An Examination of Potential Racial and Gender Bias in the Principal Version of the Interactive Computer Interview System

By

Joseph M. DiPonio

B.S. California University of Pennsylvania, 1993
M.S. Northwest Missouri State University, 1999

Submitted to the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy
Studies and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of
Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

_____
Dr. Howard Ebmeier, Chairperson

_____
Dr. George Crawford

_____
Dr. Perry Perkins

_____
Dr. Paul Markham

_____
Dr. Mike Neal

Dissertation defended: January 22, 2010

The Dissertation Committee for Joseph DiPonio certifies
that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

JOSEPH M. DiPONIO

Committee:

_____

Dr. Howard Ebmeier, Chairperson

_____

Dr. George Crawford

_____

Dr. Perry Perkins

_____

Dr. Paul Markham

_____

Dr. Mike Neal

Date Approved:_____

Abstract

The primary object of this study was to determine whether racial and/or gender bias were evidenced in the use of the ICIS-Principal. Specifically, will the use of the ICIS-Principal result in biased scores at a statistically significant level when rating current practicing administrators of varying gender and race.

The study involved simulated interviews of fifty-two participants who currently are practicing principals in a large, urban school district located in the southeastern region of the United States. Participants in the study were evenly split according to race, with twenty men and thirty-two women participating.

Independent t-tests were conducted to investigate the differences between race and gender and ANOVA analysis was conducted comparing results according to organizational level (elementary, middle, and high school). Regression analysis was also conducted on the subscales of vision, instruction, management, collaboration, and integrity, examining the influence of race and gender on the subscale score. The study revealed evidence of the possibility of some racial bias in the instrument. The research indicated that there were significant differences according to race in the content area of ensuring effective management of the organization. In this case a significance of .02 was found. Research indicated that there were slight differences found in terms of gender and organizational level. Regression analyses indicated that the variables of race and gender overall had a slight influence over the content areas measured by the ICIS-Principal. Race did, however, appear to be more important in the results than gender.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

It has been over 25 years since the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for higher educational standards in its release of A Nation at Risk, which served as a beginning point for America's preoccupation with standards based educational reform. Several years later in 2001, the federal government enacted a proposal from President George W. Bush which requires all students to be proficient in the areas of mathematics and reading by the year 2014. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 single handedly became the most important piece of legislation in education designed to increase accountability and student achievement. The backbone of this act requires that all teachers be "highly qualified" and all schools make "adequate yearly progress" (ed.gov, 2001). The changes in practice since the time of NCLB in addition to increased accountability have led to an attempt by American schools to find and retain the most qualified school personnel.

In addition, the shift in American schools to increased accountability has come with a significant shift in American demographics. At the time of the release of A Nation at Risk, the United States' minority population was under 23% (United States Census Bureau, 1980). In the past 25 years that same population has grown to just over 34% and by the year 2050 the projected growth of minority populations will exceed that of non-Hispanic whites (United States Census Bureau, 2009).

While this shift in demographics can be easily seen in the student desks in a typical classroom, there has been little change in the make up of school personnel. A 2003 National Education Association (NEA) study indicates that only 8% of racial

minorities can be found working in certified positions within the United States public school system. A survey conducted in Kansas concluded only 4% of the teaching population reflected minority status (Kansas Teachers Working Conditions Survey, 2006) This disparity between the racial and ethnic make up of the teacher and student can have a profound impact on schools and potentially negatively affect a minority population's ability to achieve "adequate yearly progress". The implications of an emerging minority population and a stagnant, and in some case declining, minority teaching staff, "create an imbalance that reaches far beyond what the numbers convey" (Michael-Bandele, 1993, p. 86). The mere existence of teachers of color supports the value of education and affirms the possibility for success in minority populations (Dilworth, 1990). In addition to this vital component, teachers of color can serve as "cultural translators" in the school community (Irvine, 1990). A teaching staff that under represents the diverse population it serves runs the risk of under-serving its population.

The selection of school personnel is arguably the single, most important job completed by administrators. This action can have a far-reaching impact on the operation and success of a school (DuFour and Eaker, 1992). In addition, the selection of school personnel can have a lasting and profound consequence for student achievement. Students in schools with inadequate staff do not receive a high quality education (Baskin, Ross, and Smith, 1996) and being exposed to poor teaching can have long term, negative consequences (Coady, 1990). Given the importance of staff selection, one would assume the process for selection would be refined and systematic throughout the profession. However, the practice of hiring staff has long been subjected to the differences that exist from district to district and has traditionally reflected the unique characteristics of the

individual districts doing the selection (Vornberg & Liles, 1983). School districts begin by compiling a pool of candidates through applications submitted, career fairs, and job postings. Some from this list of candidates will then participate in a screening interview: the most utilized selection device in organizations (Posthuma, 2002). A wide range of interview styles are used including structured, unstructured, and branching interviews.

Racial Bias in employer interview systems has been a source of concern and focus for improvement for many years. Since the beginning of standardized psychological testing, differences between racial and ethnic groups have intrigued researchers (Galton, 1892). While structured interviews significantly decrease the impact race has on the interview, race still plays a role. Studies conducted on the impact race has on interviews have yielded mixed results. Dipboye (1996) suggests that results may be inconclusive because: "Given the strong pressures on interviewers to appear fair and nondiscriminatory, the transparent nature of much of this research, and the reluctance of organizations that do discriminate to allow such research, it is not surprising that the research literature shows so little convincing evidence of bias (p36)".

This study seeks to determine whether gender and race bias might be associated with using the newly developed Interactive Computerized Interview System (ICIS) for Principals. This instrument represents the latest in a series of employment interview systems developed at the University of Kansas and supported by the American Association of School Personnel Administrators. While previous instruments have demonstrated relatively little gender and racial bias, The ICIS-Principal version is unexamined. The specific question involved is: Will the use of the ICIS-Principal result

in gender or race-based biased scores at a statistically significant level when rating

current practicing administrators of different racial backgrounds?

