000, p. 27).

Low salaries, inadequate fringe benefit packages, and job security issues have hampered the state of Iowa's efforts to recruit quality secondary school administrators as well. In a 1997 report to the School Administrators of Iowa Executive Committee, financial barriers to school administration listed included insufficient salaries and fringe benefits (especially the difference between the salaries of classroom teachers and beginning administrators) and the lack of compensation for Phase III responsibilities. The goal of Phase III is to enhance the quality, effectiveness, and performance of Iowa's teachers by promoting teacher excellence by development of performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans requiring additional instructional work assignments which may include specialized training or differential training, or both. Unless salaries and benefits are

improved, this report suggested that Iowa would have difficulty in attracting individuals to become school administrators as well as retaining those currently serving as school administrators.

Stress in school administration

As expectations and responsibilities of school administrators have increased, so have the levels of stress (Barker, 1996; ERS, 1998; IEL, 2000). Gmelch and Chan (1994) found that principals often suffer more severe stress from conflict and time pressures than do superintendents. The work of principals is stressful. Principals are on duty every hour of every day, as long as they remain employed with a school district. Principals are viewed as representing the school district and are held to a higher standard than others within the community. They are expected to be role models for others to emulate.

Selye (1974) considered stress to be the “non-specific response of the body to any demand made upon it” (p. 6). The longer it takes to adjust and the more intense the situation becomes, the greater the stress one experiences. Similarly, Kelly (1974) defined stress as the “state of the total organism under difficult or extenuating circumstances” (p. 12). McGrath (1970) also viewed stress as a physiological phenomenon, but emphasized its psychological aspects. He defined stress as the anticipation of inability to respond adequately to perceived demand. Gmelch and Chan (1994) indicate that there is both positive stress and negative stress. Regardless of the type of stress, a person’s initial physiological reaction is much the same. They state that “stresses are found in all aspects of being a principal, from the school environment, the nature of principal’s work, the

educators they work with to those within their own personalities and dispositions” (Gmelch & Chan, 1994, pp. 4-5).

Without question, the potential for stress plays a significant role in discouraging people from applying for administrative positions. Many prospective administrators feel that the compensation for the position is simply not enough when the amount of stress, strain, responsibility, and time are considered. Job-related stress for school administrators includes role conflict (Kahn, Wolf, Quinn, & Snoek, 1964); work overload (Piatt, 1981); inadequate compensation (Brown & Carlton, 1980; Hendrickson, 1979); interpersonal conflict with parents, teachers, and students (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Washington, 1980); and increased administrative responsibility (Brown & Carlton, 1980; Hendrickson, 1979).

Brimm (1983) administered a questionnaire developed by Swent and Gmelch (1977) to 1800 Oregon school administrators, which incorporated stressors such as meetings, workload, management, supervision, evaluation, negotiations, interpersonal relations, self-expectations, and role expectations of the public. The goal of the study was to determine which facets of the job produce the most stress. Brimm found the 10 most stressful parts of the job were: a) complying with state, federal, and organizational rules and policies; b) excessive time devoted to meetings; c) trying to complete paperwork on time; d) trying to gain public approval and/or financial support; e) resolving parent-school conflicts; f) teacher/staff evaluations; g) making decisions that affect the lives of individuals the principals knew; h) too heavy a work load impossible to finish in a regular work day; i) imposing excessively high standards oneself; and j) frequent interruptions.

Brimm (1983) conducted a similar study in the state of Tennessee and found the same results but in a slightly different order. In both studies, the greatest stress factors for administrators were meetings, workload, and compliance with policies.

Administrative stress is not a phenomenon unique to only the United States. Spooner (1984) surveyed 296 primary headteachers in England and found reprimanding staff, dealing with staff under stress, responsibility of the position, maintaining standards, and quality of work in the school to be the most stressful aspects of school administration. Using a large-scale survey in the United Kingdom, Kelly (1988) found workload, handling staff relationships, demands of local school districts, handling inadequate staff, and feeling undervalued to be the most stressful factors of school administration.

In a survey conducted in Malta with 104 administrators from all state schools, Borg and Riding (1993) found the level of stress perceived by an administrator is connected to the amount of principalship experience. Administrators with over five years of experience rated their stress level higher than administrators with fewer than five years of experience. Borg and Riding determined that a combination of four factors contributed to high stress levels: work load, lack of support, resolving conflicts, and inadequate resources. No statistical significance was found between the amount of work and job satisfaction experienced by respondents, indicating it is the nature of the work itself, not the amount of work that determines job satisfaction.

The stress experienced by school administrators is not without personal cost (Duke, 1988; Whitaker, 1996). In exploring causes of administrator stress and burnout, Whitaker (1996) interviewed principals considering leaving the principalship and found heart problems, insomnia, and failed marriages as a result of negative school issues carrying over

into home life. Lack of time for family and personal matters, particularly for two-income families in which responsibilities at home must be shared contributed to the negative effect on a school administrator's home life (NESDEC, 1988). Respondents in the NESDEC study indicated that the position's responsibilities had no boundaries, which resulted in administrators' feeling consumed with the job.

Whitaker (1996) used the Maslach Burnout Inventory to determine which factors of the job result in administrator burnout. Indicators of burnout included emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low personal accomplishment. Whitaker identified site-based decision-making, shared decision-making, declining resources, increased paperwork, and greater expectations from the public and central administration for high student standards as the greatest sources of stress. While one segment of the population is demanding a "back to basics" curriculum, another is demanding higher standards. Additional stress is caused by pressure on the school administrator to restructure the learning environment to achieve higher test scores, according to MacCarthy (1993).

Emotional aspects related to administration include stress, burnout, and frustration. Cooley and Shen (1999) found that more than 65% of teachers responding to their survey suggested that the emotional aspects of administration were a major consideration in applying for an administrative position. Seventy-two percent of respondents stated that they would consider the impact of administration on their home life when applying for an administrative position. Teachers questioned whether the extra compensation and prestige were worth being questioned and criticized by both internal and external stakeholders. Teachers recognized stress as a critical part of administration.

In 1998, a joint study was conducted in which 403 superintendents and central office personnel, who had hired a building principal within the previous year, were surveyed. They identified 32% of the respondents as having selected "job too stressful" as the second highest ranked barrier to people pursuing principalships. The same study identified "too much time required" as the third highest barrier (27%). A similar nationwide survey based on 1,323 randomly selected principals found "hours too long" and "work-related stress" were the second and fourth most frequent reasons for concerns about attracting quality candidates (ERS, 1999). It was determined that expectations of principals to meet local and state mandated-student achievement standards, raise funds for the school programs, and having to share the decision-making process with others were resulting in higher degrees of job-related stress.

A Louisiana survey of teachers who were certified as administrators but were not yet working as administrators ranked stressful condition of position (42%) as the number two reason they were not pursuing a career as principal (Jordan et al., 1994). In 1999, the Montana School Boards Association surveyed Montana educators who had administrative certification but were not currently working as administrators. Those who did not intend to apply for an administrative job ranked as their third and fourth most important reasons were "conflict with desired life style and longer working hours."

Carr (1994) suggests that the high incidence of stress (anxiety and depression) among principals is in large measure related to the insistence on educational administration being considered a technical rather than a human relations activity. According to Barker (1996), districts need to advocate for principals as human beings and work with local constituents to alter long-held beliefs about the role of the principal that included being

available and on call at all times. If expectations were more reasonable, more educators would pursue the principalship. Barker also found turnover among principals was greater than in other administrative positions. Retaining quality people currently involved in educational administration also is necessary in addressing the principal shortage.

Negative dealings with students, parents, and lack of community support

Teachers applying for administrative positions are very aware of the importance of community support, which can influence an administrator's perception of job security within the school-community. A study by Cooley and Shen (1999) found 75% of the respondents identified community support as a factor in applying for an administrative position. Issues such as school funding, violence, students' drug/alcohol use, community politics, and parental involvement in schools affect individuals' decisions whether or not to apply for an administrative position. It has a critical impact on the administrator's capability to lead, develop programs, and meet the needs of faculty, staff, students, and the communities they serve.

Participants in a 1999 meeting of executive directors and presidents of state principals' associations discussed factors that they saw discouraging good people from applying for principalships. Among the themes that emerged were a lack of understanding by the general public of the scope of the job and inadequate support from parents (ERS, 2000). The role of the principal has changed dramatically. Ferrandino (1999) states, "the demands that are being placed on the individual are such that very few qualified people are willing to step up to the plate any longer and take those responsibilities" (p. 2).

The involvement of both internal and external groups in decision-making requires principals to be an instructional leader and facilitator of many different opinions. Negative dealings with students, parents, staff, and the Board of Education are deterrents, according to both Restine (1997) and Barker (1996). The lack of information about the positive aspects of administration, combined with the perception that there is little appreciation or recognition, only compounds negative feelings about the role (SAI, 1997).

Many different groups place demands upon school administrators, all of whom believe their demand is most important (Cooley & Shen, 2003; Moore, 1999). The increased demands coming from parents, teachers, students, and college likely will result in a less effective school administrator (Borg & Riding, 1993). The treatment of administrators by others may be a significant reason why licensed principal candidates choose not to pursue administration (NESDEC, 1988).

Demanding nature of the work, responsibilities, and time

The enormous demands placed on today's principal attract very few qualified people to take on those responsibilities of the position. Candidates endorsed to be secondary principals mainly perceive the role as undesirable because of the ever-increasing workload and demands on principals (Barker, 1996; Murphy, 1994). Many candidates suggest that any initiative to address the problem should begin with a redefinition of the role of the principal (ERS, 2000).

Finding time to wear the hat of an instructional leader, which is the principal's primary task, often becomes difficult. Both principals and executive directors of state associations, while attending a joint NAESP/NASSP leadership meeting in 1999, were

asked to identify critical professional competencies of principals for the year 2000. In their view, principals needed to: a) provide steady leadership; b) have a clear focus and personal vision for education; c) be educationally savvy; d) be innovative; e) be capable of building consensus and developing teams; f) have good communication skills; g) be aware of technology; h) have a good grasp of issue related to curriculum, instruction, and assessment; i) be capable of evaluating teachers and helping them grow; j) be able to sell the school; k) be capable of interacting with a diverse constituency; l) be a good manager; m) be interested in using and applying research to improve the school's programs; n) have the ability to deal with multiple priorities; o) have an accurate understanding of the environment of the community; p) possess good conflict resolution and mediation skills; and q) be child advocates who are dedicated to doing their job well. When reflecting on the current role of the principal, one may make a comparison to the Superman character.

Ferrandino and Tirozzi (2001) state that "one must be more powerful than a locomotive, faster than a speeding bullet, and be able to leap tall buildings in a single bound" (p. 6).

Dedicated principals often devote 55 hours, 60 hours, or even more each week to meet the increasing demands of the job (Cooley & Shen, 1999). This kind of workweek might have been sustainable in the days of the male breadwinner and the stay-at-home mom. Today, however, the typical two-income household is already starved for time—especially if the family includes children (Grogan, 1999; Schor, 1991).

This phenomenon is not unique to the field of school administration but is part of a larger cultural picture within the United States (Schor, 1991). Schor (1991) contends that working hours have risen for men as well as women, for those in the working class as well as professionals. Her argument is that incentive structures of capitalist economies, such as

the United States, contain biases toward longer working hours resulting in increased pay versus increased leisure time through a shorter workweek. Schor (1991) believes that “this time poverty is straining the social fabric” (pp. 14-15). Although men also face difficult decisions about careers and families, the strain for wives to manage both work and home continues to be greater in this culture than for husbands (Edson, 1988).

Numerous studies show that the demands of a modern society have complicated and intensified the administrator’s work responsibilities. This responsibilities coupled with the long workday, politics, a lack of job security, and ongoing conflict makes the job looks less appealing to prospective candidates (Cooley & Shen, 1999; IEL, 2000; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998). A Louisiana survey of teachers who were certified as administrators ranked increased complexity and responsibility of the job (47%) as the primary reason they were not pursuing administrative careers (Jordan et al., 1994). Survey results based on 1,323 randomly selected principals nationwide found “increasing responsibilities” was the third most frequent reason for concerns about attracting quality candidates (ERS, 1999, p. 1). In a recent study of current educational leadership graduate students, the top inhibitor toward pursuing a principalship was identified as increased time commitments (Moore, 1999).

Geographical limitations

Today’s aspiring administrator is far less mobile than his or her typically male counterpart from the 1960s (Grogan, 1999; McAdams, 1998). Because there are a limited number of school principalships in any geographic location, the discourse of educational administration approves of individuals who are willing to relocate. Two-income families

have become the societal norm over the past 30 years. Moving to another region might represent a career opportunity but will require spouses to resign from positions that contribute substantially to family income. Dual careers rarely allow the freedom to readily relocate when career opportunities present themselves.

Thirty years ago, a majority of administrators' spouses were either teachers or homemakers. This is no longer the case. It is likely that a majority of applicants have spouses employed in professional positions, and their spouses' job opportunities are a key consideration in plans to relocate (Glass, 2000). These spouses might be happy in their current jobs. They might have their own career aspirations and be justifiably concerned about finding suitable positions elsewhere. The career interests of the trailing spouse often limit potential school administrators to applying for positions within commuting distance of their current homes. According to Glass (2000), "this problem certainly restricts the number of applicants for the 6,000 rural and small districts, where a spouse seeking a professional position comparable to the one left behind in a larger community might find the task daunting" (p. 68).

In a study conducted in Connecticut, Maine, and Massachusetts (NESDEC, 1988), it was found that some principals or licensed individuals either could not afford to move or chose not to relocate. According to McAdams (1998), "the effect can be a smaller candidate pool comprised mostly of local people" (p. 38). Cooley and Shen (1999) found that 68% of educators surveyed identified district location as a factor in applying for an administrative position, and only 20% indicated they would seek a position in the district in which they currently taught. Although district location is important, prospective administrators indicated they were willing to consider a variety of educational settings.

Another 1999 study, conducted by the Montana School Boards Association, surveyed Montana educators who had administrative certification but who were not currently working as administrators. Those surveyed, who did not intend to apply for an administrative job, ranked place-bound or unable to move family as the third most important reason why they chose not to pursue an administrative position.

Lacking adequate preparation

Increasing demands on public schools have made the principal's job much more complex, and districts are seeking principals with more sophisticated preparation. Colleges and universities play a vital role in ensuring that school leaders are prepared to lead both today and well into the future. Currently, one of the reasons educators do not choose to pursue administrative positions is their perceived quality of preparation they received from their university principal preparation programs (Barker, 1996).

Traditional principal preparation programs, offered by colleges and universities, often have been criticized as ineffective (Goldman & Kempner, 1988; Haller, Brent, & McNamara, 1997; Lem, 1989; Maher, 1987; Schnur, 1989). This criticism has centered primarily on the knowledge base supporting the profession and the methods and procedures used to educate school leaders. A report of the Task Force on the Principalship (2000) states,

Principal training is seldom anchored in hands-on leadership experiences in real schools, where principals-in-training might learn valuable lessons in shaping instructional practice, sharing and delegating authority, nurturing leadership ability among school faculty and staff, and exercising community and visionary leadership. (p. 9)

Colleges and universities face a quandary of whether to focus on theory (a traditional strength of higher education) or on practical knowledge and skills (Dunklee, 2000; Johnson, 1992; Muse & Thomas, 1991). Murphy (2001) states:

During the first half of the 20th century, business exerted considerable influence over preparation programs for school administrators. Stressed primarily were the technical and mechanical aspects of administration, specific and immediate tasks, and the practical dimensions of the job. The predominant trend between 1950 and 1985 was the infusion of content from the social sciences into administrator preparation programs. This was a movement intended to produce a foundation of scientifically supported knowledge in educational administration. It also represented a trend away from technique-oriented substance based upon practical experience and toward theory-oriented substance based on disciplines outside education.
(p. 15)

Critics of administrator preparation programs claim that these procedures have developed managers rather than leaders who have the ability to take their institutions into a radically transformed future (Hallinger & Bridges, 1992).

Principals today must deal with a plethora of different expectations while concurrently administering, supervising instruction, being accessible, delegating, accepting responsibility, etc. A wide variety of personal and professional attributes seem essential to administering successfully. Currently, educational leadership is being restructured with materials from the intellectual and moral domains of the profession—a shift in focus from educational administration as management to educational administration primarily concerned with teaching and learning (Murphy, 2001).

Despite recent signs of change, administrator preparation programs remain under attack for being too theoretical and lacking rigor (Hallinger & Bridges, 1992; Imber, 1995). According to Johnson (1992), it is the major responsibility of universities to develop educational leadership programs that encompass the type of theoretical and practical

preparation needed to meet new and changing responsibilities. Flanary (2000) states, "It's one thing to have the book knowledge of what it means to lead a school, but it's quite another to step into a school with 500 to 5,000 students and be able to put that knowledge into action" (p. 3). Principals are critical to a school's success, they are being asked to accept new responsibilities, and their roles are expanding. These new demands challenge colleges and universities to continually assess and restructure their principal preparation programs.

Universities must develop meaningful training programs for principals that focus on relevant professional issues rather than offer the traditional technical core of classes. Daresh (1997) collected empirical evidence from English headteachers and U.S. principals crossing the professional border into school leadership. The findings were that all respondents went through a period of culture shock, as none were prepared for the change in the perception of others and the intensity of the job. The study calls for a blend of theoretical and practical programs of preparation and induction that allow those stepping into the school leader's role to spend time reflecting on personal values, ethical stances, and other similar matters as a way of adjusting to the demands of the hot seat.

In an exploratory study conducted by ERS (1998), one in three superintendents surveyed characterized the educational preparation of principal candidates as excellent, with an additional three in five stating it was adequate. Fewer than 10% felt candidates' administrative preparation was adequate. When asked about the strengths and weaknesses in their own preparation for the principalship, good on-the-job training under a fine mentoring principal was identified as a strong plus. Identified as a minus was academic training that was too theoretical and that did not help them easily make connections

between theory and what they would be expected to do on the job. These superintendents also indicated that the problem was not so much finding people aspiring to the principalship as it was the quality of the applicants.

In a report to the SAI Executive Committee, the possibility exists that current principal preparation programs do not keep pace with present day demands (SAI, 1997). Efforts are underway by the Iowa Department of Education's School Leadership Initiative to collect information from across the state on how to develop high quality school leadership (Iowa Department of Education, 1999). This group is working on alleviating the shortage and improving school leadership. Their focus is to reach consensus on what school leaders need to know, be able to do, and be like in order to be effective leaders. Also, they want to develop a new way for potential administrators to receive the training they need to acquire those skills.

Recruitment of quality applicants

There will always be a pool of individuals who will seek administrative positions. Unfortunately, many of them do not possess the skills to provide the necessary leadership for the 21st century (Cooley & Shen, 1999). School districts should identify, recruit, and retain capable "blue chip" teachers who have leadership abilities. Blackman and Fenwick (2000) believe that many with leadership potential have not been cultivated or tapped for leadership positions. Most prospective educational leaders are self-selected due to a lack of leader recruitment programs or even research regarding effective recruitment methods (Murphy, 1992). According to Goodlad (1983),

It is simply not established procedure in the educational system to identify and groom cadres of the most promising prospects for top positions. There should be a continuous district-wide effort to identify employees with leadership potential. Using peer recognition as a starting point for identification, districts must be willing to make an investment designed to pay off in the future. (p. 6)

According to a NESDEC report (1988), recruitment efforts are necessary at both the state and local levels. School districts need to use the same strategies as large corporations to recruit individuals for the highly demanding position of school administrator (McAdams, 1998). High schools, universities, teaching organizations, and businesses should work together to recruit and retain the most intelligent and capable students into the teaching profession. Obtaining high quality individuals will happen only when administrative positions are made more attractive to potential administrators through recruitment (Jordan et al., 1994; Mann, 2002).

Winter and Dunaway (1997) studied the reactions to principal recruitment practices of teachers with an administrative endorsement. They state, "Given the demands placed on principals, particularly in areas undergoing school reform ... it is surprising how little empirical knowledge exists about applicants' reactions to principal recruitment practices" (p. 150). They suggested that recruitment materials should place more emphasis on the management aspect of the secondary principalship and less emphasis on the instructional leadership aspect.

In Iowa, it is suggested that the failure of administrators to identify and recruit quality people into the profession has contributed to a shortage of qualified individuals willing to pursue school administration (SAI, 1997). In response, SAI launched a campaign to build awareness of the shortage and encouraged its members to reduce it. They also developed a recruitment brochure and placed it in the hands of every member of their

organization. Professional organizations need to continue to develop strategies that help local school districts identify and prepare members of their own teaching staff to become school administrators. Financial assistance programs to help cover the cost of professional preparation programs would also be helpful in recruiting efforts.

It is important that the principal shortage be resolved in ways that preserve the role of professional educators as leaders of the schools. Educators need to find other educators to fill leadership positions. For principals, a teaching or educational leadership background is crucial to successfully performing their instructional leadership and democratic governance responsibilities. Schools' experiences with alternatively certified teachers and/or administrators (likely to be less effective, committed, or permanent than traditionally trained teacher or administrators) should raise cautionary flags about seeking private-sector candidates (Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). The difficult challenge districts face is to encourage the able educators to be the willing leaders. The result will be that students, teachers, and school communities will prosper from hiring and retaining exceptional leaders.

Lack of female administrators and minorities

Race and gender gaps among principals, although narrowing, continue to indicate under-representation of women and minorities in the profession (Curry, 2000). Although Shakeshaft's 1998 article on affirmative action is predominately focused on women, she writes inclusive of all minorities. She laments that the United States lacks a reliable, uniform, nation-wide, on-going database for the purpose of indicating how many women or minorities are school administrators and at what levels. While the states collect data, these data are often not comparable because of methods and definition and, therefore, whereas we

might understand what is happening in one state, it is very difficult to compare those statistics to staff in another state. In addition to those limitations, national, state, and organizational data rarely provide breakdowns for gender and race.

ERS (1998) indicates that 35% of districts surveyed in 1998 reported raising the number of minorities in management positions was an issue in the district, and 17% said that the same was true for women. From 1987-1988 to 1993-1994, the percentage of female principals in public schools increased from 24.6% to 34.5%, while the share of minority principals also rose, though less sharply, from 13% to 16% (NCES, 1997). According to the Task Force on the Principalship (2000), these national statistics mask other patterns, such as the concentration of female principalships at the elementary level (rather than the secondary level) and of minority principalships in urban (rather than rural) schools. Wegenke and Shen (2003) found that between 1987-1988 and 1999-2000, the percentage of female secondary principals doubled, which is encouraging.

Characteristics of Iowa full-time public school principals are reported annually in the Condition of Education Report issued by the Iowa Department of Education. In the year 2001 report, the most substantial change across the school years shown was the change with respect to gender composition. The percentage of female principals in Iowa public schools has more than tripled since 1985-86. The percentage of female principals in Iowa's nonpublic schools has remained, within a percentage point or two, at about 50%. The percentage of minority principals increased only slightly since 1985-86 in both public and nonpublic schools. Data from the Iowa Department of Education are not broken down and thus are all-inclusive of secondary and elementary principalships.

