THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP LEVEL AND
PREFERENCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

By

Teresa M. Tulipana

B.S.E., University of Kansas, 1986
M.S.E., University of Kansas, 1992

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:

_____

Chairperson: Dr. George Crawford

_____

Dr. Howard Ebmeier

_____

Dr. John Rury

_____

Dr. Phil McKnight

_____

Dr. Mike Neal

Dissertation defended: December 11, 2009

1

The Dissertation Committee for Teresa M. Tulipana certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP LEVEL AND
PREFERENCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Dissertation Committee:

_____

Chairperson: Dr. George Crawford

_____

Dr. Howard Ebmeier

_____

Dr. John Rury

_____

Dr. Phil McKnight

_____

Dr. Mike Neal

Date Approved: December 11, 2009

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine whether administrators at differing levels (elementary, secondary and central office) had a preference for interview questions and composite scales designed to identify effective building leaders. Research and professional standards were reviewed yielding agreement that educational leadership is a complex area of study possessing a variety of competencies. Currently in the United States, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards are the national benchmark for identifying preferred administrator competencies. The Mid-content Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) Framework of 21 Leadership Characteristics serves as a practitioner's model describing leadership competencies.

Research regarding the hiring practices for educational leaders was also explored. This research highlights concern for the lack of a coherent research-based process for identifying the best future leaders and disclosed conflicting information on an administrative shortage.

An electronic survey was sent to Missouri school administrators representing both building and central office leadership. The survey requested respondents to rank on a 5 point Likert scale from not important to very important 60 principal interview questions developed for possible inclusion in an Interactive Computer Interview System (ICIS) for Principals. The Interactive Computer Interview System was created by Dr. Howard Ebmeier in conjunction with the American Association of School Personnel Administrators (AASPA) and uses a laptop computer to track responses to interview questions, suggest follow up questions, and create a summary report to capture aspects of the interview.

i

Reliability of the survey instrument, the Principal Interview Question Perception survey, was established through the use of Cronbach's Alpha. The full scale survey instrument was determined reliable with Cronbach's Alpha at .96. Each subscale of the instrument was also deemed to demonstrate internal consistency above the .70 level. ANOVA was used to determine whether administrators at varying levels indicated a differing perception of and preference for the importance of the interview questions. ANOVA was run on the full scale of 60 interview questions and each subscale. Post hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD method further disclosed administrator differences.

Results from this study showed that on the full scale and three of the five subscales there was a significant difference among administrator levels on their preference for the interview questions. These results suggest that administrators at varying levels place differing values on administrator competencies disclosed by the interview questions.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Hiring the best administrators to lead schools is a top priority for superintendents and boards of education across the nation. The goal of any hiring process is to hire the most skilled and knowledgeable individuals who can help accomplish the vision and mission of the organization. This is particularly important in the public school sector were the vision and mission relate to student achievement and preparation of a literate society and where budgets are dependent upon federal, state and local funding.   Tax payers choose to buy homes and open businesses in areas that prosper.   A quality school system is the cornerstone of a prosperous community and a skilled, knowledgeable staff is critical to the success of schools. Though research indicates a quality teacher has a large effect on learning outcomes, the impact of an effective building leader has the greatest potential for reforming and improving schools (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Nettles & Harrington, 2007; Hallinger & Heck, 1996). According to Nettles and Harrington (2007):

> The traditional focus regarding student achievement has been on classroom level factors (e.g., scientifically based curricula and teacher quality), and appropriately so, but the national focus is now turning to what the principal can do to improve student achievement. This is a significant redirection, because actions taken to better understand and improve the impact of principals on the achievement of students in their schools have the potential for widespread benefit, as individual improvements in principal practice can impact thousands of students (p. 732).

For school reform to continue and communities to prosper, the availability of qualified administrators and effective hiring practices are critical.

Professional Standards of School Leaders

To assure administrator effectiveness and help strengthen preparation in school leadership, the Council of Chief State School Officers in collaboration with the National Policy Board on Educational Administration developed a set of standards. These standards, known as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, have become a model for leadership preparation programs and serve as guidelines for the success of sitting administrators. The ISLLC standards, according to Gray and Streshly (2008) "accomplished what they were supposed to accomplish. They are an example of the best we can come up with, given our present knowledge base" (pg xix). Gray and Streshly (2008) go on to state:

> Some of the ISLLC standards are supported by sound empirical evidence. Much of it, however, is craft knowledge or best practices. The origin of this craft knowledge often harkens back to brainstorming sessions with prominent educators and experts who then validate the resulting standards. This means they are read and judged to be accurate by a large number of the same sort of experts who developed them to begin with. In a sharp criticism of the process, Fenwick English (2005) recounted that the Educational Testing Service used 14 subject-matter experts to conduct a job analysis. This resulted in statements about the responsibilities and knowledge areas needed by beginning administrators. These statements were then mailed to more than 10,000 principals who either agreed or disagreed with the statements. English averred that the exercise is a validation exercise: 'It is not a measure of the truthfulness of the responsibilities or knowledge areas per se' (pg 32).

Despite English's harsh criticism, the ISLLC Standards remain the barometer of effectiveness for both aspiring and sitting administrators.

Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) explored the topic of principal practice, professional standards and effectiveness differently than the expert approach by the Council of Chief State School Officers by completing an analysis of 69 studies on school leadership and student learning that occurred since the mid 1970s. Their findings conclude there is "a substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement." They found that the average effect size (expressed as a correlation) between leadership and student achievement is .25 (pg 3). This finding suggest that administrators who, according to the principal measurement scale created by Waters, Marzano and McNulty, increase their effectiveness by one standard deviation can anticipate student learning outcomes to increase by 10 percentile points. There are 21 professional standards and practices supported by Waters, Marzano and McNulty's research. These standards are commonly referred to as the Framework for Balanced Leadership or McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities. The research on these responsibilities led Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) to conclude that "leadership could be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform" (pg 172).

The Availability and Hiring of Qualified School Administrators

Literature on administrator availability is conflicting. Some cite a pending shortage of school administrators (Pubmire, 1999; Peterson & Kelly, 2001). Others offer an opinion that there is not a shortage of school administrators but rather a shortage of administrators possessing the skills and knowledge to effectively lead a school (Rand Research Brief, 2003; Mitgange, 2003; Wallace Foundation, 2003; Roza, 2003; Whitaker, 2001). A study conducted by RAND (2003) found little evidence of a nationwide crisis in the market for certified school administrators. The study did find, however, several areas of concern: "a significant portion of

3

the administrative population nearing retirement, substantial variation in career incentives on the state and local level, and barriers to entry that affect teachers' willingness to become school administrators" (pg 1).   Careful consideration of these concerns is critical for school districts facing administrator hiring needs. In addition to these considerations, "a public agenda survey published in 2001 found, for example, that only one in three superintendents believes the quality of principals entering the profession has improved, 36 percent say it's stayed the same and 29 percent say it's worsened" (Mitgange, 2003).