Review of Literature

The employment interview has long served as the primary data source upon which to base employment selection in most professions (Eder, Kalmare, and Ferris, 1989). For years it has provided numerous industries with information needed to make an educated decision regarding which candidate may prove to have the most success in their prospective field. Interviews have been most commonly known to involve a defined set of questions with expected or anticipated answers. The nature of these questions has ranged from specifics regarding job skills necessary for a particular profession to domains of characteristics desirable for a particular field. Success in hiring may lie within a combination of skills and characteristics.

Structured interviews have been argued to be the most reliable in predicting the future performance of an employee. Theoretically, if a candidate performs well on a structured interview, one could predict that they will perform well within the job they are pursuing. Conversely, a poor performance on a structured interview could be a predictor of poor job performance. Structured interviews are characterized by questions related directly to the job needs. Little deviation from the set of questions occurs, and a specific guide to scoring responses insures no variation in ratings of responses based upon personal opinions, beliefs, or feelings. This guidance reduces the chance of bias (Van Clieaf, 1990).

Unstructured interviews have been argued to have less constraint regarding the direction an interview proceeds. Proponents of this type of interview may suggest that this gives them the freedom and autonomy to discuss matters that are of the most

importance to them and their particular situation. Site-based decision making and local control over local issues have led school personnel to distinguish that which is most important to them, formulating questions along those lines. The unstructured interview, however, may take the shape and views of the person directing the interview, which may not reflect the best standards and practices that make a quality employee. Unstructured interviews result in question variance, lack of definitive quality answers, and a reduction in reliability (Antoline, 2000).

Branching interviews contain more structure than unstructured interviews, yet do not follow an order of questions or designed script similar to that of a structured interview. This style of interviewing does offer more freedom, but again, with freedom comes subjectivity, lending itself once again to decreased reliability and increased bias. While the follow-up questions that are a part of branching interviews do create a depth of questioning, they may not be appropriate for a screening interview situation. While all interviews will be subject to the personal beliefs, feelings, and background of the screener, the initial interview or screening interview should provide all candidates with the most objective review of their potential.

Research in the field of the employment interviews has led to many recommendations to improve the reliability and the predictability of results. Ebmeier (2002) suggests that the following improvements will lead to improvements in the area of interviews:

1. Base interview questions on an analysis of the job.

2. Include well-defined rubrics.

3. Use structured interviews.

4. Use multiple interviewers.

5. Use only trained and certified interviewers.

6. Use combination scores of individual questions.

7. Avoid contamination of the interview with ancillary data.

The Role of Race in Education

Since the inception of this country, race has played a major role politically, socially, and economically. From the earliest formation of Colonial America to present day politics and the election of our nation's first African-American President, the struggle to present a level playing field for all ethnic and racial background has eluded us. Wong (1991) summed up this thought in stating: "Racial privilege remains a pervasive reality in the United States, deeply rooted in this nation's history, traditions, and institutions" (p143). If this is the case, then landmark Supreme Court decisions dealing with equal treatment under the law can only go so far in rectifying the history and traditions that exist within our country, institutions, and ultimately public education.

Changes beginning with the Supreme Court decision of *Brown v Board of Education* brought about a forced shift in how public schools operated. As an attempt to legislate tolerance was mandated by the federal government and civil rights were formalized through the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a level playing field began to be established. While a change in demographics and the ethnic and racial make-up could be easily seen within the desks of the classroom, the staff racial composition picture continued to reflect a predominantly white faculty. As our nation continues to evolve in

creating a society that values all racial groups equally, work continues on insuring that race does not play a negative role in hiring practices.

The role an interview plays in the selection of a candidate cannot be underestimated. The vast majority of school administrators responding to a survey identified the selection interview as the single most important tool in selecting a candidate (Vornberg & Liles, 1983). Yet, the interview is only as reliable as the instrument and the person or persons conducting the interview. A flawed instrument will yield flawed results (Kacmar & Hochwarter, 1995). Factors that also may play a role in rating variance of an interview based upon something other than responses can include the background and experiences of the person conducting the interview. "Research indicates that non-dominant interviewees are more comfortable with, communicate more openly with, and feel better understood by interviewers of their own membership group" (Buzzanell, 1999, p. 256). The expectations that interviewers have regarding applicants based upon their own background and experiences with the non-dominant group reflected in the applicant "can bias the way interviewers think about their applicants, influencing the ways interviewers interpret applicant behaviors, altering their memory for applicant information, and, most important, ultimately biasing their final evaluations of applicant performance" (Judice & Neuberg, 1998, p. 154).

While a carefully constructed interview process can insulate an organization from potential claims of discrimination and bias in hiring, these safeguards are not a guarantee of an ethnically unbiased, objective selection process. The use of job related questions, a standardized interview process, and use of multiple, properly trained interviewers are identified as key factors in protection against wrongful discrimination claims (Gollub-

Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, and Campion, 1997). Bias still has proven to be

a factor in spite of best efforts to eliminate it. Physical attractiveness in particular has

proven to be one of the most consistent factors found to influence interviewer judgment

(Dipboye, 1996). A meta-analysis has demonstrated that unattractive applicants are

evaluated far less favorably than attractive applicants in both the lab and field and across

employment interviews, promotion decisions, and performance evaluations (Hosada,

Stone-Romero, & Coates, 2003). A laboratory study conducted on female managerial

applicants examined the impact the type of clothing had on evaluations (Forsythe, 1990).