An increasing number of women hold certification and degrees to qualify them for administrative positions. Women received 11% of the doctoral degrees in educational administration in 1971, 20% in 1980, 39% in 1982, and 49% in 1991 (Quality Education Data, 1992). Numbers reported by Quality Education Data (1992) indicate that approximately 10% of school superintendents, 22% of assistant superintendents, and 9% of high school principals in the United States are female. These three positions are considered the power positions in public school education. Although these figures look promising, little change has been documented in the predominant cultural and social patterns within organizations that historically have had women in subordinate instructional roles and men in the power roles of administration (Gupton & Slick, 1996).

Studies on women in school leadership have multiplied over the years (Blount, 1998; Brunner, 1997; Curry, 2000; Grogan, 1999; Hargreaves, 1996; Hill & Ragland, 1995; Regan & Brooks, 1995; Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). Most built on the hallmark work of Carol Shakeshaft (1989), whose book, *Women in Educational Leadership*, was lauded as the first to fill the gaps in traditional literature related to women in administration.

Over the last two decades several theories have been advanced to attempt to explain the under-representation of women in educational administration. One claims the women themselves, due to some personal traits, characteristics, or qualities, are the problem. Women perceive themselves as not being strong enough, lack the self-confidence necessary to do the job effectively, and have a fear of challenging the cultural expectations of their role (Hill & Ragland, 1995; Schmuck, 1987; Shakeshaft, 1989). A study of Canadian school administrators by Brathwaite (1986) attributed the lack of female advancement

through district ranks as stemming largely from their over-saturation with the cultural message of female inferiority within white male systems.

Another theory points to the external barriers that work against women, particularly in hiring and promotion practices (Bell & Chase, 1993). Women and members of minority groups are completing certification and doctoral programs at a rate that is not reflected in the number of administrative positions they actually hold (Grogan, 1999; Pavan, 1989). Baron (1990) believes that getting hired as a principal often has more to do with who somebody knows and how well they fit in, rather than the decision being based on skills or academic background. A study of secondary school principals in Arkansas found that preferential hiring practices seem to exist that require some candidates to make applications and submit to interviews before job offers while other candidates by-pass the process (Lea, 1998). She found that although males are generally the ones who by-pass the process, when females do apply and receive interviews they are more likely than males to be hired.

A third theory highlights the cultural and social norms that channel men and women into different types of work (Hansot & Tyack, 1981; Shakeshaft, 1989). Tallerico and Burstyn (1996) suggest a pattern in which stereotypical images of what a socially acceptable leader looks like does work against women, creating obstacles to trust, acceptance, and credibility while contributing to their feelings of stress and disenchantment with the job. Curry (2000) believes that women have been socialized in their upbringing to be followers and not leaders. She states, "as such we were taught to give into subjugation by our parents (in particular our mothers) and to serve our fathers, our lovers, our husbands, and our sons" (p. 12). Men have held positions in educational administration for so long

they have defined the position. As Vail (1999) states, in the field of education, “women are seen as teachers and men are viewed as administrators” (p. 20).

The literature is replete with calls for improved recruitment and training of female and minority educational administrators. Although an increasing number of women hold certification and degrees to qualify them for administrative positions, inadequate training and educational opportunity frequently are among the top few explanations cited in the literature for women’s under-representation in educational administration (Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995; Gupton & Slick, 1996; Hill & Ragland, 1995; Lambert, 1989). Crow, Mecklowitz, and Weekes (1992) state, “Instead of waiting for individuals to self-select administration, educational leaders must be identified and groomed in a systematic way that facilitates the recruitment of potential leaders among women and minorities” (p. 7).

Anthony Alvarado (2000), chancellor of instruction for the 143,000-student San Diego school system and a former district superintendent in New York City, states that “one pool of well-qualified prospects for administrative jobs remains largely untapped: candidates who happen to be women” (p. 12). He indicates that “it is the women of this country, overwhelmingly, who have the necessary kind of instructional knowledge and skill to fill these positions” (p. 12).

Riehl and Byrd (1997) examined gender differences among new recruits to school administration. They discovered that female and male teachers possessed different levels of aspirations and qualifications for school administration. Women were not as likely to want to leave teaching, to have administrator role models of the same gender, or to have advanced training in educational administration. But they were equally as likely to have had recent training in administration and were somewhat more likely to have advanced degrees

in related fields. However, women teachers were not as likely to have had recent part-time experience in administration. According to Riehl and Byrd, these findings indicate that women possess a growing degree of career socialization toward school administration. The average female is less likely, however, to become an administrator than the average male teacher.

McAdams (1998) believes that the increased numbers of females receiving administrative certification has contributed greatly to the situation of having a large number of administratively endorsed people who are not actively pursuing administrative careers. He believes that many of these classroom teachers appear to pursue an administrative credential to keep their options open. Most teacher salary schedules partially subsidize the courses required for an administrative certificate and/or additional degrees. Teachers also can advance on the salary schedules regardless of the area in which they have earned the degree or taken courses. Many of McAdams' students at Lehigh University—men and women alike—have little interest in being aggressive about pursuing administrative roles. They say they are limited geographically and can pursue opportunities only in their home district.

In today's public schools, the role of principal is vital, complex, and stressful. To maintain a pool of well-qualified principal candidates, school districts and universities must identify, nurture, and support these talented professionals—both males and females—in equitable numbers.

Administrator Shortage

Principals are critical to the development and maintenance of effective schools. According to Jackson and Davis (2000), "No single individual is more important to initiating and sustaining improvement in students' performance than the school principal" (p. 157). Educators know that a principal can make or break a school. The job is a difficult one, and filling a vacancy can be "as elusive as the search for the holy grail" (Jones, 1995, p. 18). The enormous demands placed on today's principals attract very few qualified people to take on those responsibilities of the position. School districts are struggling to complete that elusive quest nationwide in the face of a shortage of administrative candidates for the principalship.

National concern

Who will lead the nation's schools during the 21st century? Many have projected shortages of secondary school administrators (Bowles, 1990; Jordan et al., 1994; McCormick, 1987; Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998). ERS, in conjunction with NAESP and NASSP, conducted an exploratory study that identified a shortage of competent school leaders. Although there are enough principal candidates licensed to fill future school administrator openings, there may not be a sufficient number of highly capable individuals to fill the impending vacancies (Anderson, 1991; ERS, 1998; Portin et al., 1998).

The United States Department of Labor estimates that 40% of the United States' 93,200 principals are nearing retirement and that the nation's need for school leaders will increase 10–20% through 2005 (Blackman & Fenwick, 2000). Approximately 47% of the nation's public school teachers have master's degrees in educational administration, but

many teachers prefer to acquire seniority in the classroom. In addition, many with leadership potential have not been cultivated or tapped for leadership positions (Blackman & Fenwick, 2000). Teacher reluctance to enter administration coupled with the number of administrator retirements present a significant challenge to school boards, superintendents, and communities.

The ERS projections (1998) state that although the numbers of female and minority principals have increased since 1987, there is still a need for recruitment in this area. Only about 16% of the nation's principals belong to a minority group: 11% are African-American, 4% are Hispanic, and less than 1% are Asian-American.

State of Iowa concern

More than one-third of Iowa's 1,880 school administrators (35.9%) are eligible to retire by the year 2003, according to a 1999 survey conducted by the Iowa Department of Education and the School Administrators of Iowa (SAI). Ninety-three percent of those eligible administrators indicate they will retire in the year 2003. Ted Stilwill, Director of the Iowa Department of Education, stated that "this looming shortage of superintendents, principals, and other school leaders threatens the quality of education for thousands of Iowa schoolchildren, potentially leaving some school districts with no experienced administrators at the end of the 2002-2003 school year" (IDE, 1999, p. 1).

The Iowa Department of Education prepared a policy statement on the school administrator shortage that was adopted by the Iowa State Board of Education in March 1998. The statement clarifies the pending crisis:

The evidence of an administrator shortage is plentiful. The average number of applicants for a superintendent's position in Iowa has declined seriously and a similar decrease has occurred in the number of applicants of other administrative positions. While the number of applicants is declining, qualified Iowa educators are choosing not to take administrative positions. Over 2,000 Iowans who are endorsed for administrative positions are currently employed in the education system in non-administrative positions. Women and racial/ethnic minorities continue to be underrepresented among the state's school administrators. Compared with other states, Iowa ranks low in the number of women superintendents and in the number of racial/ethnic minorities in all administrative positions. Finally, enrollment in graduate-level school administration programs has declined state-wide. (para. 3)

Iowa's school administrator shortage is not a recent phenomenon and it will not be corrected quickly. Currently, practicing administrators and representatives of professional organizations and higher education are implementing a variety of strategies to address the issue. To reduce administrator shortages and to strengthen school leadership, the State Board of Education (1998):

1. Endorses recruitment efforts that identify teachers and students for school administrator programs, including specific strategies to recruit women and minorities for school leadership.
2. Encourages higher education institutions to collaborate with a broad range of education stakeholders in order to rethink administrative roles, to conduct a comprehensive assessment of administrator preparation programs and to redesign those programs to reflect the leadership requirements of 21st century schools.
3. Recommends collaboration among administrator preparation programs, the Board of Educational Examiners, area education agencies, school districts, School Administrators of Iowa (SAI), the Department of Education and the State Board of Education in order to redesign administrator preparation to include leadership development and mentorships.
4. Supports licensure requirements that establish research-based performance standards essential to school leadership. (para. 5)

Career Motivation

Many contemporary authors have defined the concept of motivation. Motivation has been defined as: the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction

(Kreitner, 1995); a predisposition to behave in a purposive manner to achieve specific, unmet needs (Buford, Bedeian, & Lindner, 1995); an internal drive to satisfy an unsatisfied need (Higgins, 1994); and the will to achieve (Bedeian, 1993). There are many definitions of motivation, but all have the common fact that motivation is a psychological process influencing internal motives that direct the behavior of a person and force him/her to action with the intention of reaching some objective.

Motivation theories attempt to explain human behavior. In general, these theories can be divided into three categories: content, process, and environment (Wolverton & Macdonald, 2001). Content theories look at what energizes behavior, process theories take into consideration the factors that direct behavior, and environmental theories focus on how individuals sustain behavior over time (Bowditch & Buono, 1997).

Popular content theories include Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1954), Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), McClelland's Socially Acquired Needs Theory (McClelland, 1961), and Alderfer's ERG Theory (Alderfer, 1972). Maslow (1954) identified five basic categories of human needs: psychological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualization. He believed these to be the primary forces that drive human behavior. These needs form a sort of hierarchy, from low-order needs to higher-order needs, in which each need becomes active only after the need below it is satisfied.

Herzberg et al. (1959) believed that the best way to motivate an individual is to satisfy higher ego needs, such as for recognition and sense of achievement. Their work categorized motivation into two factors: motivators and hygiene. Motivator or intrinsic

factors, such as achievement and recognition, produce job satisfaction. Hygiene or extrinsic factors, such as pay and job security, produce dissatisfaction.

Sergiovanni, Metzcus and Burden (1969) conducted a study of 3,382 teachers and discovered that many of the factors in Herzberg's original model did not apply to teachers as workers. It was discovered that achievement, recognition, and responsibility were the most important contributors to teacher satisfaction (motivators). Advancement was not found to be a motivator for teachers, while the work itself was found to be not only a motivator but also a hygiene. The factors that were contributors to teacher hygiene were poor relations with peers and students, unfair or incompetent administrative and supervisory policies and practices, and outside personal problems. Sergiovanni found that two-thirds of the teachers were motivation seekers, while one-fourth of the teachers were hygiene seekers. The remaining 8% were halfway between motivation seeking and hygiene seeking. The responses did not vary with the gender, teaching level, or tenure status of the teacher.

McClelland's research (1961) led him to believe that the need for achievement is a distinct human motive that can be distinguished from other needs. His work focused on three basic needs: achievement, power, and affiliation. McClelland's concept of achievement motivation is also related to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. People with high achievement motivation tend to be interested in the motivators (job itself).

Alderfer's ERG theory (1972) is very similar to Maslow's theory. Alderfer's model consists of three hierarchically arranged needs: basic existence needs, relatedness needs, and growth and achievement needs. He suggested that needs are not progressively staged. They can overlap and people might shift back and forth between levels without fully satisfying one level before moving on to the next.

Principals begin their careers as teachers. To understand better what motivates individuals to become principals, determining why they became teachers is a good place to start. Numerous studies have been attempted to explain why people become teachers: they wanted to help children achieve (American Council on Education [ACE], 1990; Bauman, 1990; Berg, Coker, & Reno, 1992; Clarke & Keating, 1995; Farkas, Johnson, & Foleno, 2000; Fuller, 1990; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, 1990). Some individuals suggest that they were interested in teaching because they relate easily to children (Bauman, 1990). Others indicate a desire to combine career and family options citing specifically the flexibility that nine-ten month contracts provide for family life (Bauman, 1990; Farkas et al., 2000). A few speak to the advantage of collegiality and working with similar people (Berg et al., 1992; Fuller, 1990). In a recent study by Farkas et al. (2000), job security and receiving a sense of respect and appreciation were primary reasons people entered the teaching profession. Many of these same people simply indicated that they teach because they love to do it.

Wolverton et al. (2001) make a distinct connection between content motivation and the profession of teaching. They state,

Clearly, content motivation theories explain a good portion of what attracts people to the profession of teaching. Maslow's survival needs and Alderfer's existence needs for shelter, food, and security are met by the mere fact of having a job. The manifestation of affiliation needs in teachers, whether innate (Maslow and Alderfer) or acquired (McClelland) appear quite strong in terms of wanting to work with children and, to a lesser extent, enjoying the contact they have with colleagues. A desire to be respected and appreciated seems to indicate that Maslow's self-esteem need is being met. In addition, much of a person's self-actualizing behavior is motivated by the sheer enjoyment obtained from realizing and developing his/her capabilities. (pp. 9-10)

Teachers, especially ones new to the profession, simply appear to love their work (Farkas et al., 2000).

Process theories of motivation, particularly expectancy and equity theories, shed light on why teachers and other non-administrative educational professionals may choose to become principals (Adams, 1963; Vroom, 1964). The most commonly cited expectancy theory is Vroom's VIE Theory. Vroom suggests that to be motivated, it is not enough to offer the person something just to satisfy his/her important needs. In order for a person to become motivated, she/he must be reasonably sure that she/he has the ability to obtain the reward. According to Vroom, two conditions have to occur: a) the value of the particular outcome must be high for the person, and b) the person must feel she/he has a reasonably good chance of accomplishing the task and obtaining the outcome. That is, the person must believe that the effort will be instrumental to obtaining the reward.

Equity theory focuses primarily on the reward aspects of the motivation process. Basically, individuals work in exchange for rewards. Its underlying assumption is that individuals want to be treated equitably at work. Adams' theory (1963) states that employees strive for equity between themselves and other workers. Equity is achieved when the ratio of employee outcomes over inputs is equal to other employee outcomes over inputs. Based on equity theory, a teacher or other non-administrative educator may choose not to pursue the secondary principalship, or a principal may leave the position because gains associated with the position do not reflect equitable compensation for the effort deemed necessary to do the job.

Environment-based motivation theory may also provide insights into why individuals may not apply for a secondary school principalship, or choose to leave after

they successfully attained it. Environment-based theories take into account how surroundings impact individual's decision. Bandura (1977) suggests that individuals engage in three human processes: vicarious learning, use of symbolism, and self-control. Bandura claimed that individuals learn vicariously by accepting the experiences of others as their own. Under this theory, symbolism resembles a form of scenario building where individuals think through and play out in their minds various options that surround a particular situation. Ultimately, based on conclusions drawn during vicarious learning and from the use of symbolism, these individuals may choose not to engage in certain behaviors. Bandura's theory as it relates to the possible reasons for the diminishing applicant pools suggests that potential secondary principal candidates can learn quite a bit by watching those already in the position. They may also engage in symbolism by envisioning problems in the principalship as their own. Finally, they may choose to exercise self-control by not applying for the position.

Possible Solutions

The level of administrative influence has decreased while what an administrator is expected to accomplish has increased (NESDEC, 1988; Public Agenda, 2001). Licensed principals may pursue other jobs because there seems to be a general feeling that the rewards do not justify the aggravation—low pay, high aggravation, too much of the “good old boy” network in operation. Given the stress, burnout, long hours, insufficient salary, numerous job responsibilities, perplexing daily problems, negative interactions with people, lack of support, lack of appreciation, and poor administrative preparation at the university level, it is not surprising that persons currently serving as educational administrators are

leaving the principalship and the public school systems (Jordan et al., 1994). What can be done to encourage people to pursue the principalship, as well as, to retain those who currently hold such positions?

As previously noted, much of the research suggests that any initiative to address the principal shortage must include efforts to more realistically define the role of the principal (Million, 2001; Murphy, 2001; Widmier, 1996; Winter, McCabe, & Newton, 1998). School districts need to rewrite job descriptions and revise hiring policies so they reflect the role of principals as instructional leaders at the building level (Black, 2000; Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2001). School districts need to restructure the principal's role to allow principals to focus on student learning and instructional leadership and to face fewer demands for managerial tasks.

Changes must be made to principal preparation programs to better prepare principals for the realities of school administration (Whitaker, 1996). Universities must develop meaningful training programs for principals and focus on relevant professional issues rather than of the traditional collection of courses. In a survey of more than 1,400 middle-level principals conducted by Petzko and Searcy (2001), topics most often rated by principals as essential or very useful were supervision and evaluation (91%), instructional leadership (89%), legal issues (85%), technology (84%), special education issues (84%), program evaluation (83%), and curriculum development (77%).

The role of the school administrator has shifted from a focus on management to being primarily concerned with leadership (teaching and learning). According to Ferrandino and Tirozzi (2001), "Principals must be extremely knowledgeable about instruction, how children learn, how teachers teach, what kinds of training helps teachers the most, and the

important role leadership plays in all of these factors” (p. 6). A vision of the new education leader is captured in the “Standards for School Leaders,” developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO]), 1996). Murphy (2001) states that “these standards may provide a platform for the reconstitution of leadership preparation programs and the certification and re-certification of school leaders.” (p. 16)

Better recruitment efforts are needed with a special emphasis on women and minorities (Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000; Million, 2001; SAI, 1997). Principal vacancies should be well publicized on the state and local level. School districts should identify and recruit talented and capable teachers who have leadership abilities. “Grow Your Own” programs (Stricherz, 2001), “Aspiring Principals Workshops” (Petzko & Searcy, 2001), and “Principal Academies” (Smith, 1999) are some examples used to identify and recruit potential leaders. School districts or state associations might want to consider setting up scholarship or low interest loan programs to serve as an incentive to teachers who are considering a graduate degree (SAI, 1997).

Principals’ salaries must increase to a level that is appropriate for their efforts and their responsibilities. The pay differential between principals and experienced teachers has decreased during the past few years (Asch, 1999; ERS, 1998). Competitive salaries and fringe benefits, incentives for outstanding performance, and opportunities to take sabbaticals or advanced training may be ways to make the role of principal more attractive to prospective administrators.

Another possibility would be to reduce the amount of hours principals have to put into the week or year. School systems need to recognize that one person cannot provide

effective leadership for student learning while tending to the thousand tasks traditionally heaped on principals. School systems could consider providing principals with the resources and flexibility to delegate specific responsibilities, distribute leadership, or head up school leadership teams (Cooley & Shen, 2003). Districts could possibly hire substitutes to provide time for principals to get away from the building and attend professional development opportunities during the course of the school year.

Research indicates that new and aspiring principals can greatly benefit, during their first year as principal, from being mentored by effective administrators (Bolman & Deal, 1995; ERS, 2000). Experienced principals also benefit from opportunities to study, brainstorm, and problem solve within network groups of administrators (Malone, 2001; Moore, 1999; NESDEC, 1988; Whitaker, 1996). Support systems allow principals to better handle the ever-increasing demands of their jobs.

New principals need mentors and should have access to hands-on professional development. School administrators need ways to share concerns, issues, and problems. In Iowa, lack of support and mentoring was cited in a report to the SAI Executive Committee as a barrier to endorsed individuals' pursuit of the principalship (SAI, 1997). They recommend school districts establish formal mentor/mentee programs for new administrators that include a sustained, on-going training component for both the mentor and mentee. SAI also recommends developing job-shadowing programs for prospective school administrators.

An ERS study (2000) found that mentoring by effective principals mentioned consistently by past and current principals as the most important support in their days as a new principal. Mentoring encourages aspiring administrators to locate an experienced

colleague with whom he/she can forge a friendly, supportive relationship and who will guide him/her on practical problems faced on the job. Mentoring is one solution to past criticisms of school administrator programs that more of a “real life” focus is needed.

All of these suggestions should be considered as possible solutions to the secondary principal shortage. In addition to expanding the secondary principal candidate pool, these efforts may also help in retaining those currently serving as principals or school administrators.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research methodology; research questions; description of the statistical analysis; research design; pilot study; instrumentation including validity and reliability; human subjects release; and data collection, processing, and analysis.

This study featured descriptive statistics, cross-tabulations, Pearson-product moment correlations, analysis of variance [ANOVA], Spearman rho, and a Pareto scoring analysis to test for relationships among variables concerning why individuals licensed to be secondary school administrators in Iowa during the 2001-2002 school year have not entered the profession. The study describes perceived barriers to the pursuit of a principalship, factors that motivated each to pursue principal licensure, perceived effectiveness of individuals' administrator preparation program, and factors that would alleviate a principal shortage.

Descriptive research does not attempt to test a scientific theory, but rather to describe and characterize the situation that exists. According to Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996), "descriptive studies in education, while simple in design and execution, can yield important knowledge" (p. 375). The most common way to report these descriptions and characterizations is through frequency counts, distributions, and graphical displays. This method of research looks with intense accuracy at the phenomena of the moment and then describes precisely what the researcher sees (Leedy, 1993). The views of this research portray a total population at a single point in time.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What factors initially motivated principal candidates who are licensed as secondary school administrators in Iowa, but do not serve in administrative roles, to seek licensure, and do these factors vary by gender?
2. How many principal candidates have actively pursued careers in secondary school administration? What factors motivate these principal candidates to pursue careers in secondary school administration?
3. What do principal candidates view as significant barriers toward their seeking a secondary principal position? Do these perceptions vary by gender?
4. How adequately do principal candidates feel their administrator preparation programs prepared them to pursue a career in secondary school administration? Do these perceptions vary by gender?

Statistical Procedures

The size of the survey population dictated which statistical procedures best answered the research questions with the highest degree of validity and reliability. The analysis of the survey data using a descriptive format, calculating the mean, frequency, and standard deviation of the participants' responses ensured a comprehensive view of the educators on the list. These computations occurred with selected questions to identify the best descriptions and perspectives for the data received. The frequency calculations provided useful results about efforts by the educators found on Iowa's list of eligible secondary school principals' to pursue administrative positions and future plans. The mean

measures the arithmetic average of the participants' responses. Frequency counts noted in the study represent actual numbers of educators from the population who responded to the structured questions given forced-choice answers. Standard deviation figures offer to the reader a sense of how far each value reported extends from the mean.

Additionally, cross-tabulation computations using the SPSS statistical software program determined whether statistically significant relationships existed among the questionnaire variables. A Pearson's product moment correlation with a significance level of less than .05 prompted the researcher to further consider relationships among certain variables.

The tabulation of open-ended responses permitted perceptions and beliefs about the pursuit of the secondary school principalship to be categorized in an organized manner. The open-ended responses added a qualitative dimension to describe what is happening among licensed secondary school principal candidates in Iowa.