The literature indicates that it is not a shortage of certified administrators but a shortage of administrators possessing the skills to positively impact student achievement that creates a need for a screening and evaluation tool to effectively predict on-the-job performance. Steven J. Bellis (2007) summarizes the issue by stating: "The combination of a large annual turnover in principals, the importance of the principal to student achievement, and limitations of educational programs in key areas of competency make it essential that a screening and evaluation tool that is effective in predicting on-the-job performance be available to assist those responsible for hiring of principals" (pg. 4).

Existing Administrator Selection Processes

Wendel and Breed (1988) found studies of the predictive quality of administrator selection criteria are relatively few in number and often inconclusive. Researchers have been more successful in identifying criteria that do not have a relationship with successful administrative performance than in identifying criteria that correlated with successful administrative performance. In most school districts, the selection process is an intuitive one and relies primarily upon an unstructured interview given by an untrained interviewer. Breed (1985)

found that school districts use one of three interview models: 1) un-guided, 2) semi-guided, or 3) structured, and the most common of these was the semi-guided interview conducted by untrained interviewers.   This interview structure is more unreliable than its structured interview counterpart. A structured interview, given by trained interviewers, focused on measurable factors and with scored responses, has increased reliability (Wendel and Breed, 1988).

In response to a need for structured interview processes, Selection Research Incorporated developed a structured interview, the Administrator Perceiver Interview (API), to indicate whether an interviewee had the potential to develop a positive working relationship with teachers and to establish a positive, open school climate. This instrument is now marketed through Gallup as the Principal Insight. The instrument gathers information on three types of questions - situational, observational, and personal as well as information on 12 themes: mission, human resources development, relater, delegator, arranger, catalyzer, audience sensitivity, group enhancer discriminator, performance orientation, work orientation, and ambiguity tolerance (Wendel and Breed, 1988; Skrla et al, 2001; Lovely, 2004).

Another structured selection technique, an assessment center, represents state-of-the-art selection procedures. Assessment centers have multiple trained assessors; standardized methods; job-related exercises; and objective, validated criteria.   The NASSP Assessment Center rates candidates on the skill dimensions of problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, range of interests, personal motivation, educational values, oral communication, and written communication (Bryant, 1990; Skrla et al, 2004). Research on the validity of assessment center ratings is sparse and much is out dated, however it does support the assessment center as a valid means for selecting administrators (Coleman, Areglado, & Adams, 1998; Gomez, 1985; Schmitt, Noe, Merritt & Fitzgerald, 1984).

Breed (1985) found both the structured interview and assessment center to be effective and reliable strategies for hiring school administrators. The structured interview, however, provides a more cost effective model for school districts.

Differences among School Leaders Based on Organization Level

Literature on the differences among administrative levels is limited. This includes research on hiring practices and competencies. When differences among school leaders based on organizational level are found, these differences are most often related to administrator preferences for characteristics of teachers (Brannon, 2009; Celebuski, 1998). Other notations of difference are often supposition. Day, Leithwood and Sammons (2008) briefly point toward stylistic difference:

> Compared with primary heads, secondary heads tended to report more change in relation to the use and prioritizing of regular classroom observation, coaching and mentoring and redesigning resources for teaching. This suggests that effective heads in primary schools may use different strategies to influence classroom practice in comparison with their secondary counterparts. This may reflect primary heads' greater contact with staff and the curriculum given the smaller size and more generalist approach to teaching in the primary sector. Secondary heads are more likely to use indirect approaches (operating via the SLT and Heads of Departments) to support the development of teaching and teachers (pg 92).

Day, Leithwood, and Sammons (2008) also conclude that all administrative levels "build robust systems for monitoring student progress so that decisions about teaching and the

organization and differentiation may be informed" (pg 88). They continue to state that "whereas primary school head teachers influence pedagogy directly (e.g. by modeling teaching as well as indirectly through AFL and monitoring systems), secondary heads delegate the former (and perhaps the latter) to others, especially middle managers" (pg 88).   Their research found that in secondary schools there was a greater prioritization of actions related to student behaviors and a strong emphasis on performance data. These differences in style may also lead to differences in the hiring of administrators for different building levels as well as administrators' preferences for specific interview questions.

The Purpose of the Study

As the hiring of highly qualified school leaders is a priority at all levels and existing administrator selection tools do not take into account the differing administrative levels, the purpose of this study is to determine whether a difference exists between leadership level and preference for certain administrative interview questions or for certain categories of questions. The presence of a difference will allow school districts to modify or adjust interview questions based on organization level whereas the absence of a difference in preference will drive the creation of a standard interview protocol across levels.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

When reviewing literature on effective hiring practices for school administrators, three themes emerge: the changing face of school administration, characteristics and standards of an effective school leader and administrative hiring practices. Of these themes, characteristics and standards of an effective school leader have been given the most attention and produced the most literature. Very little has been written on the difference between and among administrators at varying levels of the organization.

The Changing Face of School Administration

Effective school leadership has never been more important. Since passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, the role of the school principal has evolved to meet the growing needs of accountability and the increased focus on student achievement (Butler, 2008; DeLeon, 2006; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005; Wallace Foundation, 2003). Indeed, according to a study on school leadership published by the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute with support from the Wallace Foundation (2003), "The role of principal has swelled to include a staggering array of professional tasks and competencies. Principals are expected to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations and communication experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special program administrators, as well as guardians of various legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives" (pg. 10).   This swell of professional tasks and competencies has put a new face on administration and requires effective administrators to prioritize efforts toward areas deemed to have the greatest impact on student achievement. Butler (2008) believes

that due to the increased focus on accountability and the pressure to improve student performance, school leaders must transition their role from a more administrative role to a role more heavily involved in assessment, instruction, curriculum and data analysis (pg 66). Though DeLeon (2006) agrees that increased accountability requires changes in administrator focus, he cites Vartan Gregorian's[1] premise that this change, when too heavily focused on test results, falls short of what is needed to revolutionize our public school system:

> Some would argue that the educational reform movement of the past two decades, culminating in the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, has moved American education into an era of high accountability with heightened expectations regarding student achievement and learning - and with serious penalties for schools that fail to perform. As No Child Left Behind has moved America's schools into an era of accountability, says Vartan Gregorian, president of Carnegie Corporation of New York, the focus of American education has been on testing. 'The focus, however, must and will change to performance and leadership if the goal of creating effective schools in America is to be realized'. Above all, says Gregorian, 'It is the principal as instructional leader who is crucial to the effectiveness of the nation's nearly 96,000 schools' (pg 1).

Gregorian's focus on instructional leadership is a common theme across the literature. School principals have responded to increased accountability and made the transition from school managers to instructional leaders. However, this too seems limiting and current literature is increasingly focusing on the transition from instructional leader to the leader of school reform.

---

[1] President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The transition from instructional leader to the leader of school reform is often categorized into three distinct leadership styles: transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and balanced leadership.