Applicants appeared in silent videotaped recordings of mock interviews. Clothing was

manipulated between masculine blue suits and feminine beige dresses. Candidates

wearing the more masculine clothing were evaluated to display more favorable

characteristics such as self-reliance and decisiveness. In turn, they were also more likely

to be hired. In terms of bias based upon weight, Pingitore, Dugoni, Tindale, and Spring

(1994) studied the influence of applicant obesity. The study involved actors posing as

job applicants who were outfitted with costumes which made them appear obese. The

applicant obesity factor had a negative influence on perceptions of personality traits and

explained 35% of the variance in hiring decisions. The effects were more pronounced for

women than men. Meta-analysis of the influence of applicant race on interview

evaluations resulted in a higher variance of results for subgroup performance on less

structured interviews (Huffcutt & Roth, 1998).

At the fundamental level, the interview is a social interaction between the

interviewer and the applicant (Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). As such, the

need for study on how various social factors such as race, gender, socio-economic status,

9

age, and disability affect selection of applicants is clear. In cases studied regarding interviewer-applicant similarity, Harris (1989) found that when the interviewer and applicant were of the same gender, the interviewer began to ask more positive questions suggesting a confirmatory bias. This in turn may suggest a disconfirmatory bias for applicants of the opposite sex. The phenomenon of confirmatory bias suggests that initial impressions create a hypothesis and then the individual seeks out information to confirm the hypothesis. They may also ignore information that refutes the hypothesis (Dougherty & Turban, 1999). In the case of job interviews, if a recruiter enters an interview with certain biases towards a race, gender, or age, then a hypothesis may be formed and a confirmatory bias may be created. Philips and Dipboye (1989) found that when a favorable pre-interview impression was created, applicants received more time in an interview, increased favorable reviews, and increased post-interview impressions. Given the human aspect of beliefs, opinions, and feelings that surround the interaction that takes place with an interview, the structure of the interview and training of the interviewer are essential in producing reliable results. As is the case with any new instrument, a thorough examination of potential racial and gender bias should be conducted. This study seeks to examine whether the ICIS-Principal exhibits these two biases.

Methodology

This section provides a description of the instrument used for gathering data for this study. It also includes a description of the sample of participants used for collecting the data and the manner in which it was obtained. The study seeks to examine the racial and gender bias of the newly developed ICIS-Principal instrument.

Participants

Guilford County Schools (GCS) is the third largest school district in North Carolina, serving more than 71,000 students. The second largest employer in a 12-county area, Guilford County Schools employ more than 10,000 full- and part-time employees. Of the district's 120 schools located in both urban and rural areas, 67 are elementary, serving grades K through 5, and in some instances, Pre-K through 5. The district also operates 22 middle schools, 26 high schools, two special education schools (Gateway and McIver special education centers), two SCALE sites, which provide an alternative to long-term suspensions and Saturn Academy, which offers high school students a flexible schedule to complete graduation requirements. In addition, the district now has the High School Ahead Academy and the GCS Newcomers School.

Participants for the study were randomly selected from all principals in the district and randomly assigned to four interviewers who gathered the data through phone interviews using the ICIS-Principal instrument. Interviewers were University of Kansas graduate students and also practicing administrators in the Kansas City metropolitan area with significant experience in interviewing teacher and administrative candidates. Each interviewer was required to pass with 90% proficiency the training module associated

with the ICIS-Principal before the interviews were initiated. The training module

involves a simulated interview which respondents provide answers to questions. Trainees

are challenged to watch the video clips and respond with an appropriate rating.   Each

interviewer was provided with a list of 20 randomly selected GCS Principals to conduct

interviews. Prior to phone contact, the Principal participants were informed by mail

through Guilford County Schools that they had been selected to participate. In addition,

prior to the interview, participants were read a standardized statement informing them of

the purpose of the study, guaranteeing the anonymity of their results to Guilford County

Schools, and informing them of their right to opt out at anytime. Once this information

was provided, an interview was conducted using the ICIS-Principal, normal version.

While most did participate in the simulated interview, less than 25% of the selected

Principals did not respond to repeated attempts to participate.

Instrument

The ICIS-Principal is a derivative of the original ICIS-Teacher Version developed

in 2002-2003. The original teacher version sought to create an adaptive interview

instrument that would assure reliability and conserve time. The bases for creation of the

version for teachers were the national studies *Teacher of the Future* and *Praxis III:*

Classroom Performance Assessments. Using the research provided from these

documents, a guideline for the development of the ICIS-Teacher was created. It centered

on the formation of questions based upon four clusters (Working with Others, Knowledge

of Teaching, Knowledge of Instruction, and Knowledge of Content). Within each cluster,

a bank of questions was formed. To ensure construct validity, questions selected for the

use in the ICIS-Teacher instrument were associated with constructs found in both the pillar documents on which in instrument was founded. With each question came a specific rubric measuring the level of each response. Questions for each cluster would continue until the variance remained steady or the test bank ran out of questions. The levels of responses include Level One, poor answer, Level Two, moderate answer, and Level Three, excellent answer. The entire interview is conducted with the use of a laptop computer providing easy compilation of data and convenience of managing information electronically (See Appendix 1).

The development of the ICIS-Principal followed a similar path. The basis for the interview system is founded in the 2008 Educational Leadership Policy Standards, the updating of the 1996 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC). ISSLC established six standards that define strong school leadership. Those are:

1. Setting a widely shared school vision;

2. Developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;

3. Ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;

4. Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;

5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and

6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural contexts.

Within each standard, a set of functions associated with the standard exists. From this, one can establish a set of skills necessary to perform at a high level within school administration. This basis for job performance helped establish a bank of questions for the ICIS-Principal.

Initially, a bank of questions was created by four graduate students in educational administration and two professors of educational administration for the ICIS-Principal containing 140 questions in five broad content areas closely associated with the six standards established by ISSLC. The five content areas are:

1. Developing a School Vision and Culture;

2. Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program;

3. Managing the Organization;

4. Collaboration with Families and Community Members;

5. Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner.