Research question 1 utilized descriptive statistics, analysis of variance (ANOVA) or cross-tabulation, Spearman's rho correlations, and a Pareto scoring analysis to test the relationships between gender and the factors that motivated individuals to seek licensure. Research question 2 used descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (ANOVA) or two-tailed Pearson correlation coefficients to test for relationships between gender and how actively principal candidates have pursued an administrative position. Research question 3 utilized descriptive statistics, analysis of variance (ANOVA) or cross-tabulation, and Spearman's rho correlations. The items in question 3 were grouped and/or collapsed to formulate a linear composite to test further the degree to which individuals felt the survey items have been barriers to their pursuit of a secondary administrative position. Research

question 4 utilized descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (ANOVA) or cross tabulation to test the relationship between gender and the degree to which individuals perceive their administrator preparation programs have prepared them to pursue careers in secondary school administration.

Population of the Study

The Iowa Department of Education provided a listing of individuals in Iowa who held secondary principal licensure during the 2001-2002 school year. From an original number of 453 individuals, efforts were made to eliminate those who did not meet the researcher's criteria. These criteria included individuals who possessed secondary principal licensure in Iowa and were involved in some aspect of K-12 education but were not serving in an administrative position. Current information obtained from School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) and the Iowa High School Athletic Association (IHSAA) directory allowed the researcher to eliminate those individuals who did not satisfy the criteria. The total population was narrowed to 165 females and 220 males, for a total of 385. Additional information provided by the Iowa Department of Education included the name of the individual's school district, school, address, and city.

Development of the Instrument

The Web-based survey used in this study was developed after an extensive review of the literature to identify factors that motivate individuals to attain principal licensure, as well as perceived barriers to the pursuit of a principalship. Questionnaires used in research are most productive when used with large numbers of respondents, when the information sought is straightforward information, and when there is a need for standardized data

without requiring personal interaction (Denscombe, 1998). A climate where full and honest answers can be acquired lends itself to survey methodology (Denscombe, 1998).

During the fall semester 2002, individuals who possessed secondary principal licensure reviewed the survey to provide feedback as the survey evolved. In October 2002, the researcher's major advisor and doctoral committee provided additional input to refine the survey further. The final step was to pilot the survey in November 2002 with principal candidates who had recently acquired secondary principalship licensure in Iowa but were not included in the 2001-2002 Iowa licensure database. As a result of these pilot efforts, minor changes were made to the survey before it was posted on-line. These steps were consistent with guidelines developed through research on the development and use of Internet surveys (Dillman, 2000). A copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

Validation of the instrument

The survey was validated by six Iowa State University professors who are familiar with various aspects of the secondary principal licensure program in Iowa and the role of the secondary school principal. Once the doctoral committee approved the research proposal, principal candidates who had recently completed secondary principal licensure in Iowa but were not currently serving in an administrative role were invited to complete a paper and pencil version of the survey. They were asked to provide feedback on wording, length of time required to complete the survey, and general comments regarding the survey itself. Minor changes were made to the survey based on their feedback.

The final instrument design included four open-ended completion items, structured questions with pre-determined response choices, personal demographic information, and Likert scale items that addressed the categories of motivation, educational administration preparation programs, barriers, and demographics. The questionnaire attempted to elicit opinions, attitudes, preferences, perceptions, facts, and intentions through written responses from the participants.

Human subjects release

The final form of the letter inviting professionals, who hold secondary principal licensure in Iowa but are choosing not to be school administrators, to complete the survey was mailed after the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee approved the letter of invitation and survey instrument (see Appendix B). In accordance with Human Subjects criteria, participants were informed of their rights related to participation in this study. Consent to participate was obtained from all participants in the form of modified consent assumed by those who voluntarily accessed and completed the Web-based survey, in accordance with Human Subjects criteria.

Instrument Distribution and Data Collection

The initial letter inviting the survey population to participate in this research study, via a Web-based survey, was mailed on November 2, 2002. The letter, which was sent via the United States Postal Service, included a code number for each respondent to use on the Web site. This code number provided security to ensure that unidentified individuals did not complete the survey and also provided a vehicle to monitor who had not completed the survey so reminders could be forwarded. An additional benefit of the coding was the

researcher's ability to identify, collect, and enter data that were omitted by respondents. The initial letter asked participants to complete the Web-based survey by November 15, 2002. Email requests were made of the individuals' building principals, to encourage participation. Email correspondence was made with non-respondents after an extensive search of the various school district Web sites. On November 16, 2002, non-respondents were contacted with a follow-up mailing to remind them to access the survey. A final reminder, via email, was communicated to non-respondents on November 23, 2002. Thirty-six hard copies of the survey were mailed to individuals who had unsuccessfully attempted to submit their responses electronically, had specifically requested a copy, or were not able to be directly contacted via email. Web access to the survey was terminated on December 6, 2002.

Analysis of the Data

Personnel in the Iowa State University Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) office assisted in posting the survey to the Internet Web-site as well as in downloading and entering data into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, which was used to analyze the quantitative data.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the reasons why individuals licensed to be Iowa secondary administrators have not entered the profession and to identify factors that might motivate them to consider administrative appointments in the future. The study utilized descriptive statistics and quantitative methodology to provide a thorough understanding of this research topic.

General Characteristics of the Sample

Emanating from a review of the literature, a Web-based survey was developed to identify factors that motivate individuals to pursue principal licensure, as well as perceived barriers to the pursuit of a principalship. The instrument design included four open-ended completion items, structured questions with pre-determined response choices, personal demographic information, and Likert-scale items. The questionnaire attempted to elicit opinions, attitudes, preferences, perceptions, facts, and intentions through written responses from the participants.

The Iowa Department of Education provided a listing of the total population in Iowa with secondary principal licensure who met the researcher's criteria. Excluded from this survey population were individuals with secondary administrative licensure in Iowa who were currently working in the position of superintendent, assistant or associate superintendent, principal, administrator, administrative assistant, assistant dean/director, assistant principal, curriculum director, or dean of students. A total of 385 Iowa educators met the criteria for this study. These individuals were mailed a letter inviting them to

participate in the study (see Appendix C). One follow-up reminder mailing was sent to all possible respondents, and two email reminders, with the same message, were sent to non-respondents (see Appendix D). A total of 290 individuals responded, for a response rate of 75.32%.

Demographic data related to respondents

In addition to data pertaining to the reasons why individuals licensed to be secondary administrators are not entering the profession, and factors that might motivate them to consider administrative appointments in the future, demographic data included gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, children, and residency. Demographic characteristics of the principal candidates who responded to the Web-based survey are listed in this section and are illustrated in Table 1.

Gender. Of the 289 respondents who completed this item, 159 (43.3%) were female and 164 (56.7%) were male.

Ethnicity. Two hundred eighty-four (98.3%) respondents were white, 2 (0.7%) were African-American, and 2 (0.7%) were Hispanic, of the 289 respondents who completed this item. One respondent did not report ethnicity.

Age. Of the 285 respondents who completed this item, 11 (3.9%) were between the ages of 25-30, 62 (21.8%) were between the ages of 31-40, 118 (41.1%) were between the ages of 41-50, 93 (32.6%) were between the ages of 51-60, and 1 (0.3%) was over 60 years of age. Five respondents did not report their age.

Table 1. Responding educator demographics

Category	Description	Frequency	Valid percent
Gender	Female	125	43.3%
	Male	164	56.7%
	Missing	1	
Ethnicity	White	284	98.3%
	Native-American	0	0.0%
	African-American	2	0.7%
	Hispanic	2	0.7%
	Asian	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.3%
	Missing	1	
Age	25-30 years	11	3.9%
	31-40	62	21.8%
	41-50	118	41.4%
	51-60	93	32.6%
	Over 60 years	1	0.3%
	Missing	5	
Marital status	Never married	27	9.3%
	Married/domestic partner	238	82.1%
	Divorced/separated	25	8.6%
Children	Yes	171	59.0%
	No	119	41.0%
Residence	Urban	94	32.8%
	Rural	123	42.9%
	Suburban	70	24.4%
	Missing	3	

Marital status. Twenty-seven (9.3%) of the respondents had never been married, 238 (82.1%) were married or had a domestic partner, and 25 (8.6%) had been divorced, given 290 respondents.

Children. Of the 290 respondents, 171 (59%) had children and 119 (41%) did not have children.

Residence. Ninety-four (32.8%) respondents described themselves as living in an urban setting, 123 (42.9%) live in a rural setting, and 70 (24.4%) reside in a suburban setting. Three respondents did not report residence.

Additional demographic characteristics asked requested were the highest degree earned, college where the administrative degree was earned, current position, total years in education, whether they had been previously employed as an administrator, number of times they had applied for an administrative position within the past five years, when the administrative license was attained, and the year they were intending to retire. Additional demographic characteristics of the principal candidates are listed below and are summarized in Table 2.

Highest degree earned. One hundred thirty-seven (48.2%) respondents reported having a masters degree in educational administration as their highest degree, 81 (28.5%) held an MA with principal licensure hours, 37 (13%) hold a specialist or certificate of advanced studies, 13 (4.6%) attained a doctorate, and 16 (5.6%) of the 284 respondents who completed this item indicated that they had another type of degree. Six respondents did not report their highest degree earned.

Table 2. Demographic profile of respondents

		Frequency	Valid percent
Highest degree earned	MA in Educational Administration	137	48.2%
	MA with Principal Licensure Hours	81	28.5%
	Specialist/Certificate of Advanced Studies	37	13.0%
	Doctorate	13	4.6%
	Other	16	5.6%
	Missing	6	
College where administrative licensure was attained	Drake University	125	46.0%
	University of Northern Iowa	35	12.9%
	University of Iowa	27	9.9%
	Iowa State University	23	8.5%
	Western Illinois University	16	5.9%
	Northwest Missouri State University	9	3.3%
	Truman State	7	2.6%
	University of South Dakota	7	2.6%
	Buena Vista University	4	1.5%
	Loras College	4	1.5%
	Clarke College	2	0.7%
	Other	13	4.8%
	Missing	18	
Current position	Teacher	165	67.3%
	Counselor	25	10.2%
	AEA Employee	22	9.0%
	Athletic Director or Athletic Director/Teacher	12	4.9%
	State Dept. of Education Employee	1	0.4%
	Other	20	8.2%
	Missing	45	
Total years in education	1-10 years	36	12.4%
	11-20 years	98	33.8%
	20-30 years	115	39.7%
	31 or more years	41	14.1%
Previously employed as administrator?	Yes	36	12.5%
	No	252	87.5%
	Missing	2	

Table 2. continued

		Frequency	Valid percent
Number of times applied for principal positions within the last five years	1-5 times	137	48.6%
	6-10 times	26	9.2%
	11-15 times	5	1.8%
	Over 15 times	13	4.6%
	Never	101	35.8%
	Missing	8	
When administrative licensure was attained	1965-1975	1	0.4%
	1976-1985	11	3.9%
	1986-1995	95	33.9%
	After 1995	173	61.8%
	Missing	10	
Year intending to retire	2002-2010	64	22.1%
	2011-2020	99	34.1%
	2021-2030	58	20.0%
	After 2030	11	3.8%
	Unsure	58	20.0%

College attended. Of the 272 respondents who completed this item, 125 (46.0%) attained their administrative licensure at Drake University, 35 (12.9%) at the University of Northern Iowa, 27 (9.9%) at the University of Iowa, 23 (8.5%) at Iowa State University, 16 (5.9%) at Western Illinois University, 9 (3.3%) at Northwest Missouri State University, 7 (2.6%) at the University of South Dakota, 7 (2.6%) at Truman State University, 4 (1.5%) at Buena Vista University, 4 (1.5%) at Loras College, and 13 (4.8%) received their administrative licensure at various other colleges or universities. Eighteen of the 272 respondents who completed this item did not report college attended.

Current position. Of the 245 respondents who completed this item, 165 (67.3%) identified themselves as teachers, 25 (10.2%) were counselors, 12 (4.9%) were athletic directors or athletic director/teacher, 22 (9.0%) were Area Education Agency employees, 1 (0.4%) was employed by the Iowa Department of Education, and 20 (8.2%) indicated that their job was something other than the choices provided. Forty-five respondents did not report their current position.

Total years in education. Thirty-six (12.4%) respondents had 1-10 years experience in education, 98 (33.8%) had 11-20 years experience, 115 (39.7%) had 20-30 years experience, and 41 (14.1%) had 31 or more years experience, given 290 respondents.

Previous employment. Of the 288 respondents who completed this item, 36 (12.5%) had previously worked as an administrator and 252 (87.5%) had not previously been employed as an administrator. Two respondents did not report previous employment.

Principalship application. One hundred thirty-seven (48.6%) respondents had applied for a principal position at least 1-5 times within the past five years, 26 (9.2%) had applied for 6-10 administrative positions within the past five years, 5 (1.8%) had applied for 11-15 positions within the past five years, 13 (4.6%) had applied for over 15 positions within the past five years, and 101 (35.8%) had never applied for an administrative position. Eight respondents did not report whether they had applied for a principalship.

Year Licensed. Given 280 respondents, 1 (0.4%) attained their administrative licensure between the years 1965-1975, 11 (3.9%) between the years of 1976-1985, 95 (33.9%) between the years of 1986-1995, and 173 (61.8%) attained their administrative licensure after 1995. Ten respondents did not report the year of their licensure.

Retirement. Sixty-four (22.1%) of the 290 respondents intend to retire between the years of 2002-2010, 99 (34.1) between the years of 2011-2020, 58 (20.0%) between the years of 2021-2030, and 11 (3.8%), intend to retire after 2030. An additional 58 (20.0%) respondents indicated they were unsure when they would retire.

Statistical treatment of data

Analysis of returned surveys revealed demographic distributions closely resembling the total population. For example, in the overall population the gender breakdown was 223 male (57.47%) and 165 female (42.53%), and the respondents 164 male (56.7%) and 125 female (43.3%) reveal nearly the same gender demographics. The most recent statistics regarding incumbent secondary school principals in Iowa, as reported by SAI in 1997, indicate a gender breakdown of 82.9% male and 17.1% female (SAI, 1997). A representative distribution of demographics similar to the original population offered greater validity to the study results.

The analysis of the survey data using a descriptive format, calculating the mean, frequency, and standard deviation of the participants' responses, ensured a comprehensive view of the respondents. These computations occurred with selected questions to identify the best descriptions and perspectives for the data received. When possible, arithmetic mean averages were substituted for missing data. The frequency calculations provided informative results about the efforts of eligible secondary school principals to pursue administrative positions and their future intentions. The mean for this study related to the arithmetic average of the participants' responses. Frequency counts noted in the study represented actual numbers of educators from the population who responded to the

structured questions given specific answer choices. Standard deviations provided the reader a sense of how far each value reported extended from the mean; a large standard deviation represented a greater dispersion of data (Denscombe, 1998).

Cross-tabulations, Pearson-product moment correlations, analysis of variance [ANOVA], Spearman rho were used to test for relationships among variables. The SPSS statistical software package revealed the presence of statistically significant relationships among the questionnaire variables. A correlation with a significance of less than .05 prompted the researcher to consider further the pattern of relationships among certain variables. According to Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996), "A test of statistical significance occasionally is done when the entire population has been studied" (p. 185). A Pareto scoring analysis was also conducted to test relationships among variables.

Tabulation of categories or themes within the open-ended responses permitted perceptions and beliefs about the pursuit of the secondary school principalship to be assessed in an organized manner. The open-ended responses added a dimension to what is happening among licensed secondary school principal candidates in Iowa.

Research question 1

What factors initially motivated principal candidates who are licensed as secondary school administrators in Iowa, but do not serve in administrative roles, to seek licensure, and do these factors vary by gender?

Respondents rated 10 factors that motivated them to attain secondary principal licensure. Using a Likert-type scale, responses were 1 for Little Motivation, 2 for Below Average Motivation, 3 for Average Motivation, 4 for Above Average Motivation, and 5 for

Highly Motivated. The responses from 286 respondents indicated that the primary motivating factor toward seeking secondary principal licensure was the desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers ($\underline{M} = 4.51$, $SD = .734$), followed closely by the desire to be a leader ($\underline{M} = 4.25$, $SD = .850$). These factors were the only two that respondents rated from above average to highly motivated. Moving up on the pay scale in their current position, was cited as their third-most motivating factor to pursue secondary principal licensure ($\underline{M} = 3.58$, $SD = 1.365$), while the encouragement by the principal and/or colleagues was cited fourth ($\underline{M} = 3.55$, $SD = 1.298$). The attraction of a higher administrative salary was ranked as the fifth factor ($\underline{M} = 3.49$, $SD = 1.280$). The remaining motivating factors mean scores fell within the low average to below average range. See Table 3 for the complete breakdown of responses for total respondents, female respondents, and male respondents.

When data were analyzed by gender, there were some similarities but many differences. Both males ($\underline{M} = 4.37$, $SD = .755$), and females ($\underline{M} = 4.70$, $SD = .662$), rated the desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers as their top motivating factor. The desire to be a leader was rated second by both males ($\underline{M} = 4.15$, $SD = .816$) and females ($\underline{M} = 4.38$, $SD = .880$). Male respondents rated moving up on the pay scale in their current position as their third-most motivating factor ($\underline{M} = 3.76$, $SD = .098$), whereas females rated this item fourth ($\underline{M} = 3.35$, $SD = 1.467$). Being encouraged by their principal and/or colleagues was rated third by females ($\underline{M} = 3.73$, $SD = 1.222$). Males rated encouragement by their principal and/or colleagues as fifth ($\underline{M} = 3.41$, $SD = 1.34$). Males rated the attraction of a higher administrative salary fourth ($\underline{M} = 3.73$, $SD = 1.097$), whereas females rated this sixth ($\underline{M} = 3.16$, $SD = 1.428$). Female respondents rated enhancing their

Table 3. Factors that motivated respondents to attain secondary principal licensure

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
Desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers.	Female	4.70	0.662	124	15.018*	<.001
	Male	4.37	0.755	162		
	Total	4.51	0.734	286		
Desire to be a leader.	Female	4.38	0.880	124	5.369*	.021
	Male	4.15	0.816	164		
	Total	4.25	0.850	288		
Move up on the pay scale in my current position.	Female	3.35	1.467	121	6.367*	.012
	Male	3.76	0.098	164		
	Total	3.58	1.365	285		
Encouraged by principal or colleagues.	Female	3.73	1.222	123	4.416*	.036
	Male	3.41	1.340	162		
	Total	3.55	1.298	285		
Attraction of a higher administrative salary.	Female	3.16	1.428	124	14.701*	<.001
	Male	3.73	1.097	164		
	Total	3.49	1.280	288		
Enhance my job opportunities in education, but not serve as a secondary school administrator.	Female	3.20	1.397	124	2.714	.101
	Male	2.94	1.294	163		
	Total	3.05	1.343	287		

Table 3. continued

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
Develop my leadership skills for non-administrative purposes.	Female	3.11	1.368	123	4.326*	.038
	Male	2.78	1.325	164		
	Total	2.92	1.351	287		
To become an athletic director and possibly a principal some day.	Female	2.05	1.465	122	52.869*	<.001
	Male	3.36	1.538	164		
	Total	2.80	1.639	286		
Status of the position, more prestige in administration.	Female	2.21	1.214	122	.788	.375
	Male	2.34	1.206	164		
	Total	2.29	1.209	286		
To become only an athletic director.	Female	1.15	0.540	122	43.048*	<.001
	Male	1.96	1.290	162		
	Total	1.61	1.111	284		

*p < .05 (2-tailed).

job opportunities in education, but not serving as a secondary school principal fifth ($M = 3.2$, $SD = 1.397$), whereas males rated this seventh ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.294$).

Eight of 10 factors that initially motivated respondents to seek licensure resulted in significant statistical difference between the mean scores of females and males at the alpha level of 0.05. Men rated moving up on the pay scale in their current position $F(1, 284) = 6.367$, $p = .012$, attraction of a higher administrative salary $F(1, 287) = 14.701$, $p < .001$, becoming an athletic director with the possibility of someday becoming a principal $F(1, 285) = 52.869$, $p < .001$, and to only become an athletic director significantly $F(1, 283) = 43.048$, $p < .001$ higher than women. Women rated desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers $F(1, 285) = 15.081$, $p < .001$, desire to be a leader $F(1, 287) = 5.369$, $p = .021$, developing my leadership skills for non-administrative purposes $F(1, 286) = 4.326$, $p = .038$, and encouraged by principal or colleagues $F(1, 284) = 4.416$, $p = .036$ as significantly higher motivating factors, toward pursuing secondary principal licensure, than men (see Table 3).

Survey question 1B asked respondents to indicate their top three reasons for attaining secondary principal licensure. Because respondents were limited to rating only three items, a Pareto scoring system was used with the first choice receiving five points, the second choice receiving three points, and the third choice receiving one point. These points were then totaled for males, females, and all respondents. Once again, the desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers and the desire to be a leader were chosen by both males and females as their two most important reasons for pursuing secondary principal licensure. In this case however, desire to be a leader was ranked first by all

respondents and desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers was ranked second.

Using this system to rate motivating factors, males rated moving up on the pay scale in their current position as their third-most important reason for pursuing licensure, whereas females rated enhancing their job opportunities in education, but not serving as a secondary school principal as third. Moving up on the pay scale was determined to be fifth. Table 4

Table 4. Factors that motivated respondents to attain secondary principal licensure (Pareto scoring)

	Total points (rank)		Total points (rank)
	Female	Male	
Desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers.	256 2	236 2	492 2
Desire to be a leader.	400 1	364 1	764 1
Move up on the pay scale in my current position.	98 3	68 7	166 5
Encouraged by principal or colleagues.	85 5	44 8	129 7
Attraction of a higher administrative salary.	6 9	31 9	37 10
Enhance my job opportunities in education, but not serve as a secondary school administrator.	86 4	229 3	315 3
Develop my leadership skills for non-administrative purposes.	52 7	159 4	211 4
To become an athletic director and possibly a principal some day.	53 6	111 6	164 6
Status of the position, more prestige in administration.	15 8	114 5	129 7
To become only an athletic director.	0 10	44 8	44 9

summarizes the factors that motivated all respondents to attain secondary principal licensure as measured by the Pareto scoring system.

A Spearman's rho correlation test was conducted on the respondents' rankings of motivating factors. This test was conducted separately for the rankings based on Table 3 and 4 data. In both cases, a strong positive correlation was found between the rankings among males and females. Table 5 summarizes the findings of the Spearman's rho correlations.

Table 5. Spearman's rho correlations on male and female rankings of what motivated them to attain secondary principal licensure

Spearman's rho Table 3 Rankings		Female	Male
Female	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.855**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	10	10
Male	Correlation coefficient	.855**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	10	10

Spearman's rho Table 4 Rankings		Female	Male
Female	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.693*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.026
	N	10	10
Male	Correlation coefficient	.693*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	
	N	10	10

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Research question 2

How many principal candidates have actively pursued careers in secondary school administration? What factors would motivate these individuals to pursue careers in secondary school administration?