Transactional leadership emerged from the changing roles of principals in the 1960's and 1970's. During these decades principals became increasingly responsible for managing federal mandates designed to assist special student populations. Principals assumed a new set of functions that ranged from monitoring compliance with federal regulations to assisting in staff development and providing direction to support classroom teachers. The primary role of transactional leaders was to help followers succeed. To achieve this goal, transactional leaders focused on planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, evaluating and budgeting for the present and the immediate future. (Prater, 2004; Bass, 1998; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

In 1983, A Nation at Risk was published by the National Commission on Educational Excellence. This publication signaled the beginning of school reform. Administrators at all levels realized that to achieve the reforms necessary a different type of leadership was required. The challenges of school reform demanded the principal become an agent of change and transformational leadership emerged as the model needed to lead schools through reform. Transformational leaders motivate followers by "raising their consciousness about the importance of organizational goals and by inspiring them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization" (Marks & Printy, 2003). Transformational forms of leadership are well suited to the challenges of operating an effective school organization. Transformational leaders focus on commitments and capacities of organizational members and the potential to foster growth in the capacities of teachers to respond appropriately to reform challenges. In the

educational setting, the transformational principal helps teachers feel and act like leaders by identifying and articulating a common vision and fostering the acceptance of group goals. Transformational principals lead by doing, while simultaneously holding expectations for excellence, quality, and high performance on the part of the staff (Prater, 2004; Marks & Printy, 2003).

Leadership of a school building includes a number of factors, but ultimately student growth in academic achievement is the factor that currently takes the highest priority in determining school effectiveness. Passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 and a greater emphasis on student achievement and accountability spurred the final evolution of school leadership toward balanced leadership. In the winter of 2004, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) published *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*, a working paper written by R.J. Marzano, T. Waters and B. McNulty. The paper included a meta-analysis of studies that examined the role of building leadership and student achievement. This paper, in conjunction with prior works from the Council of Chief State School Officers, has resulted in nation-wide changes in how effective school leadership is currently viewed.

The Changing Face of Administration Summary

Impetus for Change	Emerging Leadership Style
Public Law 94-142 (1975)	Transactional Leadership
A Nation at Risk (1983)	Transformational Leadership
No Child Left Behind Act (2002)	Balanced Leadership

Characteristics and Standards of Effective School Leaders

From 1994 to 1996 the Council of Chief State School Officers created a study group called The Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). The group, composed of educational leaders representing 24 states was led by Vanderbilt University professor, Dr. Joe Murphy. The purpose of the group was to craft common standards for school leaders. As the breadth of responsibilities for school administrators is wide, ISLLC focused on only those topics that formed the "heart and soul of effective leadership" (ISLLC, 1996). The resulting standards are divided into six domains that are essential for a school leader to be successful. The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 standards, the newest iteration of the ISLLC standards, are listed below.

Standard One: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

Standard Two: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to students learning and staff professional growth.

Standard Three: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard Four: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard Five: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard Six: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Though ISLLC Standards have been adopted nationwide and represent our current best practice, the authors of the ISLLC standards, The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), in their report *Transforming Education: Delivering on Our Promise to Every Child* (March 2009) called for standards reform:

> If we are to challenge what learning should look like, we must also turn to the three historical and powerful drivers of education reform: standards, assessment, and accountability. Each on its own represents common sense answers to problems that plague the educational enterprise. Each has – in its own way – become ubiquitous in education today, to the point where its need now goes unquestioned. Concealed within that ubiquity, however, is the fact that in the process of implementation we introduced a unique set of unintended consequences that must be addressed if the goals of reform are to be realized (pg 6).

According to the CCSSO (2009), standards were created using a variety of methodologies, but in all cases the most crucial step involved a committee made up of subject matter experts making the determination as to what the standards should be. This was the case with the ISLLC Standards. Though well informed decisions were made, these decisions often lacked a research basis. The CCSSO Reform 2.0 includes a stronger focus on basing standards in research and evidence, benchmarking them against successful systems here and abroad, and sharing the results across states to see how they reflect expectations. Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2005) explored the first leg of this recommendation: research and evidence.

In *What Works in Schools* (2003) the topic of leadership was conspicuously missing from the list of school-level factors that impacted student achievement. According to Marzano (2003), this was not an oversight:

> Virtually all descriptions of leadership were either very narrow or so broad as to encompass virtually all other categories. For example, in the Scheerens and Bosker (1997) review, leadership was rather narrowly focused on what might be referred to as quality control. This narrow definition probably accounts for the fact that it is rated next to last in their analysis. In contrast, Levine and Lazotte (1990) define leadership as encompassing the following elements: high expenditure of time and energy for school improvement; superior instructional leadership; frequent, personal monitoring of school activities and "sense-making"; and acquisition of resources. Such broad descriptions of leadership were also characteristic of the interpretations by Sammons and Edmonds. I have chosen to exclude leadership from the list of school-level factors. Its proper place is as an overarching variable that impacts the effective implementation of the school-level factors, the teacher-level factors, and the student-level factors (p. 20).

Despite the intentional exclusion of leadership from *What Works in Schools*, Marzano, along with Waters and McNulty (2005), turned their focus to leadership in *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results* based on the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) group's Balanced Leadership Framework. The framework, based on meta-analysis of 69 studies, identifies 21 leadership responsibilities. Within these 21 responsibilities are 66 leadership practices. Comparatively, the 2008 ISLLC Standards outline six standards with 31 functions. In a review of a side by side comparative analysis of the McREL Framework

and ISLLC Standards, Waters and Kingston (2004) note the McREL Framework identifies 17

important leadership practices not found in the ISLLC standards. These leadership practices are

practices deemed significant through McREL's meta-analysis of research on effective school

leadership.   In addition, Waters and Kingston (2004) point to a lack of clarity with the ISLLC

Standards as compared to the McREL Framework.

It could be argued that the McREL Framework also lacks clarity. Though Waters,

Marzano and McNulty (2005) provide specific data on the effectiveness of each of the 21

leadership responsibilities, they do not place these in hierarchal order. Each is important to

leaders focused on improving student achievement and each must be present.   Waters, Marzano

and McNulty (2005) do highlight, however, the need to vary the use of leadership responsibilities

based on whether or not a school is experiencing first or second order change.   Table 2.1 lists

the 21 Leadership Responsibilities outlined by Waters, Marzano and McNulty and reports the

average effect size, confidence interval, number of studies analyzed and number of schools

reflected in these studies.

Table 2.1: 21 Leadership Responsibilities outlined by Waters, Marzano and McNulty

Responsibility	The Extent to Which the Principal…	Average r	95% CI	No. of Studies	No. of Schools
1. Affirmation	Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures	.19	.08 to .29	6	332
2. Change Agent	Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo	.25	.16 to .34	6	466
3. Contingent Rewards	Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments	.24	.15 t0 .32	9	465
4. Communication	Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students	.23	.12 to .33	11	299
5. Culture	Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation	.25	.18 to .31	15	819
6. Discipline	Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus	.27	.18 to .35	12	437

7. Flexibility	Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent	.28	.16 to .39	6	277
8. Focus	Establishes clear goals and keeps those goal in the forefront of the school's attention	.24	.19 to .29	44	1, 619
9. Ideals/Beliefs	Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling	.22	.14 to .30	7	513
10. Input	Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies	.25	.18 to .32	16	669
11. Intellectual Stimulation	Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture	.24	.13 to .34	4	302
12. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices	.20	.14 to .27	23	826
13. Knowledge or curriculum, instruction and assessment	Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction and assessment practices	.25	.15 to .34	10	368
14. Monitoring/Evaluating	Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning	.27	.22 to .32	31	1,129
15. Optimizer	Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations	.20	.13 to .27	17	724
16. Order	Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines	.25	.16 to.33	17	456
17. Outreach	Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders	.27	.18 to .35	14	478
18. Relationships	Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff	.18	.09 to .26	11	505
19. Resources	Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs	.25	.17 to .32	17	571
20. Situational Awareness	Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems	.33	.11 to .51	5	91
21. Visibility	Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students	.20	.11 to .28	13	477

Though McREL's work on leadership responsibilities has evolved to be a major source of guidance for schools and districts on characteristics of effective principals, other educational organizations including The Southern Regional Education Board, National Association for Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) strive to contribute to the dialogue on standards and characteristics of effective school leaders. In each of these cases, a combination of expert opinion and research contribute to the factors identified.