Once questions were created, graduate students at the University of Kansas reviewed each one, selecting those that represented most closely the ISSLC standards. These questions were then reviewed by practicing administrators and teachers from Guilford County Schools for practicality and desired job performance and functions.   They were then narrowed down to a bank of 60 questions that were most representative of the job practices of a school principal and best aligned with the ISSLC standards. A rubric was created for each question, again based upon ISSLC standards, rating responses against ISSLC standards for best practices and research based effective leadership. Responses based upon the rubric were giving a rating based upon a three point scale. Similar to the ICIS-Teacher, the levels of responses included Level One, poor answer, Level Two,

moderate answer, and Level Three, excellent answer. Tulipana (2009) investigated the

relationship between interviewee preference of questions and and composite scales such

as the ISSLC standards. This study indicated that a difference in question choice was

linked to the varying school levels (elementary, middle, and high school). This study

assisted in the development of the ICIS-Principal.

Design and Analysis

       The purpose of this study was to determine whether racial or gender bias was

present in the ICIS-Principal through the collection of interview responses of practicing

school Principals from Guilford County Schools. Phone interviews were conducted with

practicing administrators in the Guilford County Schools. At the completion of each

interview, results for respondents were recorded. In addition to each interviewee's

personal scores, demographic information regarding age, gender, experience, and race

was linked to their scores. This demographic information was not available to those

conducting the interviews, in order to minimize potential bias. Scores of central tendency

were tabulated for the entire group interviewed, as well as the three organizational levels

(elementary school, middle school, high school). These scores were organized in the five

areas of:

      1. Developing a School Vision and Culture;

      2. Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program;

      3. Managing the Organization;

      4. Collaboration with Families and Community Members;

      5. Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner.

Three separate analyses took place in this study. The first was an analysis of results comparing interviewees according to race. The majority represented white interviewees. A t-test was used to measure any differences. The second analysis compared minority interviewees according to gender to the majority. A t-test was used in this comparison as well. Finally, a third comparison compared results of interviewees across organizational levels (elementary school, middle school, high school). An Analysis of Variance or ANOVA test was used for analysis of this comparison. A regression analysis was also conducted to measure the effect of the variables race and gender on each of the content areas of the instrument. These analyses will assist in the further development of the ICIS-Principal.

Results

Interviews were conducted between July and September, 2009 with a total of 52 practicing school principals taking part in the study. Table 4.1 summarizes the demographic information of participants. Table 4.2 summarizes the administrative assignments of those who participated in the study.

Table 4.1: Summary of Demographics of Participants

Number of Male Participants	20
Number of Female Participants	32
Number of White Participants	26
Number of Black Participants	26

Table 4.2: Summary of Administrative Assignments

Number of Elementary Participants	30
Number of Middle Level Participants	9
Number of High School Level Participants	13

As previously noted, participants in this study were practicing administrators from a large, urban school district in the southeastern region of the United States. Phone interviews conducted asked questions in the content areas of:

1. Developing a School Vision and Culture

2. Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program

3. Managing the Organization

17

4. Collaboration with Families and Community

5. Acting in an Ethical Manner

In these areas, a score was given for each response based upon a well-defined rubric for rating the responses. Responses were given a 1 rating for a minimal response, a 2 rating for an adequate response, and a 3 rating for a superior response. Table 4.3 shows a sample question and rubric from the ICIS-Principal.

Table 4.3: Sample ICIS-Principal Question and Scoring Rubric

Describe and explain some key characteristics of an effective school vision statement.

Level 3
Candidate displays a clear, detailed understanding of the need for statements to provide compelling direction, be engaging, motivational, meaningful--easy to remember, not trite and peripheral.

Level 2
Candidate describes generally relevant references to direction, motivation and memorability, but not in detail.

Level 1
Candidate displays minimal knowledge of the relevance and importance of vision statements to school direction and performance.

Results from each interview were gathered and recorded via a computerized interview program. The program automatically tabulates results and creates reports in a Word document. Questions for each content area were drawn from a pool of questions. During the course of an interview, questions in that category continued until responses demonstrated consistency measured by the standard deviation (0.575), or exhaustion of questions from the pool occurred (N>12). In addition to mean and standard deviation

scores for each category, a total weighted score and total score were tabulated by the system. Total weighted scores represent the average score for responses to all questions asked, while total scores represent the average scores from each category, not taking into consideration the variance of number of questions asked. They were then disaggregated according to gender, race, and organizational level. Table 4.4 summarizes results from responses by all participants in this study.

Table 4.4: Summary of Results by All Participants

Content Area	Mean	Standard Deviation
Vision	2.48	.46
Instruction	2.62	.36
Management	2.57	.36
Collaboration	2.55	.49
Integrity	2.72	.40
Weighted Total	2.58	.32
Total	2.59	.33

Results were disaggregated by gender, race, and organizational level. Table 4.5 summarizes results by gender while Table 4.6 summarizes results by race. Table 4.7 and 4.8 illustrate male and female results by race. Finally, results were separated by organizational level. The results are presented in Table 4.9.