As a group, Iowa's secondary principal candidates have actively pursued the principalship. Responses on this question ranged from a low of 0 to a high of 76. Nearly half of the respondents 137 (48.5%) had applied for 1-5 positions within the past five years. In addition, 26 (9.2%) of the respondents indicated that they had applied for 6-10 administrative positions, 5 (1.8%) had applied for 11-15 administrative positions, and 13 (4.6%) had applied for over 15 administrative positions within the last five years. However, 101 (35.8%) of the respondents indicated that they had never applied for a secondary principalship. Table 6 summarizes the number of times respondents had applied for secondary principal positions within the past five years.

Table 6. Number of times respondents applied for secondary principal positions within the last five years

		Frequency	Valid percent
Number of times applied for principal positions within the last five years	1-5 times	137	48.6%
	6-10 times	26	9.2%
	11-15 times	5	1.8%
	Over 15 times	13	4.6%
	Never	101	35.8%
	Missing	8	

Table 7. Application frequency by gender

	N	Mean	Std. deviation	F	Sig.
Females	121	2.48	3.531		
Males	160	4.61	9.842	5.146*	.024
Total	281	3.69	7.839		

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

A statistically significant difference at an alpha level of .05 exists in the number of times male and female principal candidates have applied for secondary principalships within the past five years, $F(1, 280) = 5.146$, $p = .024$ (see Table 7). Male respondents indicated having applied for an average of ($M = 4.61$, $SD = 3.531$) secondary principalships within the past five years, whereas female principal candidate responses indicated having applied for an average of ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 3.531$) within the past five years.

Although these statistics show interest in the pursuit of the secondary school principalship, the data indicate that few job offers have been made. Of the 249 responses, only 23 principal candidates (9.2%) indicated that they had previously been offered a position and had chosen not to accept. An additional 28 respondents (11.2%) indicated that they previously had held a secondary principal or other administrative post. Table 8 summarizes respondents' answers to the question regarding what best described their pursuit of a secondary school principalship.

Table 8. Respondents' pursuit of the secondary school principalship

	Frequency	Valid percent
I have applied for a secondary principal position, but have never been offered one.	152	61.0%
I have applied and have been offered a secondary principalship but did not accept.	23	9.2%
I have never applied for a secondary principal position and do not intend to.	37	14.9%
I have never applied for a secondary principal position, but I intend to seek a secondary principal position in the future.	50	20.1%
I have previously been a secondary principal or administrator, but I am currently in a non-administrative position.	28	11.2%
I am currently an athletic director and may possibly become a principal some day.	11	4.4%
I am currently an athletic director and have no intention of becoming a principal.	2	0.8%

Pursuit of the secondary principalship

A total of 195 respondents answered an open survey question: "What changes to the principal's job description would you recommend, if any, that would make the job more enticing to you?" Responses addressed 195 specific issues and were categorized into the following themes hiring practices, isolation, leadership vs. management, location, none, preparation, responsibilities, stress/conflict and lack of support, time not commensurate with pay, and too political/outside influences. Forty-eight (24.6%) of the responses

addressed the issue of too much time involved and/or too little pay as their primary barrier toward aspiring to the secondary principalship. Forty-four (22.1%) of the responses indicated the desire for the position to focus more on instructional leadership vs. managerial duties; 30 (15.4%) of the respondents indicated that there were too many various responsibilities with the position in its current state; 21 (10.8%) of the responses indicated that the position was too political and/or that there were too many negative outside influences. The remaining responses were: 15 (7.7%) no change, 14 (7.3%) the stress, conflict, and lack of board, community, and/or media support for the position, 12 (6.2%) current hiring practices that worked against them, and 4 (2.2%) for each of the categories of the position being too isolated and preparation needing to be better. Looking for the right location to become available had three responses (1.5%). This tabulation of categories within the open-ended responses permitted perceptions and beliefs about the pursuit of the secondary principalship to be reported in an organized manner. Table 9 summarizes the responses within the 10 categories/themes.

Research question 3

What do principal candidates view as significant barriers toward their seeking a secondary principal position? Do these perceptions vary by gender?

Respondents rated 36 barriers that they perceived as preventing them from seeking or securing an administrative position, using a Likert-type scale of 1 for No Barrier, 2 for Small Barrier, 3 for Moderate Barrier, 4 for Strong Barrier, and 5 for Significant Barrier. The responses from 280 respondents indicated that the primary barrier was that they were geographically bound and unable to relocate ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.375$), followed closely by

Table 9. What changes to the secondary principalship would make the job more enticing to the respondents?

Job changes/categories	Frequency	Valid percent
Time commensurate with pay	48	24.6%
More leadership/less management	44	22.1%
Fewer responsibilities	30	15.4%
Less political/outside influences	21	10.8%
No changes	15	7.7%
Less stress, conflict, and more support	12	6.2%
Fair hiring practices	14	7.3%
Better preparation	4	2.2%
Less isolation	4	2.2%
More favorable location	3	1.5%

the position requiring a tremendous amount of time ($\underline{M} = 3.07$, $SD = 1.492$). The belief that the position would have a negative impact on their family life and family responsibilities was cited third ($\underline{M} = 2.92$, $SD = 1.482$), while the position having increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities was cited fourth ($\underline{M} = 2.9$, $SD = 1.369$). The stress of the position was determined to be the fifth-largest barrier toward respondents pursuing the secondary principalship ($\underline{M} = 2.82$, $SD = 1.361$). Respondents rated all other factors of lesser importance (see Table 10).

There were some similarities and differences in how males and females rated the barriers. Both males ($\underline{M} = 3.13$, $SD = 1.332$) and females ($\underline{M} = 3.20$, $SD = 1.435$) ranked being geographically bound and unable to relocate as their primary barrier. The time commitment was ranked second by both males ($\underline{M} = 3.05$, $SD = 1.488$) and females ($\underline{M} = 3.10$, $SD = 1.503$). Male respondents rated the position having increasing role

Table 10. Barriers toward respondents seeking a secondary school principalship

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
I am geographically bound and unable to relocate.	Female	3.20	1.435	120	.171	.680
	Male	3.13	1.332	160		
	Total	3.16	1.375	280		
I have negative perceptions about role of the secondary school administrator.	Female	2.13	1.306	120	.292	.590
	Male	2.04	1.187	159		
	Total	2.08	1.238	279		
I have little information on the positive aspects of the job.	Female	1.74	1.099	121	.301	.740
	Male	1.82	1.093	158		
	Total	2.07	1.175	279		
It is an isolated position.	Female	2.04	1.165	121	.111	.740
	Male	2.09	1.186	158		
	Total	2.07	1.175	279		
I lack an administrative mentor to assist me with an administrative position.	Female	2.37	1.461	121	5.611*	.019
	Male	1.99	1.247	158		
	Total	2.15	1.355	279		
I lack a network of people in administrative positions who could assist me.	Female	2.48	1.472	120	2.775	.097
	Male	2.20	1.370	157		
	Total	2.32	1.420	277		
The position generally suffers from a lack of appreciation and/or support from students.	Female	2.16	1.225	121	1.706	.193
	Male	1.97	1.100	158		
	Total	2.05	1.157	279		
The position generally suffers from a lack of appreciation and/or support from parents.	Female	2.39	1.321	118	1.601	.207
	Male	2.19	1.283	158		
	Total	2.28	1.300	276		

Table 10. continued

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
The position generally suffers from a lack of appreciation and/or support from staff.	Female	2.24	1.240	119	.353	.553
	Male	2.15	1.089	158		
	Total	2.19	1.155	277		
I lack administrative experience.	Female	2.82	1.506	120	.651	.421
	Male	2.66	1.595	158		
	Total	2.73	1.556	278		
I do not have adequate knowledge and skills to be successful as an administrator.	Female	1.55	0.076	119	.019	.891
	Male	1.53	0.868	156		
	Total	1.54	0.851	275		
I do not feel adequately prepared to be a secondary administrator.	Female	1.71	0.965	120	2.706	.101
	Male	1.53	0.840	155		
	Total	1.61	0.899	275		
The salary increase does not justify my move from teaching to administration.	Female	2.33	1.456	119	1.017	.314
	Male	2.50	1.354	154		
	Total	2.42	1.399	273		
I am satisfied with my current job.	Female	2.78	1.542	120	.016	.899
	Male	2.80	1.395	158		
	Total	2.79	1.458	278		
I intend to retire in the near future.	Female	1.59	1.185	120	.488	.485
	Male	1.50	0.994	156		
	Total	1.54	1.080	276		
Secondary administration is a very difficult job.	Female	2.42	1.357	120	.019	.892
	Male	2.39	1.285	157		
	Total	2.40	1.314	277		

Table 10. continued

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
There is tremendous conflict associated with this position.	Female	2.40	1.284	119	.306	.718
	Male	2.46	1.233	157		
	Total	2.43	1.253	276		
There are continual negative contacts with students.	Female	2.09	1.221	119	1.051	.306
	Male	2.24	1.204	156		
	Total	2.18	1.212	275		
There are continual negative contacts with parents.	Female	2.27	1.233	119	.027	.871
	Male	2.29	1.205	157		
	Total	2.28	1.215	276		
There are continual negative contacts with faculty/staff.	Female	2.10	1.105	119	.055	.815
	Male	2.07	1.084	157		
	Total	2.08	1.091	276		
There are continual negative contacts with central office/Board.	Female	1.96	1.007	120	.006	.938
	Male	1.97	1.037	156		
	Total	1.96	1.023	276		
The position highly political.	Female	2.87	1.315	120	1.832	.177
	Male	2.65	1.348	156		
	Total	2.74	1.336	276		
The position requires a tremendous amount of paperwork.	Female	2.45	1.332	119	1.600	.207
	Male	2.65	1.268	155		
	Total	2.56	1.297	274		
The position is highly stressful.	Female	2.85	1.400	120	.133	.716
	Male	2.79	1.335	157		
	Total	2.82	1.361	277		

Table 10. continued

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
The position requires a tremendous time commitment.	Female	3.10	1.503	120	.073	.787
	Male	3.05	1.488	157		
	Total	3.07	1.492	277		
The position would have a negative impact on my family life and responsibilities.	Female	2.94	1.469	119	.041	.839
	Male	2.90	1.497	157		
	Total	2.92	1.482	276		
My spouse/partner cannot be supportive of me picking up the additional responsibilities of the position.	Female	1.79	1.210	121	.649	.421
	Male	1.91	1.200	157		
	Total	1.86	1.204	278		
The position lacks job security.	Female	2.09	1.230	120	.991	.320
	Male	2.24	1.277	156		
	Total	2.18	1.257	276		
The position is highly accountable for student achievement.	Female	2.33	1.286	120	1.076	.301
	Male	2.18	1.190	157		
	Total	2.25	1.233	277		
The position has increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities.	Female	2.87	1.322	120	.117	.732
	Male	2.92	1.408	157		
	Total	2.90	1.369	277		
The position is too far removed from the classroom and student contacts.	Female	2.33	1.300	121	.033	.856
	Male	2.36	1.280	156		
	Total	2.35	1.286	277		
Age discrimination may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	Female	2.39	1.369	121	5.137*	.024
	Male	2.03	1.279	155		
	Total	2.18	1.329	276		

Table 10. continued

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
Gender discrimination may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	Female	2.78	1.405	121	58.099*	<.001
	Male	1.63	1.090	154		
	Total	2.13	1.362	275		
Preconceived gender stereotypes may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	Female	2.79	1.374	121	78.985*	<.001
	Male	1.53	0.951	151		
	Total	2.09	1.314	272		
Ethnic discrimination may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	Female	1.50	1.037	120	.072	.789
	Male	1.47	0.958	154		
	Total	1.48	0.992	274		
I lack sufficient "inside connections" to attain administrative employment.	Female	2.85	1.470	122	2.308	.130
	Male	2.58	1.524	156		
	Total	2.70	1.504	278		

*p < .05 (two-tailed).

expectations with competing responsibilities as their third-largest barrier ($\underline{M} = 2.92$, $SD = 1.408$), whereas females rated it fourth ($\underline{M} = 2.87$, $SD = 1.322$). Females also rated the position being highly political as fourth ($\underline{M} = 2.87$, $SD = 1.315$). Females rated the position having a negative impact on their family life and responsibilities third ($\underline{M} = 2.94$, $SD = 1.469$), whereas males rated this fourth ($\underline{M} = 2.90$, $SD = 1.497$).

Gender issues made the female respondents' top 10 significant barriers for not seeking or securing a position as a secondary school principal. They rated preconceived gender stereotypes may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment ninth ($\underline{M} = 2.79$, $SD = 1.405$) and gender discrimination may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment tenth ($\underline{M} = 2.78$, $SD = 1.405$).

Four of the 36 potential barriers resulted in statistically significant difference at the alpha level of 0.05 between the mean scores of males and females. Women rated lacking an administrative mentor $F(1, 278) = 5.611$, $p = .019$, age discrimination $F(1, 275) = 5.137$, $p = .024$, gender discrimination $F(1, 274) = 58.099$, $p < .001$, and preconceived gender stereotypes $F(1, 271) = 78.945$, $p < .001$, as statistically significant higher barriers toward pursuing secondary principal licensure than did men. Only the latter two made the females' list of the top 10 barriers toward pursuing a secondary principalship.

A Spearman's rho correlation test was conducted on the respondents' rankings of barriers toward seeking a secondary principal position. A strong positive correlation was found between the male and female rankings. Table 11 summarizes the findings of the Spearman's rho correlation.

Table 11. Spearman's rho correlations on male and female rankings of barriers toward seeking or attaining a secondary principalship

Spearman's rho		Female	Male
Table 10 Rankings			
Female	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.772*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001
	N	36	36
Male	Correlation coefficient	.772*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	
	N	36	36

*Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

The 36 barriers were then grouped into categories to determine if there were any differences between male and female respondents in what they considered to be barriers toward seeking or securing a position as a secondary school principal. Each of the 36 barriers was placed into one of five categories: role perception/support of position, administrative preparation program, satisfied with present position, responsibilities, and discrimination (see Table 12). The survey responses that make up each category or theme can be found in Appendix E.

When analyzed by total respondents, the categories rated as small to moderate barriers as follows: (1) Responsibilities ($\bar{M} = 2.43$, $SD = .909$), (2) Satisfied with current position ($\bar{M} = 2.247$, $SD = .971$), (3) Perception of the role ($\bar{M} = 2.33$, $SD = .800$), (4) Discrimination ($\bar{M} = 2.213$, $SD = 1.004$), and (5) Preparation ($\bar{M} = 1.917$, $SD = .909$).

Male and female respondents indicated a statistically significant difference at the alpha level of .05 regarding discrimination $F(1, 277) = 27.186$, $p < .001$ being a barrier

toward them seeking or securing a secondary principal position. Female respondents ranked this category as their highest barrier ($\underline{M} = 2.462$, $SD = 1.05212$) whereas male respondents ranked this category as their lowest barrier ($\underline{M} = 1.858$, $SD = .881$) (see Table 12).

Research question 4

How adequately do principal candidates feel their administrator preparation programs prepared them to pursue a career in secondary school administration? Do these perceptions vary by gender?

Respondents were asked to rate their administrator preparation programs in terms of theoretical preparation (in coursework), practical experience (in coursework), practical experience (internship/clinical experience), instructional leadership, and overall administrative preparation. Response options were 1 for Poorly Prepared, 2 for Below Average Preparation, 3 for Average Preparation, 4 for Above Average Preparation, and 5 for Well Prepared.

Respondents indicated that the quality of their administrator preparation programs prepared them at an average to above average level, in regards to pursuing a career in secondary school administration (see Table 13). Both males ($\underline{M} = 3.71$, $SD = .874$) and females ($\underline{M} = 3.80$, $SD = .963$) rated instructional leadership preparation the highest, with theoretical preparation (in coursework) rated a close second by males ($\underline{M} = 3.57$, $SD = .921$) and females ($\underline{M} = 3.78$, $SD = .984$). Male respondents rated practical experience (internship/clinical experience) third ($\underline{M} = 3.56$, $SD = 1.048$), whereas female

Table 12. Barriers toward respondents seeking or securing a position as a secondary school principal (themes)

Item	Gender	Mean	S. D.	N	F ratio	F prob.
Role perception/support of position.	Female	2.305	0.076	122	1.751	.187
	Male	2.178	0.765	160		
	Total	2.233	0.800	282		
Administrative preparation program.	Female	2.039	0.939	121	1.223	.268
	Male	1.918	0.885	159		
	Total	1.971	0.909	280		
Satisfied with current position.	Female	2.227	1.065	121	0.091	.763
	Male	2.263	0.895	158		
	Total	2.247	0.971	279		
Responsibilities.	Female	2.424	0.903	122	0.032	.857
	Male	2.444	0.918	157		
	Total	2.435	0.909	279		
Discrimination.	Female	2.462	1.052	122	27.186*	<.001
	Male	1.858	0.881	156		
	Total	2.213	1.004	278		

*p < .05 (two-tailed).

Table 13. How adequately respondents felt their administrator preparation programs prepared them to pursue a career in secondary school administration

		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Theoretical preparation (in coursework)	Female	124	3.78	.984	3.633	.058
	Male	164	3.57	.921		
	Total	288	3.66	.953		
Practical experience (in coursework)	Female	124	3.56	1.006	.233	.637
	Male	163	3.51	.965		
	Total	287	3.53	.981		
Practical experience (internship/clinical experience)	Female	124	3.51	1.240	.174	.677
	Male	163	3.56	1.048		
	Total	287	3.54	1.133		
Instructional leadership preparation	Female	124	3.80	.963	.728	.394
	Male	163	3.71	.874		
	Total	287	3.75	.913		
Overall administrative preparation	Female	122	3.75	.941	.074	.786
	Male	164	3.77	.824		
	Total	286	3.76	.874		

respondents rated it fourth ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.240$). Females rated practical experience (in coursework) third ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 1.006$), whereas male respondents rated it fourth ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .965$). At the alpha level of .05, there were no statistically significant differences between male and female respondent mean scores concerning any of the topics regarding their administrative preparation programs.

Additionally, male and female respondents were asked their motivation levels related to seeking a secondary principalship both before and after the completion of their administrative preparation program (see Table 14). Response options were 1 for Little

Table 14. How motivated respondents were to eventually assume an administrative position when they began and completed their administrator preparation program

		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Motivation when beginning administrator preparation program.	Female	125	3.93	1.116	.013	.908
	Male	162	3.91	.987		
	Total	287	3.92	1.043		
Motivation when administrator preparation program was completed.	Female	125	3.88	1.119	.017	.898
	Male	162	3.86	.962		
	Total	287	3.87	1.031		

Motivation, 2 for Below Average Motivation, 3 for Average Motivation, 4 for Above Average Motivation, and 5 for Highly Motivated.

Female responses indicated a slightly greater motivation ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.116$) than males ($M = 3.91$, $SD = .987$) prior to entering their administrator preparation program. Likewise, female responses indicated a slightly greater motivation ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.119$) than males ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .962$) after having completed their administrator preparation program. However, there were no statistically significant differences by gender regarding motivation levels before or after the completion of their administrator preparation programs. Total respondents were slightly more motivated to eventually assume an administrative position when they began their administrative preparation program ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.043$) than they were upon program completion ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 1.031$).

Summary

This chapter presented the findings of the study. The analysis of data determined, that a majority of principal candidates were actively seeking a secondary school principalship, with males nearly twice as likely as females to pursue a position. The desire to make a positive difference for students and staff and the desire to be a leader were the biggest motivators for both males and females. These motivators were rated higher by females than they were by males. Other strong motivators for pursuing the principalship are to move up on the pay scale in their current position and the attraction of an administrative salary. These two motivators tended to be rated higher by males than they were by females. Both males and females consider the encouragement of a principal or colleagues to be a motivating factor but females rated this higher than males.

Respondents to the survey, both male and female, feel that being geographically bound and the tremendous time commitment of the job are the largest barriers toward them pursuing a secondary principalship. Both males and females also felt that the positions negative impact on their families and the increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities within the job were also barriers toward pursuing the principalship. Females rated discrimination in age, gender, and stereotyping, along with the lack of having an administrative mentor, as statistically significant higher barriers than did males.

When asked what changes to the principal's job description they recommend, respondents indicated that the current financial rewards of being a principal are not commensurate with the job's responsibilities. They also felt strongly that the focus of the job needed to be more on leadership than managerial duties and that there were far too many responsibilities with the current position of principal.

Both male and female respondents perceived that their colleges or universities had provided them with adequate preparation to pursue an administrative position actively and did not see their preparation as a deterrent to them acquiring an administrative position.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the research study, which includes the statement of the problem, a description of the methodology, and the major findings. The research questions provide the basis for the conclusions presented in this chapter. Limitations of this study are provided to assist the reader in understanding and interpreting the results. A discussion of the results provides possible explanations for the findings, as well as implications of the study. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

Summary of Problem, Methodology, and Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate reasons why individuals licensed to be secondary administrators in the state of Iowa have not entered the profession, and to identify factors that would motivate them to consider administrative appointments. Similar dissertation research recently has been completed related to individuals who hold licensure for the Iowa superintendency (Smith, 1999) and the Iowa elementary principalship (Laing, 2001). This additional information, specifically concerned with the Iowa secondary principalship, may provide further assistance in reformulating policy and practice regarding factors that would attract more highly qualified candidates for secondary principal openings in Iowa.

The researcher was interested in learning what factors influence respondents' perceptions and opinions of school administration, and more specifically the secondary

principalship, as a career. For those not currently seeking an administrative position, it was important to identify perceived barriers toward this career change.

The participants for the Web-based survey consisted of the total population in Iowa with secondary principal licensure who meet the researcher's criteria. Data provided by the Iowa Department of Education (IDE, 2002) identified a total of 385 individuals in the state of Iowa who met the criteria for this study. These criteria included individuals who currently possess secondary principal licensure in Iowa and are involved in some aspect of K-12 education, but are not serving as a secondary principal or school administrator. Excluded from this survey population were individuals with secondary administrative licensure in Iowa who are currently working in the position of superintendent, assistant or associate superintendent, principal, administrator, administrative assistant, assistant dean/director, assistant principal, curriculum director, or dean of students. A total of 290 individuals completed a Web-based survey instrument for a response rate of 75.32%.

Quantitative data were downloaded from the Web-based survey into the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software with the assistance of the Iowa State University Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) office. Based upon the research questions, descriptive statistics and two-tailed Pearson correlation coefficients were used to test data. Results from some open-ended questions were analyzed and coded, whereby categories or themes emerged.

Findings

The study addressed four research questions, and the findings are listed in this section:

Research Question 1: What factors initially motivated principal candidates who are licensed as secondary school administrators in Iowa, but do not serve in administrative roles, to seek licensure, and do these factors vary by gender?

The desire to make a positive difference for students and staff and the desire to become a leader were the two biggest motivating factors for female and male respondents to seek secondary principal licensure. Though ranked similarly by female and male respondents, both were shown to be more statistically significant motivators for females. Other strong motivating factors for pursuing secondary principal licensure were to move up on the pay scale in their current position and the attraction of a higher administrative salary. These two motivators were more statistically significant motivators for males. Both female and male respondents consider the encouragement of a principal or colleague to also be a motivating factor, but females identified it as a more statistically significant motivator. Female respondents appear to also be somewhat motivated by the opportunity to develop their leadership skills and enhance their job opportunities for non-administrative purposes, whereas male respondents appear to be somewhat motivated by the prospect of becoming an athletic director and possibly a secondary principal some day.