The Southern Regional Education Board has identified 13 critical success factors essential to good leadership (Butler, 2008). These factors include:

Create a mission. Create curriculum and instruction that lead to higher achievement.

Set high expectations. All students should learn higher-level content.

Encourage quality instruction. Lessons should motivate and encourage students, increasing academic achievement.

Implement a caring environment. Develop an organization where faculty and staff know every student counts and has an adult's support.

Use data. Student information can be used to continue improvement.

Keep focused. Staff and teachers should be focused on student achievement.

Involve parents. Make parents your partners in education and achievement and collaborate with other educators.

Understand change. Use leadership and facilitation skills to manage change effectively.

Use sustained professional development. Advance meaningful change through quality staff development that leads to increased student achievement.

Organize time and resources. Devise innovative ways to meet and sustain school improvement goals.

Use resources. Find and use resources wisely.

Seek support. Find central office and community support for school improvement.

Remain open to new information. Learn from colleagues who keep tabs on new research and proven practices. (p.68)

The National Association for Elementary School Principals (NAESP) identified a set of standards and states that "individually and collectively, these six standards define leadership for learning communities: places where adults and young people are continuously learning and striving towards improving their knowledge and skills" (NAESP, 2008).   The six standards identified by NAESP (2008) state effective leaders of learning communities:

Lead schools in a way that places student and adult learning at the center.

Set high expectations for the academic, social, emotional and physical development of all students.

Demand content and instruction that ensure student achievement of agreed-upon standards.

Create a culture of continuous learning for adults tied to student learning and other school goals.

Manage data and knowledge to inform decisions and measure progress of student, adult, and school performance.

Actively engage the community to create shared responsibilities for student performance and development (pg 13).

In 2006, NAESP's counterpart, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, identified 18 skill competencies of principal effectiveness (NASSP, 2006):

Leadership: Ability to motivate and guide people to accomplish a task or goal.

Problem Analysis: Ability to identify the important elements of a problem situation and seek out relevant information to determine possible causes and solutions.

Judgment: Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information.

Sensitivity: ability to perceive the needs and concerns of others; resolving and diverting conflicts; dealing tactfully with persons from different backgrounds.

Organizational Ability: Ability to use time and resources effectively to accomplish short and long-term goals.

Delegation: Ability to effectively assign projects and tasks to the appropriate people giving them clear authority to accomplish them and responsibility for their timely and acceptable completion.

Planning: Ability to clarify a goal or objective and develop a strategy to accomplish the desired results.

Implementing: Ability to carry out programs and plans to successful completion.

Evaluating: Ability to examine how outcomes compare with previously defined standards, goals, or performances.

Written Communication: Ability to express ideas clearly in writing, to write appropriately for different audiences.

Self-development: Ability to identify and create a set of key behaviors to build desired skill.

Handling Resistance to Change: Ability to bring about change in a school through anticipating problems, meeting needs, and sharing decision making.

Giving Feedback: Ability to give clear, specific feedback.

Creating New Ideas: Ability to get a group to suggest multiple solutions to a problem or opportunity and select the best idea for implementation.

Team Building: Ability to create and maintain a high performance team.

Dyadic Interaction: Ability to communicate effectively in one-to-one encounters.

Small Group Communication: Ability to communicate effectively to small groups.

Large Group Communication: Ability to communicate effectively to large groups.

The differing approach of NAESP and NASSP to the task of outlining effective

leadership competencies may be an indication that there is a difference in perception of

characteristics of effective school leaders across differing levels of the school organization.

Another indicator comes from Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2005) who considered the level of

the school in studies of the relationship between leadership and student achievement.   Table 2.2

outlines their finding.

Table 2.2: Relationship between Leadership Level and Student Achievement

Levels of School on Which Studies Focused	Average r	Number of Studies	Number of Schools
Elementary	.29	36	1, 175
Middle School/Junior High	.24	6	323
High School	.26	9	325
K-8	.15	7	277
K-12	.16	6	499

Though Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2005) considered that it might be the case that a

relationship between leadership and student achievement is substantially different at one set of

grade levels than it is at another, they found "no hard and fast conclusions should be drawn….

Taken at face value, however, the figure indicates little difference in the effect of principal

leadership from elementary school to middle school/junior high to high school. Although the

correlations are not identical for these three levels of schooling, they are probably too close to be

considered "different" from a statistical perspective" (pg 37).

The literature indicates a lack of agreement and consistency of definitions of

characteristics, factors or standards of effective school leaders. This lack of consistency can be

traced back to the models for developing the protocols. Over emphasis of the "expert" model

leads to protocols that vary from organization to organization. Though ISLLC is considered the

premiere list of standards, the Council of Chief State School Officers called for a revision of

standards based on research and evaluation. The 21 Leadership Responsibilities outlined by

Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2005) are based on research and appear to becoming, at least at

the practitioner level, the most sought resource for leadership standards.

Administrative Hiring Practices

Literature on interviewing and hiring school leaders often refers to pending challenges with recruiting, selecting and training of administrators. According to Peterson and Kelley (2001): "U.S. schools are facing one of the most massive transformations of leadership in a century. By some estimates, more than half of all principals are expected to retire in the next five years" (pg 8). Despite the claim by Peterson and Kelley, most researchers paint a different picture. They claim there is no statistical evidence of a shortage of certified candidates for the principalship (Wallace Foundation, 2003; Roza, 2003; Whitaker, 2001; Rand Research Brief, 2003; Mitgange, 2003). Rather than a shortage of certified candidates, there is a shortage of candidates who possess the skills and knowledge necessary to be effective. "Times and expectations have changed for school leaders, and districts are now searching for characteristics in principal candidates far beyond minimal state certification requirements…. Defining the shortage problem merely in terms of certified applications, it continues, is only part of the story. Clarifying what districts really want in school leadership applicants is the other part" (Wallace Foundation, 2003, p.6).