Table 4.5: Results by Gender

Content	Male			Female		
	Number	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Number**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Vision	20	2.53	.47	32	2.45	.46
Instruction	20	2.63	.34	32	2.61	.38
Management	20	2.61	.38	32	2.55	.35
Collaboration	20	2.67	.49	32	2.47	.48
Integrity	20	2.70	.40	32	2.73	.40
Weighted Total	20	2.62	.33	32	2.55	.31
Total	20	2.63	.34	32	2.56	.32

Table 4.6: Results by Race

Content	White			Black		
	Number	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Number**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Vision	26	2.54	.47	26	2.41	.45
Instruction	26	2.64	.35	26	2.59	.38
Management	26	2.68	.33	26	2.46	.36
Collaboration	26	2.65	.38	26	2.44	.57
Integrity	26	2.79	.31	26	2.66	.47
Weighted Total	26	2.65	.27	26	2.51	.35
Total	26	2.66	.28	26	2.51	.36

Table 4.7: Male Results by Race

Content	White			Black		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Vision	13	2.55	.47	7	2.50	.50
Instruction	13	2.58	.37	7	2.72	.27
Management	13	2.67	.36	7	2.51	.42
Collaboration	13	2.83	.26	7	2.38	.68
Integrity	13	2.83	.22	7	2.46	.56
Weighted Total	13	2.67	.28	7	2.53	.42
Total	13	2.69	.27	7	2.51	.44

Table 4.8: Female Results by Race

Content	White			Black		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Vision	13	2.54	.49	19	2.38	.46
Instruction	13	2.70	.33	19	2.54	.38
Management	13	2.70	.32	19	2.44	.35
Collaboration	13	2.48	.40	19	2.47	.48
Integrity	13	2.75	.38	19	2.73	.40
Weighted Total	13	2.63	.28	19	2.50	.33
Total	13	2.63	.29	19	2.51	.33

Table 4.9: Summary of Results by Organizational Level

Content	Elementary Level Participants			Middle Level Participants			High School Level Participants		
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Vision	30	2.48	.45	9	2.52	.43	13	2.45	.54
Instruction	30	2.64	.36	9	2.65	.29	13	2.54	.43
Management	30	2.55	.37	9	2.76	.26	13	2.50	.37
Collaboration	30	2.49	.56	9	2.66	.41	13	2.60	.34
Integrity	30	2.69	.48	9	2.83	.17	13	2.73	.28
Weighted Total	30	2.57	.35	9	2.68	.17	13	2.55	.33
Total	30	2.57	.37	9	2.68	.15	13	2.56	.33

The means of each content area as well as weighted and unweighted total scores were compared for both gender and race using an independent samples t-test. The resulting analyses are presented in Table 4.10 and Table 4.11.

Table 4.10: Mean, Standard Deviation, and t-test Differences Between Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
				Group Statistics				
Vision	Male	20	2.53	.47	.10	.64	.53	.09
	Female	32	2.44	.46	.08			
Instruction	Male	20	2.63	.34	.07	.23	.53	.02
	Female	32	2.61	.38	.06			
Management	Male	20	2.61	.38	.08	.64	.52	.06
	Female	32	2.55	.35	.06			
Collaboration	Male	20	2.67	.49	.11	1.46	.16	.20
	Female	32	2.47	.48	.09			
Integrity	Male	20	2.70	.40	.09	-.28	.78	-.03
	Female	32	2.73	.40	.07			
Weighted Total	Male	20	2.62	.33	.07	.75	.46	.07
	Female	32	2.55	.31	.05			
Average	Male	20	2.63	.34	.08	.73	.47	.07
	Female	32	2.56	.32	.06			

Table 4.11: Mean, Standard Deviation, and t-test Differences Between Race

	Race	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
				Group Statistics				
Vision	White	26	2.54	.47	.09	1.04	.30	.13
	Black	26	2.41	.45	.08			
Instruction	White	26	2.64	.34	.06	.54	.59	.06
	Black	26	2.58	.37	.07			
Management	White	26	2.68	.33	.06	2.32	.02	.22
	Black	26	2.46	.36	.07			
Collaboration	White	26	2.65	.37	.07	1.58	.12	.21
	Black	26	2.44	.56	.11			
Integrity	White	26	2.79	.30	.06	1.21	.23	.13
	Black	26	2.66	.46	.09			
Weighted Total	White	26	2.65	.27	.05	1.64	.11	.14
	Black	26	2.50	.34	.06			
Average	White	26	2.66	.27	.05	1.70	.10	.15
	Black	26	2.51	.35	.07			

In this study, 30 participants were Elementary Principals, 9 Middle School Principals,

and 13 High School Principals.   An ANOVA one-way analysis was used to compare the

means of the three groups. Table 4.12 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 4.12: ANOVA Comparison of Elementary, Middle, And High School Participants

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Vision	Between Groups	.02	2	.01	.05	.94
	Within Groups	10.82	49	.22		
	Total	10.85	51			
Instruction	Between Groups	.09	2	.04	.36	.69
	Within Groups	6.58	49	.13		
	Total	6.68	51			
Management	Between Groups	.41	2	.20	1.62	.20
	Within Groups	6.22	49	.12		
	Total	6.63	51			
Collaboration	Between Groups	.24	2	.12	.50	.60
	Within Groups	11.94	49	.24		
	Total	12.19	51			
Integrity	Between Groups	.13	2	.06	.41	.66
	Within Groups	7.92	49	.16		
	Total	8.06	51			
Weighted Total	Between Groups	.10	2	.05	.50	.60
	Within Groups	5.00	49	.10		
	Total	5.11	51			
Total Average	Between Groups	.10	2	.05	.46	.62
	Within Groups	5.33	49	.10		
	Total	5.44	51			

Lastly, regression analysis was run with the content areas of the ICIS-Principal, developing a school vision and culture, developing and maintaining the instructional program, managing the organization, collaboration with families and community, and acting in an ethical manner as the dependent variables and race and gender as the independent variables. In these statistical analyses, each content area was the focus of a regression analysis when looking at how they were influenced by both race and gender combined. Tables 4.13-4.19 summarize the findings.