Research Question 2: How many principal candidates have actively pursued careers in secondary school administration? What factors would motivate these individuals to pursue careers in secondary school administration?

Nearly two-thirds of Iowa's male and female secondary principal candidates have actively sought to attain a principalship within the past five years. Data from female and male respondents indicate that males are significantly more likely to actively pursue the principalship than females, applying nearly twice as often. It is also important to note that

35% of the respondents indicated that they have never applied for a secondary principal position.

When asked what changes to the principal's job description they could recommend, respondents indicated that the current financial rewards of being a principal are not commensurate with the job's responsibilities. They also felt strongly that the job needed to focus more on leadership than managerial duties, and that there were far too many responsibilities with the position.

Research Question 3: What do principal candidates view as significant barriers toward their seeking a secondary principal position? Do these perceptions vary by gender?

Respondents to the survey, both male and female, felt that being geographically bound and the tremendous time commitment of the job are the largest barriers preventing them from pursuing a secondary principalship. Both males and females also felt that the position's negative impact on their families and the increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities within the job are also barriers toward them pursuing the principalship. Female respondents identified discrimination in age, gender, and stereotyping along with the lack of having an administrative mentor as significantly higher barriers than did males.

Research Question 4: How adequately do principal candidates feel their administrator preparation programs prepared them to pursue a career in secondary school administration? Do these perceptions vary by gender?

Both male and female respondents felt that their colleges or universities had provided them with average to above average preparation to actively pursue an

administrative position, yet they do not see their training as a deterrent to them acquiring a position.

Limitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. The survey population did not include individuals who had recently graduated (spring/summer 2002) from educational leadership programs and applied for licensure, who graduated from educational leadership programs and had chosen not to apply for licensure, and/or had previously held secondary principal licensure and had chosen to let their licensure expire.
2. Certain individuals, within this survey population, could not be located because they had moved out of state or had moved to another building and/or district, where they may have assumed an administrative or non-administrative position.
3. The survey population did not include those individuals who currently possess secondary principal licensure in Iowa but are not working in the field of education.
4. The study sampled respondents in only one state, thus limiting the generalizability of the findings to other locales.
5. Although 10 potential motivators and 36 potential barriers were identified from the literature and/or previous research studies, no study can effectively identify all of the potential motivators and barriers that may influence a principal candidate's decision related to applying for an administrative position.

6. The survey methods utilized in this study sought the perceptions of Iowa's secondary principal candidates and did not address their capabilities as perceived by potential hiring agencies.

Discussion

Recent reports at the state and national levels have announced that the number of educators licensed to be school administrators appears to be adequate. However, there is a shortage of individuals who actually want to become school principals (ERS, 1998; Laing, 2001; McAdams, 1998; Public Agenda, 2001; SAI, 1997; Sheldon & Munnich, 1999). This trend appears to be especially evident at the secondary principal level (Marnik, 1998; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Whitaker, 2003; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998). Some writers believe that while there may be an adequate supply of principal candidates, the overall quality of this potential applicant pool is deficient (Anderson, 1991; ERS, 1998; Portin et al., 1998). This phenomenon poses a serious problem for the field of education, because the research strongly indicates that one of the most important features of effective schools is strong administrative leadership (ERS, 2000; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Jackson & Davis, 2000; Patterson, 1997).

Motivating factors

Nearly two-thirds (64.2%) of the 290 respondents to this survey indicated that they had applied for a principalship within the past five years. This study has identified several factors that motivate these individuals to seek administrative employment and has disclosed differences in motivating factors for female and male principal candidates. Understanding what motivates potential principal candidates and what discourages others from pursuing

the secondary principalship, is critical toward filling future administrative vacancies with quality individuals.

Motivation theory. Understanding motivating factors has been the focus of many researchers for a number of decades (Adams, 1963; Herzberg et al., 1959; Maslow, 1954; Vroom, 1964). Among various theories developed during this time was a motivation theory developed by Frederick Herzberg. Herzberg's work categorized motivation into two factors: motivators and hygienes (Herzberg et al., 1959). Motivators, or intrinsic factors such as achievement and recognition, were believed to create job satisfaction by fulfilling individuals' needs for meaning and personal growth (internal motivation). These motivators are associated with long-term positive effects in job performance. Hygiene or extrinsic factors, such as pay and job security, can produce job dissatisfaction if they are not sufficiently maintained. They are issues related to an employee's environment and do not motivate but can minimize dissatisfaction if it exists (external motivation). Herzberg believed that these dissatisfiers produce only short-term satisfaction in employees through change in job attitudes and performance, which will eventually regress to the previous levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959).

The first research question addressed factors that motivate potential Iowa principal candidates as they consider whether or not to apply for the position of secondary principal. Recent research suggests that once teachers have satisfied their lower-order needs (survival and existence needs) by simply having a job, they begin to plan to address their higher-order needs by moving into principalships in order to revisit their achievement, recognition, growth, responsibility, and self-actualization needs (Harris, Arnold, Lowery, & Crocker,

2000; Parkay & Hall, 1992). These motivators are associated with long-term positive effects in job performance (Herzberg et al., 1959).

This study found the most important factors in the decision to pursue principal licensure appear to revolve around making a difference for others and the desire to be a leader. Herzberg's theory (1959) would label these factors as motivators. Both males and females rated the desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers and the desire to be a leader as their primary motivating factors for pursuing administrative licensure. In both cases, females rated these items significantly higher than males. Although this study did not determine how these individuals defined leadership, their motives could implicitly include a desire for power (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Wolverton, Rawls, & Macdonald, 2000).

A leadership position may be a motivator when viewed as a way to fill an individual's need for power in the form of status or prestige, or it could even be viewed as a stepping-stone to a higher administrative position. Others may look at power as a potential disincentive due to added exposure to the media, increased stress associated with additional responsibilities, and the political nature of the position (Cooley & Shen, 2003; Wolverton & McDonald, 2001). The findings of this study reinforce Laing's study (2001), which found the primary reasons individuals attained elementary principalship licensure were to make a positive difference for students and teachers, the desire to be a leader, and to develop leadership skills. Additionally, respondents to this study rated being encouraged by their principal or colleagues and to enhance their job opportunities in education in a non-administrative capacity as motivators to seeking the secondary principal licensure.

The prospect of increased salary also appears to provide some impetus to attain administrative licensure and/or a principal position (Asch, 1999; ERS, 1998). Respondents in this study rated moving up on the pay scale in their current position and the attraction of a higher administrative salary as their third and fifth most motivating factors respectively. Herzberg's theory (1959) would label these as hygiene factors. In both of these cases, males rated these items significantly higher than females rated them. As has been previously stated, whereas an administrator's contract may approach 240 days with the salary superior to that of teachers, the reality is that the daily rate may be equal to or less than that of teachers. This finding is important because although salary is not a motivator, it could be a dissatisfier (Herzberg et al., 1959). Cooley and Shen (2003) found that teachers' decisions to move into the principalship were only moderately influenced by the perceived differential in administrators' and teachers' daily salary rates. School boards should take this into account when attempting to appropriately compensate individuals who seek administrative employment in their district.

Gender differences. There is an old saying you can take a horse to water but you cannot make it drink. It will only drink if it is thirsty, and so with people. Individuals will do what they want to do or otherwise are motivated to do. Although there was a strong positive correlation in how females and males ranked factors that motivated them to pursue an administrative position, there also were many differences. The survey results indicate that female respondents rated motivation factors (desire to make a positive difference for students and staff and desire to be a leader, and encouraged by principal or colleagues) significantly higher than males, while males tended to rate hygiene factors (move up on the

pay scale in my current position and attraction of a higher administrative salary) significantly higher than females. In other words, female respondents were looking at a secondary principalship licensure as a means to potential career advancement or professional growth opportunity (internal, or long-term, motivation), whereas males tended to look at their pursuit of the principalship as a means to bettering their environment and/or personal status, particularly financial (external, or short-term, motivation) (Herzberg et al., 1959).

What exactly does this mean and how does it apply to the findings of the study? This study has found that there are more potential male principal candidates than female candidates in Iowa, and that male candidates tended to apply for administrative roles twice as often as females. Women tended to be more motivated intrinsically to attain principalship licensure to pursue the opportunity to be a leader and/or make a positive difference for students and staff, whereas males tend to be more extrinsically motivated to receive higher compensation in their current position and/or the potential in gaining a future administrative role. Previous research studies claim that while there appear to be enough principal candidates to fill vacant administrative positions, the quality of those potential candidates is inadequate (Anderson, 1991; ERS, 1998; Portin et al., 1998). Could there be a correlation between the factors that motivate principal candidates to pursue licensure and seek administrative positions and the perceptions of hiring agents and/or agencies as to their potential as effective leaders? If so, would the potential for effective leadership be more apt to come from intrinsically motivated females than extrinsically motivated males?

Barriers

Research on principal shortages and difficulties in the recruitment and retention of principals has been emerging for several years in the United States (ERS, 1998; McCormick, 1987; Whitaker, 2003). Teacher reluctance to enter administration coupled with the number of impending administrator retirements present a significant challenge to school boards, superintendents, and communities. One of the foci of this study was to determine what Iowa's secondary principal candidates viewed as significant barriers toward their pursuit of the principalship. These barriers include being geographically bound, time commitment, nature of the job, gender issues, and job preparation.

Geographically bound. In regard to geographic limitations, many males and females appear unwilling to relocate a family for reasons such as loss of second income, uprooting school-aged children, or a spouse who likes his/her own job. In this study, both males and females rated this concern as the most significant factor preventing them from not seeking or attaining a secondary school principalship. Moving to another region might represent a career opportunity for administrators, but it also may require their spouses to resign from positions that contribute substantially to family income. These spouses might be happy in their current employment setting, have their own career aspirations, and/or justifiably be concerned about finding suitable positions elsewhere. Laing's study (2001) found that those licensed to be elementary principals in Iowa rated geographic limitations or unwillingness to relocate as the second biggest factor in discouraging them from seeking or attaining an elementary principalship. The career interests of the trailing spouse, whether male or female, often restrict potential school administrators to applying for positions

within commuting distance of their current homes (Grogan, 1999; McAdams, 1998).

Unfortunately, little probably can be done to reduce the influence of this barrier on peoples' willingness to seek and/or attain the secondary principalship.

Time commitment. Respondents in this study identified the time requirements of the secondary principalship (longer work days, longer work year, and required attendance at nighttime meetings and/or activities) as the primary barriers toward them pursuing an administrative position. Principals are required to put in long hours on the job. Many principals work year-round and are on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week (Holcomb, 1987), leaving little time for family. The amount of time that must be devoted to the job is mentioned repeatedly as a disincentive to entering the principalship (ERS, 2000; NASSP, 2001; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Schiff, 2002).

Forty-six percent of middle school principals responding to a 2001 NASSP survey indicated that the length of their working week averaged 50-59 hours. Additionally, 39% indicated that their working week averaged 60-69 hours (Petzko et al., 2001). The last comprehensive study of high school principals was conducted by NASSP in 2001; these principals reported spending an average of 50-60 hours a week on their jobs (NASSP, 2001). Long hours and a heavy workload can create a sense of principals' feeling that they are unfairly compensated. Coupled with this feeling of under-compensation is the belief, by male and female respondents, that the position, in large part due to the time commitment, would have a negative impact on their family life and responsibilities.

Principal candidates find that administrative jobs leave little time or energy for personal lives (Houston, 1998). Seventy-two percent of the respondents in a study

conducted of 189 master's degree students enrolled in a mid-western university's educational leadership program indicated that they consider the impact of administration on their home life when applying for an administrative position (Cooley & Shen, 1999). It seems clear that the position and its perceived impact on the family constitute a major barrier to teachers entering the field of administration.

Nature of the job. Participants in this study identified a number of factors that prevented them from considering the principalship. Clearly, the nature of the job itself and lack of support contributed to their tepid perceptions of the secondary principalship. Administrative job responsibilities for most entry-level positions (assistant or small school head principalships) include student discipline and attendance, teacher evaluation, supervision of activities, and a myriad of other assignments. Finding the time to wear the hat of instructional leader, which should be the principal's primary task, often becomes difficult when added to these managerial duties.

Male and female respondents to this survey identified the principalship's increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities as a barrier for them in pursuing such position. These principal candidates may believe that no matter how much effort they put forth, they would not be effective because they perceive that the job is impossible to do (Vroom, 1964). According to Whitaker (2003), "enhanced expectations in regard to accountability remain at the forefront of the principal's responsibilities" (p. 41). Legislators, school boards, and district administrators proposing changes affecting schools and the principal's role should realize that many principals have little capacity to assume additional duties (Drake & Roe, 1999; Portin et al., 1998). The current nature of the position with its

complexities and demands simply may make the position unattractive to many of the potential candidates.

Gender issues. There were four statistically significant response differences identified by males and females regarding barriers toward pursuing the principalship. Three barriers, which were rated significantly higher by females, involved their perception related to unfair hiring practices: They believed that gender discrimination; age discrimination; and hiring based on the “buddy system” or “who one knows” were factors in employment decisions. Numerous leadership studies from the past decade speak to this very issue (Bell & Chase, 1993; Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). These studies suggest that the stereotypical image of what socially acceptable leaders do and look like works against women by creating obstacles regarding the issues of trust, acceptance, and credibility. These findings are consistent with Laing’s (2001) study, which identified the same three factors as hiring obstacles for females.

One’s age may also have important implications for available career opportunities and/or accomplishments for women. Previous studies have shown that women and minority administrators have more years of teaching experience and enter administration at a later age than do white males (Andrews & Basom, 1990; Miklos, 1988; Poppink & Shen, 2003). These patterns may limit both the length and types of administrative careers offered to females, because they conflict with career norms that favor youthful career entry (NCES, 2000).

Gender gaps among secondary principals, although narrowing, continue to indicate the under representation of women in the profession (IDE, 2002; SAI, 1997; Wegenke &

Shen, 2003). This slow narrowing of the gender gap among practicing administrators is interesting, because many administrator preparation programs have long reported higher numbers of female graduates than male graduates (McAdams, 1998).

Bowls (1990) believed that district administrators are unwilling to tap women for potential leadership roles in secondary schools. This unwillingness to hire females may be due to a perception that the secondary principalship is a masculine role, creating perceptions of sex-role incongruence for female applicants (Pounder & Merrill, 2001). Today's more current image of the principal as an instructional leader may lend itself well to women's historically strong instructional expertise and experience (Pounder, 1994). This image, coupled with the currently perceived administrator shortage, may make women more desirable candidates for future secondary openings (Pounder, 1994).

The fourth barrier identified by females being statistically significant was the lack of and/or desire to have an administrative mentor. This finding is consistent with the findings in Thompson's study (1998). When surveying principals in the state of Mississippi regarding their mentoring experiences, she found that even though the genders were equally represented in both mentored and un-mentored principal groups, more females were benefiting from the mentoring of both then mentored and un-mentored respondents. Mentoring by good and experienced principals is consistently mentioned in the literature as an important support for new and/or aspiring principals, as wells as, seasoned veterans (ERS, 2000; Malone, 2001).

Preparation for the job

Traditional principal preparation programs offered by colleges and universities have been criticized as ineffective and irrelevant as documented in numerous studies (Goldman & Kempner, 1988; Haller et al., 1997; Lem, 1989; Maher, 1987; Schnur, 1989). These critics claim that the procedures, methods, and theories currently taught by colleges and universities continue to develop managers rather than leaders who have the ability to take their institutions into a radically transformed future (Hallinger & Bridges, 1992).

Both male and female respondents in this study indicated that their educational administration programs, at their respective colleges or universities, had done an average to above average job in preparing them for the secondary principalship. Although these were not glowing marks, respondents indicated that they did not believe their educational administration preparation programs had prevented them from seeking and/or attaining a secondary principalship. In the most recent National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Schools by NASSP (Petzko et al., 2002), topics most often rated as "essential" or "very useful" were supervision and evaluation (91%), instructional leadership (89%), legal issues (85%), technology (84%), special education issues (84%), program evaluation (83%), and curriculum development (77%). College and university faculty must examine how they currently address these issues in coursework and field experiences, and they should strive to increase the relevancy of their programming in its value for future administrators (Petzko et al., 2002).

It has already been acknowledged that the majority of respondents in this study have been actively pursuing a career in educational administration. When asked to indicate the number of times they had applied for an administrative position in the past five years,

responses ranged from a low of zero to a high of 76. In fact, 44 (15.6%) of the respondents indicated that they had applied from six to over 15 times for administrative positions within the past five years. Is their inability to attain an administrative position a reflection of poor preparation, or might it simply reflect the perceived quality of the applicant by the hiring agency? These results may lend some additional credibility to those who believe there may not be a sufficient number of highly capable individuals to fill the impending vacancies (Anderson, 1991; ERS, 1998; Portin et al., 1998). With this in mind, colleges and universities must continue to strive to develop meaningful and relevant principal training programs that focus on professional issues rather than offer the traditional collection of classes (Dunklee, 2000; Hallinger & Bridges, 1992). Typical recommendations include the use of adult learning principles; reflective activities; coherent, integrated curricula; mentoring; cohorts; authentic assessment; and added opportunities for clinical learning (Daresh, 1997).

As previously stated, this study found that there is a large pool of qualified secondary principal aspirants in Iowa who are actively pursuing employment as administrators. The study did not investigate the perceived and/or actual quality of these aspirants. Rather than continuing to rely on aspirant self-selection processes, colleges, universities, and principal academies should take a serious look at revising and/or raising standards for those applying to and graduating from principal training programs, the better to ensure that the purpose of their programs is to generate strong leaders for student learning (IEL, 2000). This may better ensure a quality pool of principal aspirants to fill existing administrative vacancies.

Implications

The decision to pursue a secondary administrative post is in part related to negative perceptions of the position. This research has demonstrated that the time demands and nature of the position are especially barriers for these individuals' potential pursuit of the principalship. This research also demonstrated that these individuals desire an opportunity to make a positive difference for students and staff and to be a leader. The key for school boards and superintendents is to find ways to reduce the negative elements of the position while enhancing the positive. Several implications for practice are suggested as a result of this study.

First, school districts need to restructure the principal's role to allow principals to focus on student learning and instructional leadership and to face fewer demands for managerial tasks. Specific attention should be focused on the amount of time and the amount of responsibilities that are expected from school boards and communities (Hirsch & Groff, 2002). The concept of distributive leadership is one way of sharing responsibilities and the burden of the position so that additional time can be allocated for the principal to address curriculum, instruction, and other pressing needs (Quinn, 2002; Schiff, 2002; Supovitz, 2000). Principals will need to be willing to give up some authority by delegating some of their responsibilities to assistant principals, teachers, and/or office managers. A reduction of responsibilities should reduce the hours principals spend on managerial tasks, permitting more time to address instructional issues.

Secondly, school districts must better ensure that teachers moving into secondary school principalship positions are compensated adequately for increased responsibilities, longer contracts, and longer working hours. There is plenty of evidence that administrative

salaries have not kept pace with the overwhelming responsibilities of the job (Cooley & Shen, 2003; ERS, 1998; Ferandino & Tirozzi, 2000). Principals are realizing that on a per diem basis, they might actually earn less than many of their teachers (Asch, 1999; ERS, 1998). In many cases, the financial incentives are not adequate if the income of the spouse is lost because the educator must uproot his/her family in order to assume the principalship.

Alternative incentives for recruiting and maintaining principals may need to be further explored as a means of compensation. Hirsh and Groff (2002) suggest that incentives such as signing bonuses, housing options, and tax-sheltered annuities might be attractive to promising candidates.

The old model of self-selection of teachers into leadership programs may no longer be viable (Whitaker, 2003). The results of this study indicate that the encouragement of principals and colleagues does make a positive difference in people choosing whether or not to seek administrative licensure and/or positions. A study by ERS (1998) confirms that there is a lack of systematic recruitment of quality applicants; only 27% of its study respondents indicated that their districts have an aspiring principals program designed to recruit and prepare potential principal candidates. Special programs such as "grow your own" programs (Million, 2001; Stricherz, 2001), "aspiring principal workshops" (Petzko & Scearcy, 2001), or leadership academies for teachers who are interested in becoming principals can help to identify, recruit, and support potential leaders (ERS, 1998; Smith, 1999).

Data from this study indicated that males were twice as likely to pursue administrative positions actively and that females particularly believed that the lack of a mentor was a barrier toward their pursuit of a secondary principal position. Today's

aspiring school leaders need more support than ever from districts (Whitaker, 2003).

Aspiring principal candidates desire and need quality mentors and should have access to hands-on professional development within their school systems. Systemic efforts might include new programs, activities, or schedules that would support principal networking, mentoring, and coaching at the school and district levels (IEL, 2000). Research indicates that an effective mentor may provide reassurance, support, and be able to answer questions that students may have as they are making decisions about the principalship as a career (Bolman & Deal, 1995; ERS, 2000).

There was a distinct perception among females that hiring practices sometimes may be based more on a person's gender, age, or who a person knows rather than an individual's merit. Further efforts need to be made to educate school boards and superintendents regarding the attributes and characteristics of effective school administrators and to make them aware of effective hiring practices. Search committees often choose candidates based on gut reactions, and this over-reliance on feelings often places female candidates at a disadvantage (Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). Training sessions regarding effective administrator hiring practices and procedures could be provided by organizations at the state level, such as SAI or the Iowa Association of School Boards. School districts should also encourage women to consider administration by supporting professional memberships and conferences designed for aspiring and current women administrators (Vail, 1999).

From the respondents' comments, it is apparent that university preparation programs are only perceived as performing an average to above job in preparing potential principal candidates for administrative positions. The literature suggests that educational administration faculties should continue to pursue ways of providing real-life application

and relevancy to their programs of study versus the traditional collection of classes in order to best prepare principal candidates (Daresh, 1997). The role of the school administrator has shifted from a focus on management to being concerned primarily with instructional leadership (Murphy, 2001). Aspiring principals must have preparation that helps them gain greater knowledge of a variety of leadership skills and styles, best practices in instruction, and knowledge about the role of the school in a community. Closer partnerships between principal training programs and local school systems can link training with hands-on experience in leadership for student learning and collaborations with effective principals (ERS, 2000; IEL, 2000).

Today's administrator candidate is far less mobile than his or her typically male counterpart from the 1960s (Grogan, 1999; McAdams, 1998). Because there are a limited number of school principalships in any geographic location, the discourse of educational administration approves of individuals who are willing to relocate. Respondents in this study indicated that a lack of mobility or being geographically bound was the primary barrier in regard to their pursuit of an administrative position. Moving to another region might represent a career opportunity for administrators but will require their spouses to resign from positions that they enjoy and that contribute substantially to family income. Dual careers rarely allow the freedom to move around as freely when career opportunities are available. It also poses a dilemma to principal candidates with school age children who enjoy the community in which they live. Though little may be able to be done to combat this concern, school districts might begin to think of ways, in addition to or instead of simply increasing salaries, to make these positions more enticing to both the educator and spouse.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further study are presented:

1. Literature suggests that administrator shortages are looming in many states and at different levels of school administration. Because this study was limited to the state of Iowa, it would increase the current body of knowledge to replicate this study at a national level to understand better why potential candidates licensed to be secondary school principals are not serving in that capacity.
2. The data from this study suggest the need to collect additional information concerning the hiring practices for school administrators in Iowa. Qualitative studies that include interviews with those individuals who have actively pursued secondary principal jobs but had not been hired would be most informative. This data could provide a better understanding of the female respondents' perception "who you know is more important than merit" in getting hired as a principal or the perception of unfair hiring practices. This information may assist in understanding the organizational, cultural, and societal structure elements that might be contributing to the underutilization of women in the secondary school principalship. Questions about current application and interview procedures in school districts would be useful information for future applicants and school district personnel responsible for hiring principals. This information also may help determine if hiring practices are inconsistent/unfair or if the candidates who have been unsuccessful in obtaining jobs are lacking in some key skill areas, such as interpersonal skills or knowledge of best practices in education.