The most extensive writing on the topic of a principal shortage comes from Marguerite Roza in her 2003 book *A Matter of Definition: Is There Truly a Principal Shortage*? Roza (2003) writes:

Although some districts and regions are experiencing trouble filling vacancies in the principal's chair, there are far more people certified to be school principals around the nation than jobs for them to fill. Real declines in applicant pools are district and even school-specific. They are also more pronounced at the secondary level than in elementary schools.... Difficulties in hiring are driven more by the demands for a new and

different kind of school principal…. It appeared that among those anxious about a

shortage, much of the concern turns around the quality of the applicant pool, not its

quantity. Much of this new focus on quality appears to be based on increased pressure on

school leaders to improve student performance (p. 24).

According to a survey conducted by Roza (2003), one in three human resource director

survey respondents indicated increases in principals' responsibilities to improve student

performance make it harder to find able candidates. Superintendent respondents reflected the

view that finding qualified principals is a significant challenge. Among superintendents in the

study, 80% noted that getting qualified school principals was either a moderate or a major

problem.   Just 6% of responding superintendents said it was not a problem (p. 25).

The Wallace Foundation (2003) notes that the real problem lies in a "disconnect between

what superintendents say they value most in new hires – the ability to lead and motivate staff and

execute a school improvement strategy – and what typical hiring practices are delivering – aging

educators picked more because they know the system than because they are likely to try to

change it or make demands of it (pg 10).

Interviews are the most widely used tool for making hiring decisions. Breed (1985)

found that school districts use one of three interview models: 1) un-guided, 2) semi-guided, or 3)

structured and that the most common of these was the semi-guided interview conducted by

untrained interviewers. Whaley (2002) noted that the typical administrator interview is

unstructured, lasts less than an hour, and is highly influenced by first impressions. Studies

suggest that interviewers may decide to hire or reject an applicant within the first five minutes of

an interview (pg 15).   For this reason, most argue that the more effective and reliable interviews

ask identical, pre-determined, well thought-out questions. To minimize the disconnect between

the hiring practice and the characteristics sought in new principal hires, superintendents and boards of education must develop hiring processes that directly relate to the skills and characteristics sought in new hires.

Rammer (2007) found that "superintendents in Wisconsin consider the 21 responsibilities identified by Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2005) very important. The data of this study were also clear: Superintendents in Wisconsin do not have systematic, intentional, or methodical means to assess the responsibilities in candidates who are being considered as principals. Assuming the superintendents in other states have characteristics similar to the superintendents in Wisconsin, the criteria used to select principals nationally would appear to lack purposeful design" (pg 74).

The New Teacher Project (2006) provides three guidelines for the development of effective interview questions: 1) Questions should be focused to address specific competencies; 2) Creative questions that require the candidate to think in the moment by responding to a scenario or describing specific strategies for success can probe for competencies much more effectively than questions that one can predictably encounter in any job interview; and 3) Questions should allow a candidate from any populous to demonstrate his/her competencies. These general recommendations do not provide the guidance necessary to assure interview questions are written in a manner as to effectively correlate to the hiring of effective school leaders.

Bellis (2007) developed and field tested an interview instrument that was designed to correlate strongly with ratings of job performance. The interview instrument was constructed using guidelines from best practices including ISLLC and McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities. Scoring guides were created for each question to assure consistent scoring.

Though Bellis had hoped to field test an instrument that would correlate strongly with ratings in job performance, this was not achieved. His study did, however, highlight the need for a systematic, research-based tool that consistently provides insight into the hiring process.

Summary

Before 1983, when the report <u>A Nation at Risk</u> came out, transactional leadership was the most observed leadership style of school leaders. It was a leadership style that could easily and successfully meet the basic needs of a school organization. <u>A Nation at Risk</u> was the catalyst of much educational reform and the mandate for a different type of leadership. These reforms led to the study and practice of transformational leadership in schools across the country. Though transformational leadership was a step in the right direction, achievement data showed that the needs of all students were not being met. As accountability demands increased through the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, McREL conducted a meta-analysis to determine the correlation between leaderships and student achievement. The Balanced Leadership Framework, which is commonly used to define effective leadership in our nation, emerged from this research and set the parameters for hiring the effective building leaders.

Hiring school leaders who possess research based characteristics that lead to improved student achievement is the goal of superintendents and boards of education across our nation. Currently, though there is consensus on the ISLLC Standards as the essential professional standards for school professionals, these standards are generally not founded in research. Even the Council of Chief State School Officers, the developers of the ISLLC Standards, recognizes this limitation. In response to the need for clear standards of excellence, numerous professional organizations have created their own list of standards or criteria. These standards vary from

organization to organization. Most interesting in this variance are the differing approaches of the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. The latter promotes a list that is specific and task oriented whereas the former's list is more global in scope.

Currently, except in isolated situations, there is not a shortage of certified administrators. The applicant pool, however, may not contain candidates who possess the skills necessary to experience success and positively impact student achievement. Though hiring effective school leaders is a top priority, effective systemized hiring practices are lacking.   Most school systems use a semi-structured interview process, however the correlation between what the system desires in candidates and the interview questions is weak.

Chapter Three: Methodology

The primary purpose of the study was to determine whether administrators at various

levels (elementary, secondary, and district) have different preferences related to interview

questions designed to select effective school leaders. This study uses the survey method which

was selected to reveal specific preferences of three select groups of administrators. According to

McMillan and Schumacher (1989), surveys are used frequently in educational research to

describe attitudes, beliefs, values, demographic facts, behaviors, habits, desires, ideas and

opinions (pg 293). When done properly, quality information can be collected from a small

sample that can be generalized to a larger population. This chapter provides an explanation of

the methods and procedures used in the study.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in the study is the Principal Interview Question Perception

Survey and the subscales within the survey instrument. This instrument is designed to determine

administrators' perception of and preference for interview questions created by Dr. Howard

Ebmeier for inclusion in a study to be conducted with the Guilford County Schools in

Greensboro, North Carolina by Angelique Kobler, Susie Ostmeyer and Joe DiPonio. These

interview questions are known as the ICIS for Principals.   The current study was designed to

check for differences in respondents' perceptions of and preferences for the 60 interview

questions from the ICIS for Principals and its five subscales. The five subscales include

managing the organization; acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner; developing a

school vision and culture; collaboration with families and community members; and developing and maintaining the instructional program.

In 2007, Steven J. Bellis, as part of his dissertation testing a principal selection instrument, created 40 principal selection interview questions clustered within four different themes. These 40 questions were based on a review of standards and evolved from an original bank of 115 questions after review by practitioners and University of Kansas professors. In 2009, these 40 questions were combined with additional questions written by a team of professors and graduate level students at the University of Kansas resulting in a new bank of 140 potential principal selection interview questions. A team of professionals rated these questions and accompanying question rubrics on importance and clarity. Subsequently a team of University of Kansas professors and graduate students reviewed the ratings and eliminated questions not deemed significant, combined questions that asked for similar information and reworded questions for clarity. The resulting product was a bank of 60 interview questions clustered into five distinct categories.

Independent Variable

The independent variable is the administrators' level of leadership: elementary, secondary, or district. Due to the variety of administrative configurations in Missouri schools, these levels are represented by the categories of elementary principal, middle school principal, high school principal, combined level principal, central office administrator and other in the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey.