Table 4.13: Regression Analysis with Vision as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.15				
R Square	.02				
Adjusted R Square	-.01				
Standard Error	.46				
ANOVA					
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Regression	2	.26	.13	.61	.54
Residual	49	10.58	.21		
Total	51	10.85			
	Unstandardized		*Standardized Coefficient*		
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig*
Constant	2.74	.26		10.27	.00
Race	-.12	.13	-.13	-.90	.36
Gender	-.05	.13	-.05	-.40	.68

Table 4.14: Regression Analysis with Instruction as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.07
R Square	.00
Adjusted R Square	-.03
Standard Error	.36

ANOVA

	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Regression	2	.04	.02	.15	.86
Residual	49	6.63	.13		
Total	51	6.68			

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
Constant	2.71	.21		12.80	.00
Race	-.05	.10	-.07	-.50	.61
Gender	-.01	.10	-.01	-.09	.92

Table 4.15: Regression Analysis with Management as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.31
R Square	.09
Adjusted R Square	.06
Standard Error	.35

ANOVA

	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Regression	2	.64	.32	.2.64	.08
Residual	49	5.98	.12		
Total	51	6.63			

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
Constant	2.92	.20		14.52	.00
Race	-.22	.10	-.30	-2.20	.03
Gender	-.01	.10	-.01	-.12	.90

Table 4.16: Regression Analysis with Collaboration as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.26				
R Square	.07				
Adjusted R Square	.03				
Standard Error	.48				

ANOVA					
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Regression	2	.86	.43	1.86	.16
Residual	49	11.33	.23		
Total	51	12.19			

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig*
Constant	3.06	.27		11.06	.00
Race	-.17	.13	-.18	-1.28	.20
Gender	-.15	.14	-.15	-1.10	.27

Table 4.17: Regression Analysis with Integrity as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.18				
R Square	.03				
Adjusted R Square	-.00				
Standard Error	.39				

ANOVA					
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Regression	2	.28	.14	.89	.41
Residual	49	7.77	.15		
Total	51	8.06			

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig*
Constant	2.83	.22		12.36	.00
Race	-.14	.11	-.18	-1.30	.19
Gender	.06	.11	.08	.58	.56

Table 4.18: Regression Analysis with Weighted Total Scores as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.23				
R Square	.05				
Adjusted R Square	.01				
Standard Error	.31				

ANOVA					
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Regression	2	.27	.13	1.40	.25
Residual	49	4.83	.09		
Total	51	5.11			

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig*
Constant	2.83	.18		15.70	.00
Race	-.13	.09	-.21	-1.49	.14
Gender	-.03	.09	-.05	-.38	.70

Table 4.19: Regression Analysis with Total Scores as the Dependent Variable and Race and Gender as the Independent Variables

Multiple R	.23				
R Square	.05				
Adjusted R Square	.01				
Standard Error	.32				

ANOVA					
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Regression	2	.30	.15	1.47	.23
Residual	49	5.13	.10		
Total	51	5.44			

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig*
Constant	2.85	.18		15.33	.00
Race	-.14	.09	-.22	-1.55	.12
Gender	-.03	.09	-.05	-.34	.72

Based upon the observations of Tables 4.13-4.19, minor findings were discovered in terms of impact of race and gender upon most of the scaled content areas, with the exception of the results displayed in Table 4.15. In terms of the results from Table 4.15, race seems to have had significant influence in terms of the variance of responses rated from the content area of Management. Regression analyses indicate that race may be more important than gender in terms of influencing results. The R square values, which reflect the percent of variance, indicate that race and gender combined have approximately a one to five percent impact on the total results. A six to ten percent R square value would suggest that six to ten percent of the variance is influenced by gender and race.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the Interactive Computerized Interview System-Principal Version would return results that were free of gender and race bias when utilized by administrators in interviews of practicing principals. Independent t-tests were performed to investigate the differences between races and genders while ANOVA analyses were completed comparing results according to organizational level (grade configurations). Regression analyses were completed on each of the 5 subscales (Vision, Instruction, Management, Collaboration, Integrity) plus the weighted and un-weighted total scores with race and gender serving as the predictor variables. Results indicated that there was one statistically significant difference according to race, that being the subscale of ensuring effective management of the organization. In this case a significance level of .02 was found. Research indicated that there were no significant differences found in terms of gender and organizational level. Regression analyses indicated that the variables of race and gender had little influence over 4 of 5 the subscales measured by the ICIS-Principal, with the subscale of Management showing clear differences with race. Based upon the patterns seen in the results of this study, further study to examine the influence of bias on the results of the instrument is warranted. Studies conducted regarding the utilization of the ICIS-Teacher regarding bias in selection have produced results indicating a lack of bias. Lee (2005) conducted a study in which there was no significance in the difference between male and female responses on the original ICIS-Teacher. Dennis (2007) examined racial bias in the use of the ICIS-Teacher with little significance in the difference between minority and majority respondents.

31

The presence of a statistically significant difference in the subscale of ensuring effective management of the organization can suggest the possibility of instrument bias. It may also, however, suggest the possibility of instrument error, a bias in the interviewers providing the ratings, or possibly an error in measurement given the limitations of both the number of subjects involved and the relative inexperience of the raters, even though the had successful attained a proficient level in rating based upon the training module. Differences in the sample may also have contributed to the results.

In terms of practical application, the utilization of the ICIS-Principal provides the interviewer with a number of advantages. First, the rating of applicants based upon job performance skills necessary for proficiency in the position create a focus on what is most important to ask about the Principal position. Second, the utilization of available technology provides the interviewer with an easy format to follow in terms of questioning the candidate. Third, the program produces and instant report that allows for data collection and storage to occur immediately and in an organized, consistent fashion. If these results are consistently produced in a reliable and valid fashion, the ICIS-Principal can be a useful tool in selecting a Principal.