3. Although research confirms there are adequate numbers of certified candidates for the secondary principalship, there are claims that there may be a shortage of what school boards, superintendents, and/or hiring agencies consider to be quality candidates (ERS, 1998; McAdams, 1998; NESDEC, 1988). A study of school hiring officials should be conducted to determine what they consider to be a viable quality applicant for the secondary principal position. This study also should attempt to determine if there are any common patterns in the lack of skills or attributes necessary to be an effective administrator that are found to be lacking among principal applicants.
4. There is much literature to support the respondent's claims, in this study, that the position of secondary school principal requires a tremendous time commitment and that the role and responsibilities have become overwhelming (Cooley & Shen, 2003; ERS, 2000; NASSP, 2001; Whitaker, 2003). A study to determine secondary school principals' current responsibilities, the priority of importance they assign to them, and the amount of time they currently spend on each area of responsibility could provide valuable information. Secondary principals also should be asked what responsibilities could be assigned to others to focus on those responsibilities they believe to be of utmost importance.
5. A study related to the benefits and shortcomings of current administrative preparation programs, as perceived by newly appointed and/or current administrators, may provide some further insight as to their relevancy to the current position of secondary school administrator.

Conclusion

The interest to conduct this study came from the concern, aired in numerous studies and articles (ERS, 1998; IEL, 2000; Portin et al., 1998), depicting a looming shortage of secondary school principals on the horizon. Several studies document the reluctance on the part of qualified, licensed teachers to seek these important positions (Association of California School Administrators [ACSA], 2000; ERS, 2000; IEL, 2000). The purpose of this study was to investigate the reasons why individuals licensed to be Iowa secondary administrators are not entering the profession, and to identify factors that would motivate them to consider administrative appointments in the future. Based on the respondents' results, it was evident that a majority of Iowa's secondary principal candidates are actively seeking and/or intend to seek administrative positions in the future. This study found that males tend to apply for administrative positions nearly twice as often as females.

The desire to make a positive difference for students and staff and the desire to become a leader were the two biggest motivating factors for respondents to seek secondary principal licensure. This was especially true for female respondents. Other strong motivating factors for pursuing secondary principal licensure were to move up on the pay scale in a current position and the attraction of a higher administrative salary. This was particularly true for male respondents. Both female and male respondents consider the encouragement of a principal or colleague to be a motivating factor, but females identified it as a more significant motivator. The conclusion drawn from the respondents' reports was that female respondents were looking at a secondary principalship licensure as a means to potential career advancement or professional growth opportunity (internal, or long-term, motivation), whereas males tend to look at their pursuit of the principalship as a means to

bettering their environment and/or personal status, particularly financial (external, or short-term, motivation)

Respondents felt that being geographically bound and the tremendous time commitment of the job are the largest barriers preventing them from pursuing a secondary principalship. Both males and females felt that the position's negative impact on their families and the increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities within the job are also barriers toward them pursuing the principalship. Female respondents identified discrimination in age, gender, and stereotyping along with the lack of having an administrative mentor as significantly higher barriers than did males in this study.

When asked what changes to the principal's job description respondents could recommend, they indicated that the current financial rewards of being a principal are not commensurate with the job's responsibilities. They also felt strongly that the job needed to focus more on leadership than managerial duties, and that there were far too many responsibilities with the current position of secondary principal. These suggestions might provide great insight into the reason there appear to be adequate numbers of individuals licensed to be principals, but a shortage of qualified applicants for vacant principal positions.

Respondents to this study felt that their colleges or universities had provided them with only average to above average preparation to pursue an administrative position actively, yet they do not see that as a deterrent for them acquiring a position as a secondary principal. A more relevant preparation program may further encourage Iowa's secondary principal candidates actively to pursue administrative roles and/or change the perceptions of hiring agents regarding the quality of the available applicant pool.

In conclusion, there have been and always will be candidates who willingly seek out administrative positions. There is a current perception among hiring officials that many of the current principal candidates do not possess the skills to provide the necessary leadership for the 21st century (Cooley & Shen, 1999). The charge is for colleges, universities, and local districts to recruit actively the “best of the best” to pursue administrative licensure and to provide these candidates with preparation programs and/or professional growth opportunities that will prepare them to become effective school leaders. The end result will be that students, teachers, and school communities will benefit from the hiring and retention of exceptional leaders.

APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**Survey of Iowa Professionals
Holding Secondary School Administrator Licensure**

Login ID

* To begin, place your ID number I sent you in the right corner of the cover letter.

Are you currently serving in an administrative role?

Yes, I am currently serving in an administrative role. (If yes, please click the following submit button and thank you for visiting this survey. **Doing so, you will leave this survey page and not be able to get back.**)

No, I am not currently serving in an administrative role. (If no, please continue the rest of the survey. Thank you.)

Perception or Reality?

The Secondary Principal Shortage in Iowa

Thanks for helping with this survey on the secondary principal shortage in Iowa. While national and statewide reports indicate there is a shortage of applicants for secondary administrative positions, we know that there are a large number of people with secondary principal licensure in Iowa who are not currently working in an administrative capacity.

You have been identified, by the Iowa Department of Education database for the 2001-2002 school year, as an individual who is currently licensed as a secondary school principal in Iowa but who is not currently working in that capacity. I deeply appreciate your assistance with this survey.

As stated in the letter of invitation to participate in this survey, your responses are confidential. Should you have any difficulties in responding please email me at: tschutte@boone.k12.ia.us or call at (515) 433-0995 ext. 231 or (515) 432-2299. If you prefer to print your questionnaire and return it, please mail it to Theron J. Schutte, 1724 Timberlane Drive, Boone, Iowa 50036. If you prefer for me to send you a written copy, please request by email or call.

Part I. Motivation

Based on a review of the literature, the following have been identified as significant factors related to the secondary principal shortage. The purpose of this survey is to identify those factors that discourage individuals from seeking administrative positions. Please answer the following questions to indicate what you believe motivates and/or discourages individuals from seeking administrative positions.

A) What factors motivated you to attain secondary principal licensure? Please give each item a rating from 1 to 5, with 1 being little motivation to 5 being greatly motivated.

	Little Motivation	Below Average Motivation	Average Motivation	Above Average Motivation	Highly Motivated
1. Desire to be a leader.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Desire to make a positive difference for students and teachers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Enhance my job opportunities in education, but not serve as a secondary school administrator.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Develop my leadership skills for non-administrative purposes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Status of the position, more prestige in administration.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Move up on the pay scale in my current position.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Attraction of a higher administrative salary.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Encouraged by principal or colleagues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. To become an athletic director and possibly a principal some day.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. To only become an athletic director.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Other:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input style="width: 200px; height: 15px;" type="text"/>					

B) Which of the previously stated factors (Part I. A) would be your top three reasons for attaining secondary principal licensure? Please indicate the number of your choice in order of priority.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

C) Job motivation: The following questions will assess your desire to pursue an administrative position during and upon completion of your administrative preparation program.

- | | Little Motivation | Below Average Motivation | Average Motivation | Above Average Motivation | Highly Motivated |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. When you BEGAN your administrator preparation program, how motivated were you to eventually assume an administrative position. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. When you COMPLETED your administrator preparation program, how motivated were you to eventually assume an administrative position? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Part II. Preparation

A) To what extent do you feel these components of your administrative preparation program prepared you to become an administrator?

- | | Poorly Prepared | Below Average Preparation | Above Average Preparation | Above Average Preparation | Well Prepared |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Theoretical Preparation (in coursework) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Practical Experience (in coursework) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Practical Experience (Internship/clinical experiences) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Instructional Leadership Preparation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Overall, how do you feel your university administrative preparation program prepared you to assume a principalship? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

B) How many clinical (internship) clock hours did your college/university require you to complete to acquire your secondary principalship licensure?

C) What changes in your administrator preparation program would you recommend, to enhance its effectiveness in preparing aspiring administrators?

Part III. Barriers

A) Please indicate the extent to which you would agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Also, Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would be, or has been, a barrier toward you seeking or securing a position as a secondary school principal.

	Level of agreement					Significance of barrier				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Barrier	Small Barrier	Moderate Barrier	Strong Barrier	Significant Barrier
1. I am geographically bound and unable to relocate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I have negative perceptions about the role of the secondary school administrator.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I have little information on the positive aspects of the job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. It is an isolated position.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I lack an administrative mentor to assist me with an administrative position.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I lack a network of people in administrative positions who could assist me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. The position generally suffers from a lack of appreciation and/or support from students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. The position generally suffers from a lack of appreciation and/or support from parents.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. The position generally suffers from a lack of appreciation and/or support from staff.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I lack administrative experience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Level of agreement					Significance of barrier				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Barrier	Small Barrier	Moderate Barrier	Strong Barrier	Significant Barrier

11. I do not have adequate knowledge and skills to be successful as an administrator.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. I do not feel adequately prepared to be a secondary administrator.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. The salary increase does not justify my move from teaching to administration.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. I am satisfied with my current job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. I intend to retire in the near future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Secondary administration is a very difficult job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. There is tremendous conflict associated with this position.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. There are continual negative contacts with students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. There are continual negative contacts with parents.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. There are continual negative contacts with faculty and staff.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Level of agreement

Significance of barrier

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Neutral
Agree
Strongly Agree
No Barrier
Small Barrier
Moderate Barrier
Strong Barrier
Significant Barrier

21. There are continual negative contacts with central office administration and/or the school board.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. The position is highly political.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. The position requires a tremendous amount of paperwork.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. The position is highly stressful.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. The position requires a tremendous time commitment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. The position would have a negative impact on my family life and responsibilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. My spouse/partner cannot be supportive of me picking up the additional responsibilities of the position.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. The position lacks job security.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. The position is highly accountable for student achievement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. The position has increasing role expectations with competing responsibilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Level of agreement

Significance of barrier

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Barrier	Small Barrier	Moderate Barrier	Strong Barrier	Significant Barrier
31. The position is too far removed from the classroom and student contacts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. Age discrimination may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. Gender discrimination may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Preconceived gender stereotypes may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. Discrimination for ethnicity may be a factor in my attaining administrative employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
36. I lack sufficient "inside connections" to attain administrative employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

B) What changes to the principal's job description would you recommend, if any, that would make the job more enticing to you?

Part IV. Demographics

A) Please read the following items and check all items that describe you best. For purposes of this survey, a secondary school principal is a person who has served as a principal or assistant principal within a middle school, junior high, and/or high school setting.

- I have applied for a secondary principal position, but have never been offered one.
- I have applied and have been offered at least one secondary principaiship, but did not accept.
- I have never applied for a secondary principal position and do not intend to.
- I have never applied for a secondary principal position, but I intend to seek a secondary principal position in the future.
- I have previously been a secondary principal or administrator, but I am currently in a non-administrative position.
- I am currently an athletic director and may possibly become a principal some day.
- I am currently an athletic director and have no intention of becoming a principal.
- Other:

B) For how many administrative positions have you applied in the last five years?

C) How would you describe the current location where you live? (Please check the most appropriate description)

- urban
 rural
 suburban

D) What is your current primary position/employer?

- Teacher (please note content area and grade level/s:)
 Counselor
 Athletic Director or Athletic Director/Teacher (Please note teaching content area and grade level:)
 Area Education Agency Employee (Please note position:)
 State Department of Education Employee
 Other (please note your position:)

E) Have you ever been employed as a secondary school administrator?

- Yes (If so, for how many years?)
 No

F) Please indicate your gender.

- Female
 Male

G) Please indicate your current age.

H) Please indicate your racial/ethnic classification.

- White
 Native-American (American Indian)
 African-American
 Hispanic
 Asian
 Other (Specify:)

I) Current marital status:

- Never Married
- Married/Domestic partner
- Divorced/Separated

J) Age of children currently living in your home. (Please check all that apply)

- Pre-school
- Elementary
- Secondary
- Post-secondary
- None

K) In what year did you complete your secondary administrative coursework?

L) Please indicate your current highest level of educational attainment.

- Masters in Educational Administration
- Masters with principal licensure hours
- Specialist/Certificate of Advanced Studies
- Doctorate
- Other (Please specify:)

M) At what institution did you complete your coursework to acquire your secondary principalship licensure?

- Buena Vista University
- Clarke College
- Drake University
- Iowa State University
- Loras College
- University of Iowa
- University of Northern Iowa
- Other (Please list institution:)

N) In what year do you intend to retire?

O) Including this year, how many total years of experience in education do you have?

P) Please list at least three ways that your administrative licensure has enhanced your effectiveness in your current position.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Q) Please provide any additional comments you wish to add regarding your interest in the field of educational administration.

Thank you very much for contributing your valuable time for purposes of this research. My hopes are that your collective responses will provide valuable insights concerning what factors motivate or discourage licensed individuals from pursuing secondary administrative positions. The research findings will be used to recommend policies and practices that would make secondary principalships more desirable positions and/or hopefully encourage licensed individuals to more actively pursue such positions.

Sincerely,

**Theron J. Schutte, Ph.D. Candidate
Iowa State University**

Please click the following button for submission.

Submit

APPENDIX B. HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL FORMS

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Human Subjects Research Office
2810 Beardshear Hall
Ames, IA 50011-2036
515/294-4566
FAX: 515/294-7288

TO: Theron Schutte

FROM: Janell Meldrem, SM IRB Administrator

PROJECT TITLE: Study of Selected Individuals Holding Iowa Secondary Principalship Licensure

RE: IRB ID No.: 03-148

APPROVAL DATE: October 17, 2002

REVIEW DATE: October 17, 2002

LENGTH OF APPROVAL: 1 year

CONTINUING REVIEW DATE: October 16, 2003

TYPE OF APPLICATION: New Project Continuing Review

Your human subjects research project application, as indicated above, has been approved by the Iowa State University IRB #1 for recruitment of subjects not to exceed the number indicated on the application form. All research for this study must be conducted according to the proposal that was approved by the IRB. If written informed consent is required, the IRB-stamped and dated Informed Consent Document(s), approved by the IRB for this project only, are attached. Please make copies from the attached "masters" for subjects to sign upon agreeing to participate. The original signed Informed Consent Document should be placed in your study files. A copy of the Informed Consent Document should be given to the subject.

If this study is sponsored by an external funding source, the original Assurance Certification/Identification form has been forwarded to the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration.

The IRB must conduct **continuing review** of research at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but not less than once per year. Renewal is the PI's responsibility, but as a reminder, you will receive notices at least 60 days and 30 days prior to the next review. **Please note the continuing review date for your study.**

Any **modification** of this research project must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval, prior to implementation. Modifications include but are not limited to: changing the protocol or study procedures, changing investigators or sponsors (funding sources), including additional key personnel, changing the Informed Consent Document, an increase in the total number of subjects anticipated, or adding new materials (e.g., letters, advertisements, questionnaires). Any future correspondence should include the IRB identification number provided and the study title.

You must promptly report any of the following to the IRB: (1) **all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences** involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) **any other unanticipated problems** involving risks to subjects or others.

Approval letter
Page 2
Schutte

Your research records may be audited at any time during or after the implementation of your study. Federal and University policy require that all research records be maintained for a period of three (3) years following the close of the research protocol. If the principal investigator terminates association with the University before that time, the signed informed consent documents should be given to the Departmental Executive Officer to be maintained.

Research investigators are expected comply with the University's Federal Wide Assurance, the Belmont Report, 45 CFR 46 and other applicable regulations prior to conducting the research. These documents are on the Human Subjects Research Office website or are available by calling (515) 294-4566.

Upon completion of the project, a Project Closure Form will need to be submitted to the Human Subjects Research Office to officially close the project.

cc: Donald Hackmann

Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Form

OFFICE USE ONLY
EXPEDITED FULL COMMITTEE ID# 03-148

PI Last Name Schutte Title of Project Study of Selected Individuals Holding Iowa Secondary Principalship Licensure

Checklist for Attachments

The following are attached (please check):

- 13. Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
 - a) the purpose of the research & a statement that the study involves research
 - b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #'s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 18)
 - c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research
 - d) if applicable, the location of the research activity
 - e) how you will ensure confidentiality
 - f) in a longitudinal study, when and how you will contact subjects later
 - g) that participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject
 - h) contact information of the P.I. and if a student project, the major professor or supervising faculty member's contact information
- 14. A copy of the consent form (if applicable)
- 15. Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)
- 16. Data-gathering instruments
- 17. Recruitment fliers or any other documents the subjects will see

18. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects. If using secondary data, the start date will be when the PI has access to and starts to use the data. Allow at least two weeks for review of your proposal before your anticipated start date.

First contact	Last contact
<u>11/05/02</u>	<u>1/20/03</u>
Month/Day/Year	Month/Day/Year

19. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

10/22/03
Month/Day/Year

20. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer _____ Date _____ Department or Administrative Unit _____

Daniel C. Robinson for John Schutte 10/18/02
If the PI or co-PI is also the DEO, a Dean signature authority must sign here.

21. Initial action by the Institutional Review Board (IRB):

Project approved _____ Pending Further Review _____ Project not approved _____
Date Date Date

No action required _____
Date

22. Follow-up action by the IRB:

Project approved Project not approved _____ Project not resubmitted _____
Date Date Date

Rick Sharp Rick Sharp 10/17/02
IRB Chairperson Signature of IRB Chairperson Date

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Human Subjects Research Office
2810 Beardshear Hall
Ames, IA 50011-2036
515/294-4566
FAX: 515/294-7288

TO: Theron Schutte

FROM: Janell Meldren, IRB Administrator

PROJECT TITLE: Study of Selected Individuals Holding Iowa Secondary Principalship Licensure

RE: IRB ID No.: 03-148

TYPE OF APPLICATION: Modification

APPROVAL DATE: October 22, 2002

REVIEW DATE: October 22, 2002

CONTINUING REVIEW DATE: October 16, 2003

Your human subjects research project application, as indicated above, has been approved by the Iowa State University IRB #1 for recruitment of subjects not to exceed the number indicated on the application form. All research for this study must be conducted according to the proposal that was approved by the IRB. If written informed consent is required, the IRB-stamped and dated Informed Consent Document(s), approved by the IRB for this project only, are attached. Please make copies from the attached "masters" for subjects to sign upon agreeing to participate. The original signed Informed Consent Document should be placed in your study files. A copy of the Informed Consent Document should be given to the subject.

If this study is sponsored by an external funding source, the original Assurance Certification/Identification form has been forwarded to the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration.

The IRB must conduct **continuing review** of research at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but not less than once per year. Renewal is the PI's responsibility, but as a reminder, you will receive notices at least 60 days and 30 days prior to the next review. **Please note the continuing review date for your study.**

Any **modification** of this research project must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval, prior to implementation. Modifications include but are not limited to: changing the protocol or study procedures, changing investigators or sponsors (funding sources), including additional key personnel, changing the Informed Consent Document, an increase in the total number of subjects anticipated, or adding new materials (e.g., letters, advertisements, questionnaires). Any future correspondence should include the IRB identification number provided and the study title.

You must promptly report any of the following to the IRB: (1) **all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences** involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) **any other unanticipated problems** involving risks to subjects or others.

Approval letter
Page 2
Schutte

Your research records may be audited at any time during or after the implementation of your study. Federal and University policy require that all research records be maintained for a period of three (3) years following the close of the research protocol. If the principal investigator terminates association with the University before that time, the signed informed consent documents should be given to the Departmental Executive Officer to be maintained.

Research investigators are expected comply with the University's Federal Wide Assurance, the Belmont Report, 45 CFR 46 and other applicable regulations prior to conducting the research. These documents are on the Human Subjects Research Office website or are available by calling (515) 294-4566.

Upon completion of the project, a Project Closure Form will need to be submitted to the Human Subjects Research Office to officially close the project.

cc: D. Hackmann

OFFICE USE ONLY	
Project ID# <u>03-148</u>	IRB Approval Date: <u>10/22/02</u>
Oracle ID# _____	IRB Expiration Date: <u>10/16/03</u>

Iowa State University
Continuing Review and/or Modification of Research Involving Human Subjects

(Please type the information on this form)
 One copy of this form and changed documents should be submitted to the
Human Subjects Research Office, 2810 Beardshear Hall
<http://grants-svr.admin.iastate.edu/VPR/humansubjects.html>

IRB
OCT 21 2002

SECTION I: PI/Project Information

- I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree that all key personnel involved in conducting human subjects research will receive training in the protection of human subjects. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.
- Type of Submission: Continuing Review (fill in sections I & II) (Continuing Review can only be approved up to 30 days prior to the project's original approval date)
 Modification (fill in sections I & III)
 Continuing Review & Modification (fill in sections I, II, & III)
- Date of Last IRB Approval: 10/15/02
- IRB ID #: 03-148
- Title of Project (if title has changed since original approval, please provide both titles): Study of Selected Individuals Holding Iowa Secondary Principalsip Licensure.
- Funding Source: None
- Have key personnel been added since last approval? No Yes If yes, please list. (see part III for signature requirements) _____

Theron J. Schutte
 Typed name of principal investigator

10/18/02
 Date

Theron J. Schutte *by Don Hackmann*
 Signature of principal investigator

Educational Leadership Policy Studies
 Department

N243 Lagomarcino
 Address for correspondence

WK: 515-433-0995 ext. 231 HM: 515-432-2299 email: tschutte@boone.k12.ia.us
 Phone number and email

If student project:

Typed name of major professor or supervisor
Donald G. Hackmann

10/18/02
 Date

Donald G. Hackmann
 Signature

IRB Approval:

Rick Sharp
 IRB Chair

Rick Sharp
 Signature of IRB Chair

10/22/02
 IRB Review Date

SECTION II: Continuing Review

8. Have there been any serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences since the last review?

Yes, please explain. No

9. Previously approved procedures and measure will remain the same.

Yes If no, please fill out section III.

SECTION III: Modifications (A modification is required whenever a change is made to the approved project, whether it be a title change or change in investigators, resubmission of a grant proposal involving changes to the original proposal, or changes in the funding source, etc.)
--

10. The following modification(s) are being made (check all that apply):

Change in type of subjects (i.e. minors 14-17 to minors under 14): changed from _____ to _____.

Change in informed consent document; attach copy with changes highlighted.

Change in principal investigator; requires signature of new PI and verification of human subjects training, and signature of DEO for new PI.