Participants

Convenience sampling was used to select participants. Participants' email addresses for building elementary and secondary leaders were retrieved through the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Schools data base. Email addresses for district level administrator participants were hand entered and retrieved from the Missouri School Directory of 2008-2009, which is published by the School Core Data Section of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Email addresses not associated with a school or school district were eliminated from this study. This included emails associated with generic email servers such as gmail or hotmail. All participants were currently employed by public school districts in the State of Missouri. The survey was sent to 2219 Missouri administrators. One hundred twenty one email addresses were bounced and 19 administrator email addresses had previously been registered with surveymonkey.com to automatically opt out of survey requests. This resulted in delivery of 2079 electronic surveys. Four hundred and forty nine, or 22%, of those receiving the survey participated. The participants represented all administrative levels and will be more fully described in the results. Participants were asked to respond to survey questions based upon their own experiences and preferences.

Instrumentation

The Principal Interview Question Perception Survey includes a 5 point Likert scale from which participants indicated their perception of each of the 60 questions on the ICIS for Principals. The scales' scores range from 1 (very important) to 5 (not important). In addition to the questions specific to the study, the survey included demographic questions to gather information regarding participants' gender; organization location (urban, suburban, or rural);

district size; and administrative placement (elementary, secondary, or district). The entire survey could be completed by participants in approximately 20-30 minutes.

Procedure

Approval to conduct the survey was obtained from the University of Kansas, School of Education and the Human Subjects Committee. The study used an electronic survey through the web-based service, surveymonkey.com. This service allows respondents to reply to the survey anonymously. The electronic survey included an introductory paragraph outlining the purpose of the study; an informed consent and confidentiality statement; the survey instrument; a brief demographic survey; and directions to request follow up information. A follow up electronic reminder was sent to participants ten days after the initial request for participation and the survey was closed four weeks after the initial request for participation.

All participants were given the opportunity to receive a copy of the project results.

Analysis

Data for this study were analyzed with a variety of statistical methods provided be the statistical software system Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The method of analysis is quantitative, with data from the questionnaire determining whether or not there is a difference in a perception and ultimately preference of interview questions based on administrative level.

Descriptive statistics include frequency distributions for each of the demographic factors: gender; organization location (urban, suburban, and rural); district size; and administrative

placement. These statistics describe the sample population. These descriptive analyses build a demographic profile of study participants.

To examine the internal consistency reliability of the survey, coefficient alphas were computed. Reliability is a description of the extent to which an instrument's ratings can be depended upon to yield consistent, unambiguous information. One aspect of reliability is internal consistency, which expects items measuring the same construct to behave consistently rather than randomly. Internal consistency reliability is therefore most concerned with the homogeneity of the items comprising the survey. When the items have a strong relationship to one another, the items are considered highly inter-correlated and assumed to measure the same construct. Such internal consistency may be measured in different ways, including the use of coefficient alpha (also known as Cronbach's coefficient alpha). The higher the alpha the more reliable the instrument's scores or ratings. Adequate internal consistency reliability estimates are >.70.

Inferential statistics were used to generalize the study's findings to a group larger than the sample size. ANOVA examines whether group differences occur on one or more independent variables and only one dependent variable. ANOVA tests differences in a single interval dependent variable among two, three, or more groups formed by the categories of a single categorical independent variable. Also known as univariate ANOVA or one-way ANOVA, this design deals with one independent variable and one dependent variable. It tests whether the groups formed by the categories of the independent variable seem similar and have the same pattern of response. The ANOVA procedure for one-way analysis of variance was used to test whether there are statistical differences in an administrator's perception of and preference for interview questions and the administrative level (elementary, secondary, and district). The

ANOVA answers the question: "Is there a significant difference between interview question preferences between administrators at the elementary, secondary and district office levels?" Significantly large F values allow null hypotheses (meaning there is no difference among groups) to be rejected. Significance occurred at the .05 level. In cases where significance occurred, post hoc analysis using Tukey HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) test was used. Tukey HSD provides a means of conducting post hoc paired comparisons without inflation of Type I error rate. Tukey HSD is a single-step multiple comparison procedure to find which means are significantly different from one another.

Chapter Four: Results

This chapter presents the results of the study to examine whether there are any significant differences in perception of and preference for principal interview questions based on administrator level (elementary, secondary, and district).

Description of the Sample

During fall of 2009, 449 public k-12 Missouri administrators responded to the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey. The data used in this study are based on information that was provided by each respondent. Respondents were asked their perception of 60 interview questions clustered in 5 different categories: managing the organization; acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner; developing a school vision and culture; collaboration with families and community members; and developing and maintaining the instructional program. In addition, respondents were asked demographic questions regarding their gender, organization location (urban, suburban or rural); district size; and administrative placement (elementary, secondary or district).   Tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 represent the distribution of the sample.

Table 4.1: Description of Sample, Gender

Gender	Percent of Participants
Female	44%
Male	56%

Table 4.2: Description of Sample, District Location

District Location	Percent of Participants
Urban	11%
Suburban	29%
Rural	60%

Table 4.3: Description of Sample, District Size

District Size	Percent of Participants
<1,000	35%
1,000-2,500	23%
2,500-5,000	17%
5,000-7,500	6%
7,500-10,000	3%
10,000-15,000	6%
15,000+	10%

Table 4.4: Description of Sample, Administrative Placement

Administrative Placement	Percent of Participants
Elementary	38%
Middle School	14%
High School	15%
Combined Level	6%

Central Office	26%
Other	1%

Since administrative placement represents a variable within the construct of this study, the researcher was satisfied with the distribution among the different administrative placement levels. The 2008-2009 Statistics of Missouri Public Schools indicates a similar pattern of distribution across administrator levels. A direct comparison is difficult as Statistics of Missouri Public Schools does not delineate for administrators serving at multiple levels and self identified as combined level.

Table 4.5: Comparison of Sample to Missouri Data, Administrative Placement

Administrative Placement	Percent of Participants	Missouri Data
Elementary	38%	41%
Middle School	14%	12%
High School	15%	19%
Combined Level	6%	Not available
Central Office	26%	27%
Other	1%	Not available

Tables 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 represent the average rating for each non-demographic question on the Principal Interview Question Perception survey. The average ratings are recorded by all respondents, elementary, secondary and central office. For these ratings, since

the Likert scale was 1=very important and 5=not important, a lower average rating indicates a

higher perception of importance.