Limitations of Study

While this study provides insight into the potential bias existing in the usage of the ICIS-Principal, it is not intended to provide a comprehensive understanding of the system and is subjected to certain limitations. First, an increase in the sample size, particularly at the organizational level would provide for less of an opportunity for error in the findings. The current study examined 52 participants; however, only 9 were from

the middle school level and 13 from the high school level. An increase in those numbers may provide a better opportunity to look into differences that may exist at the organizational level. Second, conducting interviews over the phone may have resulted in a more objective mind-set than the interviewers would have had if they were conducting these ratings face to face. The potential for exposing rater bias would certainly be more possible if the persons interacting were doing so in a setting where appearances were clear to the person conducting the interview.

Finally, while the persons conducting the interviews and collecting the data had passed a proficiency training requirement prior to engaging in the study, they were relatively new to administering ICIS-Principal. As a result of this inexperience in using the tool, the possibility may have increased that those rating responses may have erred in some of their ratings. It is reasonable to conjecture that a more experienced user of the ICIS may produce results that more closely reflect an accurate account of responses given by an interviewee. The results of this study may have therefore resulted in rating responses higher or lower than they should have been.

Recommendation for Further Study

While many studies have been conducted examining the use and results of the ICIS-Teacher, there has been relatively little research completed exploring the use and results accomplished with the ICIS-Principal. With the relationship that exists between the University of Kansas and Guilford County Schools in regard to the use of the ICIS reciprocal access to district administrators for future study, an opportunity exists to study the use, validity, and reliability of the ICIS-Principal. Several possible study questions

can now be considered given the data that has been collected. Comparison of results from ICIS-Principal to job performance evaluations, ICIS-Principal results to teacher ratings, and ICIS-Principal results to student achievement levels would be a few suggestions for worthwhile studies.

As mentioned previously, the interview of a candidate is an essential and important job task. The result of hiring the right person can certainly enhance any organization. Given the importance of this task, it is essential that the process result in rating candidates as closely to their future job performance as possible. The ICIS-Principal appears to provide a district level administrator with another method in which to select a candidate for a building Principalship. It, combined with other important strategies for hiring the best candidate can produce selection that is free of bias and possibly the prediction of job performance.

References

Alcock, M. & Ryan, P. (2002). Personal and Interpersonal Attributes in Selecting Teachers. Action in Teacher Education

Allhouse, T. (2003). Construct validity of the knowledge of content scale from the AASPA Interactive Computer Interview Instrument, unpublished dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Antoline, C.M. (2000). A validation study of the Teacher Perceiver Interview, Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Woman's University.

Baskin, M.K., Ross, M.R., Smith, D.L. (1996). "Selecting successful teachers: The predictive validity of the urban teacher selection interview." The Teacher Educator, 32, 1-21.

Buzzanell, P.M. (1999). Tensions and Burdens in Employment Interviewing Processes: Perspectives of Non-Dominant Group Applicants. *The Journal of Buisness Communication, 36* (2) 134+.

Campion, M., Palmer, D., & Campion, J. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 655-702.

Coady, S. (1990). "How to hire good faculty". Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Teaching Excellence and Conference of Administrators. (May 20-23).

Conway, JM, Jako, RA, and Goodman, DF. (1995). A meta-analysis of interrater and internal consistency reliability of selection interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*: 565—579.

Conwell SL. (1991). Inferential judgment in the employment interview. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts Internationa4 52, 1428.

Danielson, C. (1996). Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T.L. (2000) Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dennis, D. (2007). Racial Bias of Building Administrators' Ratings of Teacher
Applicants Using the Interactive Computerized Interview System. University of
Kansas. Lawrence, Kansas.

Dilworth, M. E. (1990). Reading between the lines: Teachers and their racial/ethnic
cultures. (Teacher Education Monograph No. 11). Washington, DC: ERIC
Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education. ED 322 148

Dipboye, R. (1982). The relationship of interviewers' preinterview impressions to
to selection and recruitment outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 43(4), 745-68.

Dipboye, R.L. (1994) Structured and Unstructured selection interviews: Beyond the job
fit model. In G.R. Ferris, (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources
Management:* Vol. 12 (79-123). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Dipboye, R.L. & Gaugler, B.B. (1993). Cognitive and behavioral processes in the
selection interview. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman. Associates (Eds.), *Personnel
Selection in Organizations* (135-170). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Dougherty, T.W., & Turban, D.B., (1999). *Behavioral confirmation of interviewer
expectations.* In R.W. Eder & M.M. Harris (Eds.), The Employment Interview
Handbook (Revised Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. (1992). Creating the New American School: A Principal's
Guide to School Improvement. New Education Service, Bloomington, IN

Ebmeier, H. (2003). Technical Manual AASPA Interviewing System. Olathe, Kansas:
American Association of School Personnel Adminstrators

Eder, R.W. & Ferris, G.R., (1989). The Employment Interview: Theory, Research, and
Practice. Sage Publications: Newbury Park, CA.

Educational Testing Service. (1994). PRAXIS III. Princeton, NJ.

Emley, K., & Ebmeier, H., (1997). The effect of employment interview format on
principals' evaluations of teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in
Education*, 11, 39-56.

Evans, L. (2004). Construct validity of the working with others scale from the AASPA
Interactive Computer Interview Instrument, unpublished dissertation, University
of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Forsythe, S.M. (1990). Effects of applicant's clothing on interviewer's decision to hire. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 20,* 1579-1595

Galton, F. (1892). Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences. London: Macmillan.

Green, PC, Alter, P, and Carr, AF. (1993). Development of standard anchors for scoring generic past-behaviour questions in structured interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 1*: 203—212.

Haberman, M. (1995). Star teachers of children in poverty. West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi.

Harris, M.H. (1989). Reconsidering the employment interview: A review of recent literature and suggestions for future research. <u>Personnel Psychology, 42(4)</u>, 691-726.