New PI typed name _____

New PI signature _____

DEO signature *J. H. Sen*

Change in co-principal investigator(s); requires signature of new co-PI and attach verification of human subjects training

New co-PI typed name _____

New co-PI signature _____

Change in total number of subjects; changed from 476 to 456

Inclusion of additional key personnel; type names and attach human subjects training verification _____

Change in project sponsor (attach complete grant application for new or additional sponsor)

Other (e.g., change in project title, adding new materials)

Additional contacts of survey participants

11. Describe the modification(s) indicated above in sufficient detail for evaluation independent of any other documents.

In addition to follow-up survey response reminder that I will mail via the U.S. Postal Service, as mentioned in the original proposal, I also will attempt to send the respondents a reminder via email communication and/or telephone communication.

APPENDIX C. SURVEY INVITATION LETTER

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

College of Education
Department of Educational
Leadership and Policy Studies
N243 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-3195
515 294-4143
www.educ.iastate.edu/elps

November 4, 2002

Your code number: «Login ID»

Dear Mr./Ms. «Last_Name»:

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at Iowa State University. My dissertation research focuses on the topic of the **secondary school principal shortage in Iowa**. As you may be aware, various reports point to a projected leadership crisis in the state of Iowa. We are facing a serious shortage of individuals pursuing the secondary school principalship. The Iowa Department of Education has identified you as one of approximately 456 people, in Iowa, who have earned a secondary administrative license, but are not currently serving as a secondary principal. Your participation in this study is critical to assist in identifying why residents in Iowa, who have earned a secondary administrative license, are not currently employed as secondary school principals.

In order to conduct this research, I am seeking your assistance in completing a web-based survey addressing these issues. Please consider participating in this research by:

- **Going to the inventory located at**
<http://www.educ2.iastate.edu/database/Schutte/SchutteSurvey.asp>
- **Entering the code provided at the top of this letter**

The code identifies your district and your school only for web security purposes. Your responses will be kept confidential; your name or the name of your school district will never be used or published. Only Theron Schutte will have access to the completed surveys. Therefore, please complete the survey openly and honestly.

The results of this study will be used to determine if changes need to be made in principal preparation programs, what barriers exist to an individual's pursuit of the secondary school principalship, and what factors would entice someone to pursue the secondary school principalship. The results of this survey are of great interest to various Iowa organizations, such as School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) and the Iowa State Education Association (ISEA), who have a vested interest in the quality and quantity of Iowa's educational administration. When completed, overall results of the survey will be available by request to me at tschutte@boone.k12.ia.us.

The survey should take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete, **and must be completed by Friday November 15, 2002**. As an educator, I know how valuable your time is! Your completion of the survey is voluntary, but is greatly appreciated and vital for the success of this study. There are no consequences for not participating in this research study.

If you have any questions or concerns or would like me to email you the URL, please contact me (515-433-0995 ext. 231 or tschutte@boone.k12.ia.us) or my dissertation supervisor, Dr. Donald Hackmann, (515-294-4871 or hackmann@iastate.edu). Thank you for your valuable time and assistance with this project!

Sincerely,

Theron J. Schutte, Ph.D. Candidate
Iowa State University

Donald G. Hackmann, Associate Professor
Educational Administration

APPENDIX D. SURVEY REMINDER NOTICE/POSTCARD

November 16, 2002

Your Log In ID# _____

A couple of weeks ago you were sent a letter of invitation to participate in a web-based survey seeking your input regarding the **secondary principal shortage in Iowa**. Your name was chosen due to the fact that the Iowa Department of Education has identified you as one of approximately 456 people, in Iowa, who have earned a secondary administrative license, but are not currently serving as a secondary principal.

If you have already completed the web-based survey, please accept my sincere thanks! **If not, please do so today.** Even if you are currently serving as an administrator, it is important for you to access the survey and indicate so. I am especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your experiences that we can understand why individuals would choose to remain in their current positions after acquiring a secondary principal license. Again, your responses will be kept completely confidential.

You can access the survey by going to:

<http://www.educ2.iastate.edu/database/Schutte/SchutteSurvey.asp>

If you would like me to email you the URL for easier access, have difficulty accessing the survey, or would like a paper copy to fill out, please feel free to contact me at tschutte@boone.k12.ia.us or (515) 433-0995 ext. 231 daytime or (515) 432-2299 evenings.



Theron J. Schutte, ISU Doctoral Candidate
1724 Timberlane Drive
Boone, Iowa 50036

APPENDIX E. SURVEY RESPONSES/CATEGORIES

Leadership Vs. Management

I would prefer more contact with students.

While I know it would be difficult to do with all the responsibilities, I would still want that positive contact w/students that I get as a teacher. I want to believe in them and it would be difficult for me to tell someone who I believed in that school as now not an option for them.

More contact with students in the classroom would make this position more appealing.

More collaboration with counselors as deans of students.

The need to have contact with staff and students in a positive setting is next to impossible.

The principal can make the job more positive on his/her own by participating in positive activities taking place in the building more frequently.

I would need the ability to surround myself with good people.

I would prefer to work as a building leader and not a disciplinarian. Less focus on supervision of activities/lunchroom etc.

Go from the managerial style to instructional leader.

Less time supervising. More time spent improving educational practices, environment, etc.

The amount of time required by Special Education is my major hang up. As I interviewed experience principals, their greatest displeasure was the time and paperwork required by special education. I want to be an educational leader, a person who is able to enhance the efficacy of teachers. Paperwork is a detriment to that goal from my perspective.

All administrators should teach, therefore remaining in touch with innovative teaching strategy. Walk the talk on quality instruction, stay in the classroom at least part of the time or on a regular basis. I think we have some incompetent administrators currently because they wanted out of the classroom. High Quality teachers make high quality administrators!!

Less paperwork.

Cut the paper work trail.

It is not the leader's job description that must change but the entire structure of the school system. The system does not maximize the ability of leaders to lead. It maximizes the unpleasant tasks and leaves little room or energy to improve the performance of teaching and learning of students.

The job of a secondary administrator is becoming more and more one of paperwork.

Cut down on the required paperwork that seems to be growing by leaps and bounds.

The principal should not have expectations to be the educational leader, supervise all events, and keep track of the custodians, kitchen, etc. The principal should be focusing on being the educational leader. The other jobs should be hired out.

Areas that require so much paper workevaluations, curriculum, grant writing, staffing, daily purchases and other related things take too much time out of the day.

These types of paper and supervision duties need to be delegated to office staff/ or district trained personnel that could do these type of jobs. Giving leaders the chance to actually be in contact...to demonstrate...to model what teachers need to do was what I thought Principals would do. I never had that ability in either job I had in administration. I was more of a business manager making things work day to day...not for the future.

I think administrators need to maintain some contact with students in the classroom. Analogy: Ask any woman after child birth if they want to have another child . .yet another child usually comes. Too many principals don't understand the pain and hard work that is involved in being a quality teacher, as they forget what it was like in the trenches. Principals need to have some classroom responsibility.

Allow time for the administrator to be in the classroom on a more consistent basis.

Discipline needs to be administered by a separate person. In today's schools, administrators spend too much time dealing with a small percentage of students on discipline problems. With the added responsibilities of principals for the accountability of student achievement they don't have time to deal with discipline all day.

My principal's time is consumed with district meetings, evaluator training, and paperwork, leaving little time for interactions with students and teachers.

Stay on the pro-active side instead of reactive side. Get involved with the teachers in helping the students more. The administration is working for the teachers type attitude.

Instructional leadership and institution warden are conflicting roles that leave no time to do either well.

More time should be spent on being an instructional leader; in other words being a teacher, being visible, and being in the classroom. However, with all the other responsibilities it is easy to get overwhelmed. I have met few principals that were true instructional leaders. Either they put too much time (or were forced to put too much time) into other duties, or they were lousy teachers.

If it were not "administrative." I am a teacher, and I do not believe there should be the barriers that have been set up between those who teach or work in other capacities. I believe schools should be run more democratically with people in leadership roles still taking part in some classroom teaching.

Less state paper work. This extra paper work usually means more paper work for teachers as well as the principal.

Paperwork.

More instructional leadership work and less issues of discipline.

Too much paperwork dealing with special ed.

more emphasis on establishing a positive climate through a service leadership style and developing & nurturing appropriate relationships with staff, students, and parents.

I would like to see principals teach at least one class a day.

Simply being a school leader, ensuring for competent instruction without having to deal with curriculum alignment, grant writing, or being athletic director.

Each principal should have a GOOD assistant principal to handle some of the discipline and other small tasks.

More emphasis on curriculum and instruction. Less on top-down administrative directives.

More interaction within the classroom, but I think that is already available and some just don't make the time for it to happen.

Be the teachers' resource not their boss.

Eliminate, or at least drastically reduce the responsibility to attend activities and athletic events. This stretches the principal too thin, and forces him/her to juggle the work that should be done in the area of student achievement and leadership with supervision at activities. There aren't enough hours in the day to do everything.

Principal/Student involvement with clubs and organizations, walking the halls during passing hour (getting to know the students), involve more parents in the process of student behavior and discipline. Try to have a win-win situation with parents and students and faculty.

Assist teachers to become better educators and students to become more focused on their personal goals.

I would rather be a facilitator than the driving force.

In our district principals are away from their buildings a lot. I would want to be in my building and connected to my staff and students.

Stress, Conflict, and Lack of Support (Board, Community, Media)

Stress, conflict, and a major time commitment are job-imbedded I don't think the job could be restructured to eliminate these things.

Principals are just pounded with work and unappreciative parents the entire year.

Support by the public's perception of a school administrator.

There will be clear expectations for the job laid out each year and the principal will have the support of the central administration and board if these expectations are met.

Being caught in the middle between staff parents, students, and Board.

A change in the public perception from punitive to proactive leadership.

The fact that most situations are lose/lose. Everyone is unhappy, no matter the outcome.

The reason I wrote that I was neutral in some of the positions was that I feel that an administrator brings about his own results often times, but sometimes there are circumstances that one just can't overcome or beat.

Support from boards and superintendents. There is a huge preconception about principals and the lack of a working relationship they have with the board.

Superintendents and Boards need to work for principals, principals need to work for teachers, and teachers need to work for kids.

Student discipline and parent problems makes this job very unattractive.

Less expected from the community.

Less pressure from teachers, Supt., and school boards.

I would like to see more support, so the principal could spend quality time being an instructional leader.

Time Commitment/Pay

I am searching for an assistant principal position that has fairly regular hours. I have two young boys and a beautiful, loving wife. I treasure the time we are able to spend together!!!

Work less hours, higher pay.

You can't change-It's the time barrier. Pay also needs to improve.

The time away from my young family is a factor at this point.

Reduce time commitment (especially evenings). Make the pay significantly more than teacher's pay. Consider classroom experience in setting salary of administrators.

Principals should not be required to attend EVERY event that is held in the evening and on weekends. Secondary administrators spend an inordinate amount of time at the school. Supervision tasks should be handled by others, in addition to the principal or assistant principal.

The principal should not have to spend 90 hours a week at school doing all the extra responsibilities, I believe superintendents should be required to fulfill some of these duties.

Because of my commitment to my family, principal's positions would have to go back to a contract where you do not have to work year round.

Daily time commitment to do the job would have to change.

The number of hours required for night supervision needs to be addressed, especially with young administrators with young kids.

Higher salary, assistant principal position existing also, Minimal duties for co-curricular activities, lowered expectations for attendance at those same activities.

Reduce the number of evening activities that all principals/assistant principals must attend/supervise. I have a sophomore and a 4th grader. I would like to be able to attend as many of their activities as possible.

Being present for every activity from the opening of the school before breakfast to the end of the night event makes some days 14-16 hours long. Never having a real day off or weekend was too much for my family or myself physically.

Change in amount of hours required. Compensation that takes into account the increased work load at the secondary level as compared to elementary, middle and junior high levels.

A few quality hours at home each day. The long hours our principal puts in are not attractive to me.

Great reduction in attendance of outside sporting events to act as a cop. More respect of "family/personal" time.

Generally, the perception that more money(salary) truly compensates for diminish free time. Although hours are long, they are made longer in small to medium-sized districts with additional hours toward disciplinary matters, supervising athletic competitions(including away games in some districts)and a plethora of other activities and events. Few administrators, I believe, have adequate time away from their positions to refresh themselves personally to keep a healthy, balanced perspective on their jobs.

Higher salary. More Job security.

LIMIT THE HOURS!! There has got to be point at which we say it's okay and acceptable for a principal to LEAVE WORK! It's the only profession where it's expected for the individual to work overtime and receive no compensation or appreciation. Parents don't say, "Wow - look, the principal stayed extra." They just complain if the principal is not there for them to talk with at 6:00 at night. Also - the financial perks don't outweigh the amount of stress. Gee - I'll make \$70,000, but die 10 years earlier. Another issue under finances regards "perks"- in other professions you are rewarded with "bonuses" or "vacations"- this is all you get in education - a yearly paycheck with maybe, if you're lucky, a 2% per year raise that is nothing compared to the rate of inflation. In an economy were businesses are seeking trainable talent, why would I stay in education? Also, since so many contracts for principals have turned to year around contracts, you don't even get the perk of having the summer off anymore. That used to be the one thing that was a perk about being in education.

Less of a time commitment after school hours, during evenings, and weekends. Balancing work and family is a huge issue with me.

Reduced number of evening supervisory hours.

My principal works 11-12 hours days. I have no desire to spend my entire life at work. The 10 hour days I work now are more than enough.

Pay.

The difference in pay and other benefits is unfair, and I would not cross the line into administration because of it.

Better pay.

The job of running a school, staff and budget is tough enough as it is but to have all the evening and weekends taken up with activities is too much.

Requirement to attend all extra-curricular events.

Fewer outside of the school day activities.

Location and time commitment.

More money and less time required to attend night and weekend activities.

Same pay and more days vacation offered during the summer.

Creating more time in the day.

At times I was logging in 60-70 hours a week as an assistant principal. More responsibilities need to be delegated. My two reasons for leaving administration: more pay in another position, fewer hours, fewer responsibilities.

Less time commitment outside of regular school hours.

More money.

Time commitment. As a teacher/coach, we put in a lot of time. To be a successful principal, you need to put even more time. Some principals aren't doing that today which is giving the profession a bad name. AD's in some schools are paid less than administrators.

Just offer the contract. Not excited about attending all athletic events.

One huge problem is the time/energy commitment.

Higher salary, less paperwork and less days to work during the summer.

It shouldn't be a 24-7 job.

I was an associate high school principal for five years and decided to leave because of the time commitment that is required to attend extra-curricular activities. I was probably working 70-80 hour weeks. It takes a lot out of you.

Less after school supervision of activities.

The High School Principal has a hug commitment to weekend and night activities.

More help with game / activity supervisors so the principal or AD do not have to attend every single event to supervise students.

With supervision of activities the work week was often 65-70 hours, and seemed like it could have been 80 to get the things done that I felt were important.

Fewer after school hour time commitment.

I would not be willing to move from the upper end of the teaching payscale to the bottom end of the administration payscale at this stage in my career, and the schools' budgets make hiring someone with less experience for less pay attractive.

TIME COMMITMENT.

For me, I started the program as a single person, I am now married and have a child, and my wife and I (mostly me) have decided that it just takes too much time to effectively do the job, and raise my child the way that I think he needs to be raised. Before I was married, I loved to spend a bunch of time preparing for school, and coaching. Now, however, I am more concerned with raising my own child than I am with raising everybody else's. I still spend a lot of time at school, but no where near what I see administrators spending, especially in the summer.

The hours are terrible!

Location

A local opportunity.

Location.

Location.

Responsibilities

Fewer hats to wear.

Principal positions that were not multiple positions, athletic director, technology director, activities director, etc.

A more narrow focus on the principal's job description.

THIS HAS TO DO WITH SCHOOL SIZE. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR A PRINCIPAL TO DO EVERYTHING CONNECTED WITH THE JOB AT SMALL SCHOOLS.

Lessening the evaluation of teachers.

I do not like the new licensure plan for teachers leaving it to the principal to decide who should get a teaching license and who shouldn't.

There should be a person on staff that deals only with Special Education. Schools who do not have a Curriculum Director, as well as a special ed director would see a great change for the administration.

Stop adding more and more requirements without figuring where the time will come from. The evaluator training is a good example of this - 10 full days away from an already "full plate."

Is there a job description developed by principals? Is there a job description developed by teachers for teachers?

Evaluation Procedures.

Be able to delegate more work to teachers/team and have them get paid a stipend.

Hire more assistants.

Accountability issues are too broad for one person.

A more streamlined job description that did not have the building principal involved in everything from transportation to maintenance. A job description focused on student achievement and evaluation of staff.

The principal's job description can be different depending on the school district's size. I feel comfortable with many responsibilities so that I don't lose contact with students. However, larger schools break up the principal's responsibilities in order to improve performance and reduce burnout. I'm not sure it is so much a change in the principal's job description as it is finding a good fit with the school district in which you want to work.

Site-based control over the decisions in the building that the position holds responsibility. A partnership with the upper administration level working toward a common goal of student achievement.

I believe that the description of the job is more dependent on the culture of the district.

It is physically and mentally difficult, if not impossible, to fill the roles of educational leader, developer of curriculum, supervisor of teachers and students, and building manager. Assistants probably help, but most principals do not have assistants in rural Iowa.

Giving teachers and support staff more responsibility for their evaluations... making teachers and staff more professional... decrease amount of busywork involved in the evaluation process.

I believe that many of those responsibilities associated with the principalship can be shared with appropriate staff.

Fewer district responsibilities.

It is the overall nature of the work that I do not seek.

In a smaller school, there needs to be more than 1 person doing the job. It makes it very difficult to be an effective principal when you have to handle the budget, discipline, staff evaluations, student achievement etc.

Fewer extra curricular responsibilities, or shared responsibility.

What is the "job description?"

Knowing the district and the administrative team and district beliefs before applying for the job.

The Associate Principal job I had (for 3 years) included work in student discipline, instructional leadership, lunch/parking lot supervision., leading an athletic dept. in a school of 1100, and also periodic chairmanship of committees overseeing the implementation of a school improvement plan. The work was endless.

A need for more administrators because in my viewpoint they are being stretched farther than any person should be from a career perspective.

Not having the responsibility for the athletic events and the extra curricula activities.

Spread out the discipline load.

Evaluation of staff is overwhelming - way to time consuming. We need to let teachers teach.

Increase of support staff and a reasonably sized management team in the building.

Preparation

Built in mentoring component to transition into position.

I would recommend more site-based management involving members of the community, students, parents, and teachers. Often administrators lack "people skills." I would add a component that required more training in this area.

To serve as an assistant principal before becoming a full blown principal.

Need more hands on experience to attain the job.

Isolation

The demands on administrators are high and the 'isolation' of the position makes it more difficult. A team approach would be more enticing to me. I would actually prefer or consider a middle school or elementary 'assistant' or associate position. A 'team' of administrators, where each one on the team is assigned to their area of expertise. All other 'duties as assigned' were shared equally among the team members. etc.

Provide incentives to work in smaller districts, where there are no (or few) fellow secondary administrators.

It would be great if smaller schools could have an administrative TEAM that works together to solve problems and make improvements. Attacking problems alone is a fear I have.

Mentoring you as you are on the job. Helping you land that first job.

Outside Influences/Politics

With all of the red tape coming from higher places I don't see any ideas or events that would make the job more enticing.

It would appear that the principal needs to be a legal wizard in all aspects of his/her job. Leadership and education and teachers and students aren't the problem. It is the outside influences (political/government/family/you name it) that makes me question whether I really want to do this.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND AND THE NEW EVALUATION REQUIRMENTS WILL ONLY MAKE THIS MORE TRUE.

I feel that in this age of increased "accountability," it is imperative that teachers and administrators know the direction they are headed. That has become difficult with the state mandates and media directives. Educators need to have clear focus in what aides student achievement.

With increased governmental expectations and requirements, the principal will have less time to maintain staff and student contact.

State mandates need to be reduced to a reasonable time frame.

Make the job less political and confrontational.

State mandates tend to be a dog chasing his tail, something done 10-15 years ago only re-named.

One of the problems with administrative jobs today is having to wade through all of the State Government mandates and directives.

Keeping the federal government and state government out of the schools. The government is making the rules and they have no clue on how much time some of this crap they are handing down takes.

Less politics and politically correct expectations. More down-to-earth, common sense practices.

There are exceedingly more expectations with legislative demands that make the position more time consuming, and not necessarily more productive.

More authority in order to make schools safer and more effective.

Make it easier to renew a license. I keep up my Secondary Administrators License and my Evaluator License; I renewed both this past summer. The Education Department has new requirement for evaluator approval renewal, I had to renew---they didn't even have the new course named let alone the material to be taught for renewal. I took the hours for renewal and got a temporary Evaluator Approval Renewal for 1 year. Now where do I go and take this Eval. Approval Renewal Class???? Come on lets stop making hurdles for Administrator or want-a-be Administrator to jump through.

State standards would help. You should not have to work with state and local budgets that are broke. Job descriptions should reflect a state description and not a ever changing local board description.

Less paperwork designed to appease government entities.

Less paper work for the Dept. of ED.

The new added pressure by the state to determine licensure for 1st and 2nd year teachers.

Position seems to be in a transition mode and will be until NCLB is sorted thru.

Good 'Ole' Boy System/Hiring Procedures

There needs to be a shift in thinking. It seems that many old coaches get hired "in house" without even completing the Master's Program and those of us who have completed it and have been involved in multi- areas of need never get a second look. On the other side, some schools want experienced admin's and won't hire a "newbie", even if the experienced person is weak.

I would like to see something like a civil service exam as part of the requirements to become a principal. I have seen too many people of limited ability become a principal, and too many qualified people being excluded because of factors not relating to the job in the least.

STOP THE GOOD OLD BOY SYSTEM!! IDIOTS ARE BEING HIRED WITH NO BACKGROUND CHECKS AND POOR LEADERSHIP SKILLS.

No experience required!

My biggest concern was with the comments that state "Lack of experience."

I have been an athletic director for over 30 years, and I have interviewed for at least a dozen principalships. The reason given each time is, lack of experience.

When I applied in a (previous) larger district - It was "political" and only inside candidates that had political connections were accepted. Outside of the district, my lack of experience was a factor.

Hiring seems to be based on who you know, not what you know in this area.

If SE Iowa would view women in secondary admin. roles in a positive manner.

Fairness.

Of all the Administrative/Principal jobs I have interviewed for I have lost out to a male of similar background with less supervisory experience, except for ONE job (West Des Moines). Therefore I marked that gender discrimination as a high barrier. In Des Moines, there seem to be "certain" positions that you have to hold before you are A PRINCIPAL. For example, people don't just walk into that job, you have to be a MS Principal first & to

become a MS principal you have to be a VP or a Dean of Students first - if that isn't political I am not sure what it would be called. Whatever happened to the best candidate?

It is hard to get into a larger district even as a dean, and smaller districts tend to recruit the person they want to fill that position, or will not hire someone from a larger school for fear that person will leave in a year, or won't "fit" in a small school setting.

None/Content

None, I am just waiting for retirements to occur so there are administrative openings in our district.

None. I have had a secondary administrative position in two states for over 20 years. I now feel that my impact on education for children is best utilized by working in the AEA system. I am a Director in the AEA system.

A position in administration is very enticing to me. I would accept a position in a heartbeat.

None.

None. It is the nature of the position to be time and politically oriented. The negative aspects are probably balanced out by the positive aspects. However, the negative contacts seem more abundant.

None. I have no desire to be a principal.

Nothing.

I have no suggestions; just ask for a chance.