Table 4.6: Principal Interview Question Perception Average Ratings: Managing the Organization

ICIS Interview Questions: Managing the Organization	Rating Average 1= Very Important 5 = Not Important	Elementary Average Rating	Secondary Average Rating	Central Office Average Rating
What processes would you use to hire the best teaching staff available?	1.38	1.37	1.39	1.39
What rights and limitations apply to free speech for students?	2.76	2.81	2.80	2.67
What does the term due process mean?	1.97	2.00	1.95	1.92
What organizational systems should a principal regularly monitor?	1.83	1.72	1.90	1.91
How do you effectively monitor and manage conflict among students, staff, or the extended school community?	1.51	1.48	1.48	1.62
How does the principal go about establishing a safe environment for staff and students?	1.36	1.26	1.36	1.52
Tell about one of your successful efforts to organize and lead others and explain why it succeeded.	1.76	1.70	1.82	1.78
How do you prioritize tasks or problems?	1.86	1.78	1.90	1.93
How should school performance data and school improvement plans be aligned in order to positively affect continuous improvement?	1.33	1.28	1.28	1.43
How should a principal respond to a parent's request for special treatment for their child?	2.32	2.29	2.35	2.37

Describe how you handled an urgent, important, non-routine decision.	2.08	2.05	2.07	2.18
How would you ensure students have fair and equal access to educational opportunity?	1.90	1.80	2.04	1.95
How would you ensure that instructional time is maximized for student learning?	1.40	1.30	1.48	1.44
Should parents be involved in the development of behavior norms and guidelines of the school?	2.56	2.46	2.76	2.55
As you determine line-item budget allocations, what criteria do you use to determine how much money each line receives?	2.33	2.28	2.47	2.28

Table 4.7: Principal Interview Question Perception Average Ratings: Acting with Integrity, Fairness and in an Ethical Manner

ICIS Interview Questions: Acting with Integrity, Fairness and in an Ethical Manner.	Rating Average 1= Very Important 5 = Not Important	Elementary Average Rating	Secondary Average Rating	Central Office Average Rating
How will you serve as a role model in the school?	1.56	1.50	1.62	1.58
How do you decide the ethically right thing to do?	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.55
What will you do when a staff member openly disagrees with you in a staff meeting?	1.94	1.93	1.96	1.95
Describe a situation when you might consider disregarding district regulations.	2.08	2.01	2.29	1.90
In what cases would you challenge assumptions and beliefs held by staff?	2.06	2.05	2.03	2.13
How do you go about establishing a system of accountability for student success?	1.52	1.44	1.62	1.53
How would you handle a teacher's request to provide a special reward to selected	2.59	2.61	2.58	2.62

students for exemplary performance?				
How would you address alleged discriminatory treatment of students by a teacher or coach?	1.55	1.49	1.66	1.53
What strategies do you embrace use to reinforce transparency in decision-making?	2.12	2.06	2.12	2.18
What are the effects of a principal behaving in a trustworthy manner?	1.63	1.56	1.67	1.71

Table 4.8: Principal Interview Question Perception Average Ratings: Developing a School Vision and Culture

ICIS Interview Questions: Developing a School Vision and Culture	Rating Average 1= Very Important 5 = Not Important	Elementary Average Rating	Secondary Average Rating	Central Office Average Rating
How would you lead the process of developing a school vision as principal?	1.56	1.49	1.53	1.65
How would you address the problem of staff indifference or resistance to your school's vision statement?	1.74	1.70	1.75	1.80
How does a school maintain its focus on vision?	1.77	1.71	1.74	1.88
What criteria would you use to evaluate a school vision statement?	2.16	2.09	2.22	2.22
How important is it to building a shared vision for the school and why?	1.62	1.59	1.56	1.70
How would you go about facilitating the development of a school-wide vision?	1.79	1.71	1.72	1.92
Describe how a shared vision helps shape the educational program of the school.	1.83	1.73	1.79	2.02
If it becomes obvious that a specific school practice needs to change, how would you go about that task?	1.60	1.53	1.65	1.66

	Rating Average 1= Very Important 5 = Not Important	Elementary Average Rating	Secondary Average Rating	Central Office Average Rating
How would you align a school's teaching and learning with its' vision statement?	1.70	1.61	1.69	1.80

Table 4.9: Principal Interview Question Perception Average Ratings: Collaborating with School and Community Members

ICIS Interview Questions: Collaborating with School and Community Members	Rating Average 1= Very Important 5 = Not Important	Elementary Average Rating	Secondary Average Rating	Central Office Average Rating
How would you "market" your school?	2.16	2.08	2.27	2.12
How should the schools and the community collaborate?	1.97	1.88	2.07	2.02
How will you develop relationships with community leaders and why is that important?	1.96	1.94	2.02	1.96
How will you develop relationships with community leaders and why is that important?	1.97	1.95	2.01	1.99
How can the school and community serve one another as resources?	2.09	2.05	2.08	2.17
Why is it important to involve stakeholders in the decision making process?	1.77	1.71	1.79	1.84
How should you use community agencies (health clinics, social services, psychologists) within the school? Or should they be in the school at all?	2.21	2.09	2.28	2.30
How will you develop key lines of communication with community policy makers?	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.08
What regular, deliberate procedures would you use to ensure that your school maintained a visible, positive presence in its community?	1.85	1.84	1.82	1.89
Should families be involved in making decisions about their	1.87	1.83	1.90	1.92

child's education?				
How do you plan collaboration with families and school community?	1.82	1.70	1.86	1.94

Table 4.10: Principal Interview Question Perception Average Ratings: Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program

ICIS Interview Questions: Develop and Maintain the Instructional Program	Rating Average 1= Very Important 5 = Not Important	Elementary Average Rating	Secondary Average Rating	Central Office Average Rating
What are some principals of effective instruction?	1.42	1.35	1.50	1.45
What does student diversity mean for educational programs?	2.04	1.92	2.06	2.19
How do you make professional development an integral part of school improvement?	1.57	1.43	1.59	1.72
How do you ensure that multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students?	1.63	1.58	1.62	1.70
Why is it important to establish high standards for the staff and students?	1.52	1.48	1.52	1.62
How do you go about establishing high standards for students and the staff?	1.40	1.38	1.40	1.44
What is the function of IEPs for students with disabilities?	1.82	1.75	1.81	1.95
What should be the role of assessment in instructional improvement?	1.48	1.40	1.44	1.61
When you visit teachers' classrooms, what should you observe?	1.34	1.33	1.37	1.35
What process would you use to analyze instruction and student learning?	1.46	1.39	1.46	1.53
How would you go about providing detailed feedback to teachers that supports instructional improvement?	1.49	1.45	1.51	1.52
How do teaching and learning	1.58	1.52	1.60	1.69

relate to a school's overall purpose?				
How do you help a struggling teacher?	1.36	1.36	1.40	1.37
How do you coordinate and integrate efforts to improve teaching and learning?	1.61	1.56	1.61	1.70
How will you monitor school success?	1.49	1.43	1.47	1.57
As the building principal, how will you determine if learning is occurring for all students?	1.35	1.31	1.36	1.40

Reliability

The internal consistency reliability of the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey was assessed using Cronbach's alpha statistic, which is a measure of the internal consistency of an instrument's scores. Alpha coefficients typically range from .00 to 1.00, and higher numbers indicate higher internal consistency reliability. Adequate internal consistency reliability estimates are >.70. Table 4.11 summarizes the alpha coefficients for the survey instrument.

Table 4.11: Coefficient Alpha for Principal Interview Question Perception Survey

Scale	Number of Items	Alpha
Full ICIS Scale	60	.9567
Managing the Organization	15	.8085
Integrity	10	.8006
Vision and Culture	9	.8825
Families and Community	10	.8927
Instructional Program	16	.9094

Internal consistency is the statistical procedure that measures at a given point in time how consistent or reliable respondents' answers are within a measurement scale (Nunnally and Berstein, 1994; Crocker and Algina, 1986). Coefficient alpha is a measure of internal consistency that is suitable for rating scales (Spector, 1992) such as the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey. Results indicate an alpha = .9567. Inter-correlation analysis shows no need to remove any of the stimulus items. This strong statistic shows the items correlate well with one another, indicating a single construct.