Hosoda, M., Stone-Romero, E., Coats, G. (2003). The effects of physical attractiveness on job-related outcomes: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(2). 431-462

Irvine, J. J. (1991*).* Black students and school failure*.* Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Judice, T.N., & Neuberg, S.L. (1998). When interviewers desire to confirm negative expectations:Self-fulfilling prophecies and inflated applicant self-perceptions. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 20*(3), 175-190

Kacmar, K.M., & Hochwarter,W.A. (1995). The interview as a communication event: A field examination of demographic effects on interview outcomes. *The Journal of Business Comunication,32*(3), 207+.

Kansas Teachers Working Conditions Survey (2006*).* Retrieved from http://www.kansastwc.org/reports/report_main.php?orgID=state&siteID=state&section=demographics on September 13, 2009

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities. NY: Harper Collins.

Longenecker, D. (2005). An investigation of the metric properties of the Interactive Computer Interview System. Dissertation, unpublished dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

MacLeod, J. (1995). Ain't no making it: Aspirations and attainment in a low-income neighborhood. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McDaniel, MA, Whetzel, DL, Schmidt, FL, and Muarer, SD. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*: 599—616.

McDonald, T, Hakel, MD. (1985). Effects of applicant race, sex, suitability, and answers on interviewer's questioning strategy and rating. *Personnel Psychology 38 ,* 321-34.

McMurry, RN. (1947). Vaidating the patterned interview. *Personnel, 23*: 262—272.

Metzger, SA, and Wu, M-J. (2003, April 21—25). Commercial teacher interviews and their problematic role as a teacher qualification. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago.

Michael-Bandele, M. (1993). Who's missing from the classroom: The need for minority teachers. (Trends and Issues Paper no. 9). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. ED 352 361

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (H.R. 1), 107 Cong., 110 (2002) (enacted).

Pingitore, R., Dugoni, B.L., Tindale, R.S., & Spring, B. (1994). Bias against overweight job applicants in a simulated employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 909-917.

Posthuma, RA, Morgeson, FP, and Campion, MA. (2002). Beyond employment interview validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time *Personnel Psychology,* Durham: Spring 2002, Vol. 55, Iss. 1; pg. 1, 81 pgs.

Ryan, PM., and Alcock, MA. (2002). Personal and interpersonal attributes in selecting teachers. *Action in Teacher Education 24*(1), 58—67.

Sawyer, C.A. (1994). Development of the knowledge base for the PRAXIS III: Classroom performance assessment criteria. Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology, 29*, 79-101.

Shirk, L. (1997). Predictive validity of a computerized interview process, unpublished dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

SRI/Gallup. (1987). Teacher perceiver interview. Lincoln, NE: SRI

Tulipana, T. (2009).The relationship between leadership level and preference for administrative interview questions. Dissertation, unpublished dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Van Clieaf, M.S. (1991). In search of competence: structured behavior interviews. Business Horizons, 34, 51-53.

Vornberg, J. & Liles, K. (1983). Taking inventory of your interview techniques. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 67(459), 88-91.

Wright, PM, Lichtenfels, PA, and Pursell, ED. (1989). The structured interview: Additional studies and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 62*: 191—199.

Wong, P. (Ed.) (1999). *Race, Ethnicity, and Nationality in the United States: Toward the Twenty-First Century*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Young, AM, Kacmar, KM. (1998). ABC's of the interview: The role of affective, behavioral, and cognitive responses by applicants in the employment interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 6,* 211-221.

Appendix

Guilford County Schools

Interactive Computer Interview System--Principal Version

Tuesday, August 25, 2009
10:38:39 AM
Interviewer(s): Joseph DiPonio
Desired Position:
Current Position: Principal South Guilford Middle
Normal Interview Form

SCORE	QUESTION
	Developing a School Vision and Culture
3	How does a school maintain its focus on vision?
2	How would you address the problem of staff indifference or resistance to your school's vision statement?
2	How do you involve stakeholders in the development of a school vision?
2	How would you align a school's teaching and learning with its' vision statement?
	Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program
3	What is the function of IEPs for students with disabilities?
2	What are some principles of effective instruction?
3	What does student diversity mean for educational programs?
2	When you visit teachers' classrooms, what should you observe?
3	How do you make professional development an integral part of school improvement?
3	How do you go about establishing high standards for students and the staff?
2	Describe one effective curricular assessment strategy.
2	What are some models of instruction? What would be your favorite and why?
	Managing the Organization
2	How does the principal go about establishing a safe environment for staff and students?
3	What does the term due process mean?
2	As you determine line-item budget allocations, what criteria do you use to determine how much money each line receives?
2	How should school performance data and school improvement plans be aligned in order to positively affect continuous improvement?
3	Tell about one of your successful efforts to organize and lead others and explain why it succeeded.
3	What organizational systems should a principal regularly monitor?
3	How do you effectively monitor and manage conflict among students, staff, or the extended school community?
2	Describe how you handled an urgent, important, non-routine decision.
	Collaboration with Families and Community Members
3	How can the school and community serve one another as resources?
2	How will you develop key lines of communication with community policy makers?
2	What regular, deliberate procedures would you use to ensure that your school maintained a visible, positive presence in its community?
3	How will you develop relationships with community leaders and why is that important?
3	How should you use community agencies (health clinics, social services, psychologists) within the school? Or should they be a part of the school at all?
	Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner
2	How do you go about establishing a system of accountability for student success?
3	How would you handle a teacher's request to provide a special reward to selected students for exemplary performance?
3	How will you serve as a role model in the school?
3	In what cases would you challenge assumptions and beliefs held by staff?

Overall Evaluation

7

SUMMARY REPORT--Principal Interview   Wheat, Kevin

Scale	N	Mean	S.D.
Developing a Vision	4	2.25	.5
Managing Instruction	8	2.5	.53
Managing the Organization	8	2.5	.53
Collaboration with Others	5	2.6	.55
Acting with Integrity, Fairness and in Ethical Manner	4	2.75	.5
total/weighted Average	**29**	**2.52**	**.53**