I wouldn't be able to fairly answer this question until I actually had the experience of being an administrator.

None.

I cannot answer this since I am not practicing as an administrator.

I am not interested in becoming a principal, regardless how attractive it becomes!

None, I understood the job as is and was very willing to do it to the best of my ability.

None.

None.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-36.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings*. New York: The Free Press.
- Alvarado, A. (2000, September 9). Future of school leadership open to debate. *Education Week, 20*(4), p. 12.
- American Association of School Administrators & The National School Boards Association. (1981). *Selecting the administrative team*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- American Council on Education. (1990). *The American freshman national norms for Fall 1990*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.
- Anderson, M. E. (1988). Hiring capable principals: How school districts recruit, groom, and select the best candidates. *OSSC Bulletin, 31*(9), 1-36.
- Anderson, M. S. (1991). *Principals: How to train, recruit, select, induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse of Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED337843).
- Andrews, R., & Basom, M. (1990). Instructional leadership: Are women principals better? *Principal, 70*(2), 38-40.
- Asch, K. (1999, January 8). Schools finding it hard to hire new principals. *Washington Times*, p. 9.
- Association of California School Administrators. (2000, June). Study confirms principal shortage in California. *EdCal 29*, (39). Retrieved December 3, 2002 from http://www.acsa.org/publications/EDCAL/EDL_06_26_2000/principals.html.
- Austin, G. R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. *Educational Leadership, 37*(1), 10-14.
- Austin, G. R., & Reynolds, R. (1990). Managing for improved school effectiveness: An international survey. *School Organization, 2*, 167-178.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Barker, S. L. (1996, June). *Market trends in school administration: The case in Washington State*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Washington Association of School Administrators, Spokane, WA.
- Baron, M. A. (1990). *A preliminary investigation of superintendents' perceptions regarding recruitment and selection of principals*. (Tech Rep. No. 143). Huntsville, AL: University of Alabama.
- Bauman, G. (1990). [Why do college students want to go into teaching?] Untitled monograph. Tallahassee: College of Education, Florida State University.
- Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: A metaphorical analysis from 1920-1990*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bedeian, A. G. (1993). *Management* (3rd ed.). New York: Dryden Press.
- Bell, C., & Chase, S. (1993). *The underrepresentation of women in school leadership*. Washington, DC: Falmer.
- Berg, O., Coker, W., & Reno, T. (1992). Motivation factors for careers in teaching. *NCA Quarterly* 66(3), 541-545.
- Black, S. (2000). Finding time to lead. *American School Board Journal*, 187(9), 46-48.
- Blackman, M. C., & Fenwick, L. T. (2000, March 29). The principalship: Looking for leaders in a time of change. *Education Week*, 19(29), 46, 68.
- Blount, J. M. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency, 1873-1995*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Borg, M. G., & Riding, R. J. (1993). Occupational stress and job satisfaction among school administrators. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31, 4-21.
- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 33-64.
- Bowditch, J. L., & Buono, A. F. (1997). *A primer on organizational behavior* (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Bowles, B. D. (1990). The silent crisis in educational leadership. *The Education Digest*, 53, 12-14.
- Boyer, E. L. (1983). *High school: A report on secondary education in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brathwaite, F. (1986). *The challenge for female educational leaders: An examination of the problem and proposed solutions through educational and social change strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN.
- Brewer, H. (2001). Ten steps to success. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22(1), 30-31
- Brimm, J. L. (1983). What stresses school administrators? *Theory into Practice*, 22(1), 64-69.
- Brown, G., & Carlton, P. (1980, March). How to conquer stress you can and cope with it when you can't. *The National Elementary Principal*, 53(3), 37-39.
- Brunner, C. (1997). Working through the "riddle of the heart:" Perspectives of women superintendents. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7(2), 138-163.
- Buford, J. A., Jr., Bedeian, A. G., & Lindner, J. R. (1995). *Management in extension* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Extension.
- Carr, A. (1994). Anxiety and depression among school principals-warning, principalship can be hazardous to your health. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32, 18-34.
- Checkley, K. (2000). The contemporary principal. *Education Update*, 42(3). Retrieved October 22, 2000, from <http://www.ascd.org>.
- Clarke, R. & Keating, W. F. (1995, February). A fresh look at teacher job satisfaction. Paper presentation at the conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, Anaheim, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED391795).
- Clarke, S. S. (1995). The future is now: What leadership skills do principals really need? *The School Administrator*, 5(52), 9-11.
- Cooley, V., & Shen, J. (1999). Who will lead? The top 10 factors that influence teachers moving into administration. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(606), 75-80.
- Cooley, V., & Shen, J. (2003). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 10-25.
- Copland, M. A. (2001). The myth of the superprincipal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(7), 528-533.

- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *The interstate school leaders licensure consortium : Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Crow, G. M., Mecklowitz, B., & Weekes, Y. N. (1992). *From teaching to administration: A preparation institute*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Curry, B. K. (2000). *Women in power: Pathways to leadership in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dareh, J. C. (1997). Improving principal preparation: A review of common strategies. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81(585), 3-8.
- Denscombe, M. (1998). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley
- DiPaola, M. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 43-63.
- Drake, T. L. & Roe, W. H. (1999). *The principalship* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Duke, D. L. (1988). Why principals consider quitting. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 308-313.
- Dunklee, D. R. (2000). *If you want to lead, not just manage: A primer for principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Dunlap, D. M., & Schmuck, P. A. (1995). *Women leading in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Edmonds, R. (1987). *A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED170394).
- Educational Research Service. (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship?* NAESP Online. Retrieved September 23, 2000, from <http://www.naesp.org/misc/shortage.htm>.
- Educational Research Service. (1999). *Study of the principalship*. Educational Research Service. Retrieved October 23, 2000, from <http://www.ers.org/ERSBulletins/0299a.htm>.
- Educational Research Service. (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need*. Arlington, VA: Author.

- Educational Research Service. (2002). *Administrators' salaries lack monetary incentive for the job*. Retrieved August 1, 2002, from <http://www.ers.org/news-02.pdf>.
- Edson, S. K. (1988). *Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Else, D. (1999). *Principal job satisfaction and shortage survey*. Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J. & Foleno, T. A. (2000). *A sense of calling: Who teaches and why?* New York: Public Agenda. Retrieved December 7, 2001 from <http://www.publicagenda.org/special/teacher/teacher.htm>.
- Fenwick, L. T., & Pierce, M. C. (2001). The principal shortage: Crisis or opportunity. *Principal*, 80(4), 24-32.
- Ferrandino, V. L., & Tirozzi, G. N. (1999). *Our time has come*. NAESP Online (Online). Retrieved February 23, 2000, from http://www.naesp.org/misc/edweek_article_2-23-00.htm
- Ferrandino, V. L., & Tirozzi, G. N. (2000, October 14). The shortage of principals continues. *Education Week*, 20(7), 18.
- Ferrandino, V. L., & Tirozzi, G. N. (2001, January 31). How do you reinvent a principal? *Education Week*, 20(20), 6.
- Flanary, D. (2000, December). Principal shortage drives creation of new innovative training and technical assistance programs. *Newsleader*, 48(4), 3.
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fuller, L. (1990). *Restructuring educational systems: Key organizational factors affecting teaching development and motivation*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- General Assembly of Iowa. (2001). *Code of Iowa 2002*. Des Moines, IA: Legislative Service Bureau.

- Glass, T. E. (2000, November 8). The shrinking applicant pool: Why the superintendency has become less attractive and what can be done about it. *Education Week*, 20(10), p.68.
- Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). *The 2000 study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Chan, W. (1994). *Thriving on stress for success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goldman, P., & Kempner, K. (1988). *The administrator's view of professional training*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED325979).
- Goodlad, J. (1983). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Grogan, M. (1999). Equity/equality issues of gender, race, and class. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 518-536.
- Gupton, S. L., & Slick, G. A. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators: The inside stories of how they got there*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press
- Haller, E. J., Brent, B. O., & McNamara, J. H. (1997). Does graduate training in educational administration improve America's schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79, 222-227.
- Hallinger, P., & Bridges, E. A. (1992). Problem-based learning for administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347617).
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1985. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32, 5-44.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1985). Instructional leadership and school socio-economic status: A preliminary investigation. *Administrators Notebook*, 31(5), 1-4.
- Hansot, E., & Tyack, D. (1981). *The dream deferred: A golden age for women school administrators* (Policy Paper No. 81-C2). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
- Hargreaves, A. (1996). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teacher's work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Harris, S., Arnold, M., Lowery, S. & Crocker, C. (2000). A study of motivators and inhibitors for men and women deciding to become a principal. *Education Leadership Review*, 3, 30-37.
- Hart, A. W., & Bredeson, P. V. (1996). *The principalship: A theory of professional learning and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hausman, C. S., Crow, G. M., & Sperry, D. J. (2000). Portrait of the "ideal principal:" Context and self. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 5-14.
- Hendrickson, B. (1979). Your job is hazardous to your health. *Executive Educator*, 1, 22-24.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The management challenge* (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Hill, M. S., & Ragland, J. C. (1995). *Women as educational leaders: Opening windows, pushing ceilings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Hirsch, E. & Groff, F. (2002). *Principals in Colorado: An inventory of policies and practices*, Paper presented at the National Conference of State Legislatures, Denver, CO.
- Holcomb, J. H. (1987). Boards must urge promising young school leaders to step forward. *American School Board Journal*, 174(5), 32-33.
- Houston, P. D. (1998, June 3). The abcs of administrative shortages. *Education Week*, 17(38), p. 44.
- Imber, M. (1995). What do educational administrators really know. *The School Administrator*, 52(4), 40.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship. A Report of the Task Force on the Principalship. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved January 2002, from <http://www.iel.org/pubsframeset.html>.
- Iowa Board of Educational Examiners. (2002). Secondary principal endorsement. Retrieved December 4, 2002, from <http://www.state.ia.us/boee/adminend.html>.
- Iowa State Board of Education. (1998). *Policy statement on the school administrator shortage*. Retrieved August 1, 2002, from: <http://www.state.ia.us/educate/stateboard/shortage.html>.

- Iowa Department of Education. (1999, November). Administrator shortage looms. *The Dispatch*, 27(10), 1-4.
- Iowa Department of Education. (2000). *The annual condition of education report*. Des Moines, IA: Author.
- Iowa Department of Education. (2001). *The annual condition of education report*. Des Moines, IA: Author.
- Iowa Department of Education. (2002). *The annual condition of education report*. Des Moines, IA: Author.
- Jackson, A. W., & Davis, G. A. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Johnson, N. (1992). Education reforms and professional development of principals: Implications for universities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 3, 5-19.
- Jones, B. A. (2001). *Supply and demand for school principals: A national study*. Columbia, MO: Consortium for the Study of Educational Policy.
- Jones, R. (1995). Picturing your perfect principal. *The Executive Educator* (17), 5.
- Jordan, D. W., McCauley, H. S., & Comeaux, J. B. (1994). *The supply and demand trends of public school principals and administrators in southwestern Louisiana: 1993-1997*, 1-12. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED375525).
- Kahn, R., Wolf, D., Quinn, R., & Snoek, J. (1964). *Organizational stress*. New York: John Wiley
- Kelly, J. (1974). *Organizational behavior and existential systems approach*. Chicago: Irwin.
- Kelly, M. J. (1988). *The Manchester survey of occupational stress among headteachers and principals in the United Kingdom*. Manchester, England: Polytechnic.
- King, D. (2002). The changing shape of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 61-63.
- Kochran, F. K., Jackson, B. L., & Duke, D. L. (Eds.). (1999). *A thousand voices from the firing line: A study of educational leaders, their jobs, their preparation, and the problems they face*. Columbia, MO: The University Council for Educational Administration.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Kreitner, R. (1995). *Management* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Laing, A. S. (2001). Why are school administrators in short supply and what can be done about it? (Doctoral dissertation, Drake University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 411.
- Lambert, P. (1989). Women into educational management. *Adults Learning*, 1(4), 106-107.
- Lashway, L. (2002). Rethinking the principalship. *Research Roundup*, 18(3). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED462732).
- Lea, T. J. (1998). A comparative study of the characteristics of male and female secondary principals and aspirants in the state of Arkansas. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 4021.
- Lee, J. D. (1998, December 23). Iowa schools facing administrator crunch. *The Des Moines Register*, pp. 8.
- Leedy, P. D. (1993). *Practical research: Planning and design*. New York: MacMillan.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1986). *Improving principal effectiveness: The principal profile*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Lem, R. W. (1989). Perceptions of school administrators and professors of school administration regarding the relevance and effectiveness of administrator preparation programs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 2211.
- MacCarthy, M. M. (1993). Challenges to the public school curriculum: New targets and strategies. *American School Board Journal*, 185(8), 37-39.
- Maher, R. E. (1987). The training of educational administrators: Perceptions of building and central office administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 411.
- Malone, R. (2001). Principal mentoring. *Research Roundup*, 17(2). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED453591).
- Mann, L. M. (2002). Selling the principalship. *Principal*, 82(1), 32.
- Marnik, G. (1998). Reflections on the high school principalship. *The High School Magazine*, 6(2), 4-9.

- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McAdams, R. P. (1998). Who will run the schools? *American School Board Journal*, 185(8), 37-39.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- McCormick, K. (1987). The school executive shortage: How serious is it? *The Education Digest*, (55), 2-5.
- McGrath, J. E. (1970). *Social and psychological doctors in stress*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (1990). *Metropolitan Life survey of the American teacher*. New York: Metropolitan Life.
- Miklos, E. (1988). Administrator selection, career patterns, succession, and socialization. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (pp. 53-76). New York: Longman.
- Million, J. (2001). *Study confirms powerful link between the principal and school success: Shortage of qualified candidate hindering the improvement of schools*. National Association of Elementary School Principals. Retrieved October 23, 2001, from: <http://38.202.153.34/news/05-05-01-02.html>.
- Montana School Boards Association. (1999). *A study of the shortage of school administrators in Montana*. Helena, MT.: Montana School Boards Association.
- Moore, D. H. (1999). *Where have all the principals gone?* Rochester, MI: Oakland University.
- Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. (1994). Redefining the principalship in restructuring schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 79(560), 94-100.
- Murphy, J. (2001). The changing face of leadership preparation. *The School Administrator*, 58(10), 14-17.
- Muse, I., & Thomas, G. J. (1991). The rural principal: Select the best. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools*, 4(3), 32-37.

- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2001). *Priorities and barriers in high school leadership: A survey of principals*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (1999). *Principals of change: What education leaders need to guide schools to excellence*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Center of Education Statistics. (1995). *The condition of education 1995*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Public and private school principals in the United States: A statistical profile, 1987-88 to 1993-94*. NCES 97-455. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center of Education Statistics. (2000). *The condition of education 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- New England School Development Council. (1988). *Administrative shortage in New England: The evidence, the causes, the recommendations*. Sudbury, MA: New England School Development Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED332260).
- Parkay, F. W. & Hall, G. (1992). *Becoming a principal: The challenges of beginning leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Patterson, J. (1997). *Coming clean about organizational change: Leadership in the real world*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Pavan, B. N. (1989). *Searching for female leaders for America's schools: Are the women to blame?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Scottsdale, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED321392).
- Pearlstein, L. (1999, January 5). Wanted: A few good principals. *The Washington Post*, p.1.
- Petzko, V. N., Clark, D. C., Valentine, J. W., Hackmann, D. G., Nori, J. R., & Lucas, S. E. (2002). Leaders and leadership in middle level schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 86 (631), 3-15.
- Petzko, V. N., & Scearcy, L. R. (2001). The recruitment of aspiring principals: A two-year follow-up study. *Connections*, 3, 8-18.
- Piatt, J. (1981). Stress and the school administrator. *Thrust*, 10, 13-15.

- Poppink, S. & Shen, J. (2003). Secondary principals' salaries: A national, longitudinal study. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 67-82.
- Portin, B. S., Shen, J., & Williams, R. C. (1998). The changing principalship and its impact: Voices from principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(602), 1-8.
- Pounder, D. G. (1994). Educational and demographic trends: Implications for women's representation in school leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration*, 3, 135-149.
- Pounder, D. G. & Merrill, R. J. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 27-57.
- Public Agenda. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. A report prepared by Public Agenda. Retrieved January 22, 2002, from <http://www.publicagenda.org/specials/leadership/leadership.htm>.
- Quality Education Data. (1992). *Personnel selections: Gender*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Quinn, T. K. (2002). Redefining leadership in the standards era. *Principal*, 82(1), 16-20.
- Regan, H. B., & Brooks, G. H. (1995). *Out of women's experience: Creating relational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Restine, L. N. (1997). Experience, meaning, and principal development. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35, 253-267.
- Riehl, C., & Byrd, M. A. (1997). Gender differences among new recruits to school administration: Cautionary footnotes to an optimistic tale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(1), 45-64.
- Schiff, T. (2002). Principals readiness for reform; A comprehensive approach. *Principal Leadership (High School ed.)*, 2(5), 21-26.
- Schmuck, P. A. (1987). Women school employees in the United States. In P. A. Schmuck (Ed.), *Women educators: Employees of schools in Western countries*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Schnur, S. I. (1989). The training of educational administrators: Perceptions of building principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 3438.

- School Administrators of Iowa. (1997). *The school administrator shortage: Leadership in crisis*. West Des Moines, IA: Author.
- School Administrators of Iowa & Iowa Department of Education. (1999, November). *Iowa administrator retirement intentions study*, SAI Report. Des Moines, IA.
- Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Selye, H. (1974). *Stress without distress*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. (1972). *Revitalizing the role of the school principal*. (Senate Report No 92-0000) Washington D.C: Author
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., Metzcus, R., & Burden, L. (1969). Toward a particularistic approach to leadership style: Some findings. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(1), 62-79.
- Seyfarth, J. T. (1999). *The principal: New leadership for new challenges*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1998). Wild patience and bad fit: Assessing the impact of affirmative action on women in school administration. *Educational Researcher*, 27(9), 10-12.
- Sheldon, T. D., & Munnich, L. W. (1999). *Administrative autumn: A study of Minnesota's aging educational leaders and the difficulty in finding their replacements*. Minneapolis, MN.
- Smith, E. L. (1999). Qualified but not willing: The problem with recruiting superintendents in Iowa. (Doctoral dissertation, Drake University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 2548.
- Smith, S. C., & Piele, P. K. (1989). *School leadership: Handbook for excellence* (2nd ed.). Eugene, OR: Eric Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Spooner, M. J. (1984). *The implications of the stress experience for planning and management in the primary school*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK.

- Stricherz, M. (2001, October 24). Despite retirements, 'baby busters' scarce in principal's positions. *Education Week*, 21(8), pp. 6-7.
- Stronge, J. H. (1993). Defining the principalship: instructional leader as middle manager. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 1-7.
- Supovitz, J. A. (2000). Manage less, lead more. *Principal Leadership (Middle School ed.)*, 1(3), 14-19
- Swent, B., & Gmelch, W. H. (1977). *Stress at the desk and how to creatively cope*: Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council.
- Tallerico, M., & Burstyn, J. N. (1996). Retaining women in the superintendency: The location matters. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32, 642-664.
- Task Force on the Principalship. (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Thompson, J. P. (1998). Principals perceptions and experiences with mentoring, reflective leadership development, and related variables. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 2809.
- Vail, K. (1999). Women at the top. *American School Board Journal*, 186(12), 20-24.
- Vandenberghek, R. (1995). Creative management of a school: A matter of vision and daily interventions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 2, 31-51.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Washington, K. (1980). Urban principals and stress. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61, p. 646.
- Wegenke, G. L., & Shen, J. (2003). *Has our secondary principalship become more diversified: National and longitudinal perspectives on gender, race, and ethnicity*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Whitaker, K. S. (1996). Exploring causes of principal burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34, 60-71.
- Whitaker, K. S. (2003). Principal role changes and influence on principal recruitment and selection: An international perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41, 37-54.
- Widmier, M. (1996). Groom your own for future openings. *The School Administrator*, 53(10), 38.

- Williams, R. C., & Portin, B. S. (1996). *Challenges of school leadership: The changing role of the principal*. Olympia, WA: Association of Washington School Principals.
- Winter, P. A., & Dunaway, D. M. (1997). Reactions of teachers, as applicants, to principal recruitment practices in a reform environment: The effects of job attributes, job information source, and school level. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 30, 144-153.
- Winter, P. A., McCabe, D. H., & Newton, R. M. (1998). Principal selection decisions made by teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 251-279.
- Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. S., & Munoz, M. A. (2001, November). *Principal certified personnel: Do they want the job?* Paper presented at the UCEA conference, Cincinnati, OH.
- Wood, C. L., Nicholson, E. W., & Findley, D. G. (1979). *The secondary school principal: Manager and supervisor*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolverton, M. & Macdonald, R. T. (2001). *The Pacific Northwest's phantom pool: superintendent certificate holders who do not apply and why*. Paper presented at the UCEA conference, Cincinnati, OH.
- Wolverton, M., Rawls, S. & Macdonald, R. T. (2000). *The superintendent pool: Realities in the Northwest*. Pullman, WA: Center for Academic Leadership, Washington State University.
- Yerkes, D. L. & Guaglianone, C. L. (1998). Where have all the high school administrators gone? *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 28(2), 10-15.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Throughout the process of writing this dissertation, I was often reminded of one of my favorite childhood stories, "The Little Engine That Could." Like the little engine, there were many people who provided assistance for which without their help, this goal might not have been attainable. There are many people to thank who have provided me with help, support, and encouragement toward the completion of this study and my subsequent degree.

First and foremost, my thanks go to Dr. Donald Hackmann, my major professor for teaching me that good isn't always good enough and for challenging me to strive to make this study better. My thanks go to Dr. Mack Shelley who introduced me to statistical applications in Education. He patiently provided me with support in the development of the statistical aspects of this study as it evolved into its final form. His teaching has also provided me with knowledge, tools, and ideas that have had a positive impact on the staff and students whom I have contact with daily. I would also like to thank Ching Chung-Shih and Maury Bousom for their technological expertise and support regarding the development and implementation of my Web-based survey instrument. Your skills and expertise in the technology field still blow me away.

My appreciation also goes out to others who have provided me with support in other forms including: Dr. William Jacobson and the Scottish Rite Foundation for believing in me and providing financial incentive/support to help make this accomplishment attainable; Dr. Richard Manatt, whose seminar class and wealth of experiences provided guidance in the process of writing my dissertation; and Mr. Tom Streba, my former principal,

administrative mentor, and friend whose positive words, praise, and belief in me have always stayed in my head and heart.

Most of all, I would like to thank my family, who have had to live with and without me through the years it has taken me to accomplish this professional and personal goal. My parents; John and Lois Schutte, who always had the time to listen to my frustrations and provided me with positive support and encouragement. They were there in the beginning but unable to stay on this earth for the end. I'm sure they are looking down from heaven with pride. My daughters, Marie and Maggi, whom on a moment's notice were often asked to turn over the computer and willingly did so in order that I do some work for this project. Last, but not least, my wife Conny. The list of things she has done for me over the last few years to assist me in completing this degree is endless but most importantly I thank her for giving me a kick in the back-side every now and then in an effort to motivate me to get this project done. Throughout this process, she has been patient, kind, and understanding. I deeply appreciate the love and support she has provided me.