Inferential Statistics

One-Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were used to test the null hypothesis: *There is no significant difference between and among perception of and preference for interview questions designed to identify effective building principals by administrators at differing levels.* The null hypothesis was not retained because significance was found between the administrator level and perception of interview questions designed to identify effective building principals presented through the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey. The null hypothesis was tested using a one-way ANOVA. Findings in Table 4.12 show a significant difference between the variable of administrator level and perception of the 60 interview questions represented in the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey.

Table 4.12: One-Way ANOVA of Full Scale Principal Interview Question Perception Survey

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5829.511	5	1165.902	2.460	.033
Within Groups	172988.176	365	473.940		
Total	178817.687	370			

Given the level of significance (p=.033), post hoc analysis was run. Tukey HSD helps to determine which groups' means are statistically different.   Table 4.13 shows the results of the Tukey HSD. Significance of p<.05 indicates the groups' responses differ significantly.   Based on this level of significance, on the full scale, the Tukey HSD unsuccessfully assists with indicating which group means were statistically different.

Table 4.13: Tukey HSD on Full Scale Principal Interview Question Perception Survey

(I) Administrative Placement	(J) Administrative Placement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Elementary Placement	Middle School Principal	10.10270	3.70598	.073	-.5147	20.7201
	High School Principal	1.50270	3.56105	.998	-8.6994	11.7049
	Combined Level Principal	2.74270	4.70743	.992	-10.7437	16.2291
	Central Office Administrator	7.19765	2.82658	.114	-.9003	15.2956
	Other	-7.54730	11.03120	.984	-39.1509	24.0563
Middle School Principal	Elementary Placement	-10.10270	3.70598	.073	-20.7201	.5147
	High School Principal	-8.60000	4.47334	.390	-21.4158	4.2158
	Combined Level Principal	-7.36000	5.43043	.754	-22.9178	8.1978
	Central Office Administrator	-2.90505	3.91399	.976	-14.1183	8.3082
	Other	-17.65000	11.35857	.629	-50.1914	14.8914
High School Principal	Elementary Placement	-1.50270	3.56105	.998	-11.7049	8.6994
	Middle School Principal	8.60000	4.47334	.390	-4.2158	21.4158
	Combined Level Principal	1.24000	5.33258	1.000	-14.0374	16.5174
	Central Office Administrator	5.69495	3.77705	.659	-5.1260	16.5159
	Other	-9.05000	11.31211	.967	-41.4584	23.3584
Combined Level Principal	Elementary Placement	-2.74270	4.70743	.992	-16.2291	10.7437

	Middle School Principal	7.36000	5.43043	.754	-8.1978	22.9178
	High School Principal	-1.24000	5.33258	1.000	-16.5174	14.0374
	Central Office Administrator	4.45495	4.87287	.943	-9.5055	18.4154
	Other	-10.29000	11.72359	.952	-43.8772	23.2972
Central Office Administrator	Elementary Placement	-7.19765	2.82658	.114	-15.2956	.9003
	Middle School Principal	2.90505	3.91399	.976	-8.3082	14.1183
	High School Principal	-5.69495	3.77705	.659	-16.5159	5.1260
	Combined Level Principal	-4.45495	4.87287	.943	-18.4154	9.5055
	Other	-14.74495	11.10281	.769	-46.5537	17.0638
Other	Elementary Placement	7.54730	11.03120	.984	-24.0563	39.1509
	Middle School Principal	17.65000	11.35857	.629	-14.8914	50.1914
	High School Principal	9.05000	11.31211	.967	-23.3584	41.4584
	Combined Level Principal	10.29000	11.72359	.952	-23.2972	43.8772
	Central Office Administrator	14.74495	11.10281	.769	-17.0638	46.5537

Since the ANOVA on the full scale indicates a significant difference on perception of and preference for the interview questions based on administrator level, but the post hoc analysis does not pinpoint where this difference lies, additional analysis was done to help identify the differences. This additional analysis resulted in the addition of a second null hypothesis: *There is no significant difference between and among perception of and preference for interview question categories designed to identify effective building principals by administrators at differing levels.* To test this null hypothesis, an ANOVA was run on each subscale of the full scale dependent variable, the interview questions. Table 4.14 shows each subscale and that scale's significance level. Significance occurs at p<.05.

Table 4.14: Principal Interview Question Perception Survey Subscale ANOVA Results

Managing the Organization

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	467.275	5	93.455	3.061	.010
Within Groups	12730.787	417	30.529		
Total	13198.061	422			

Acting with Integrity, Fairness and in an Ethical Manner

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	156.625	5	31.325	1.656	.144
Within Groups	8021.151	424	18.918		
Total	8177.777	429			

No significance, No post-hoc comparison necessary

Developing a School Vision and Culture

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	322.688	5	64.538	3.300	.006
Within Groups	8232.455	421	19.555		
Total	8555.143	426			

Collaboration with Families and Community Members

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	103.784	5	20.757	.776	.567
Within Groups	11180.481	418	26.748		
Total	11284.264	423			

No significance, No post-hoc comparison necessary.

Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	476.884	5	95.377	2.249	.049
Within Groups	17087.238	403	42.400		
Total	17564.122	408			

As indicated by the ANOVA for each subscale, significance occurs within the subscales designed to identify effective administrators in the areas of managing the organization; developing a school vision and culture; and developing and maintaining the instructional program.   To identify where the difference lies, a Tukey HSD was run for each of these subscales.

Table 4.15 shows the Tukey HSD comparison for the subscale of managing the organization. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.   Based on this level of significance, current elementary and middle school administrators have a different preference for the questions designed to identify qualified candidates in the area of managing the organization.

Table 4.15: Tukey HSD, Managing the Organization

(I) Administrative Placement	(J) Administrative Placement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Elementary Placement	Middle School Principal	2.81116(*)	.84890	.013	.3807	5.2416
	High School Principal	.13231	.83814	1.000	-2.2673	2.5319
	Combined Level Principal	-.13823	1.16586	1.000	-3.4761	3.1997
	Central Office Administrator	1.27584	.67828	.415	-.6661	3.2178
	Other	-2.71515	2.50817	.888	-9.8961	4.4658
Middle School Principal	Elementary Placement	-2.81116(*)	.84890	.013	-5.2416	-.3807
	High School Principal	-2.67886	1.02618	.097	-5.6168	.2591
	Combined Level Principal	-2.94939	1.30760	.215	-6.6931	.7943
	Central Office Administrator	-1.53532	.90036	.529	-4.1131	1.0424
	Other	-5.52632	2.57711	.267	-12.9046	1.8520
High School Principal	Elementary Placement	-.13231	.83814	1.000	-2.5319	2.2673
	Middle School Principal	2.67886	1.02618	.097	-.2591	5.6168

	Combined Level Principal	-.27053	1.30064	1.000	-3.9943	3.4532
	Central Office Administrator	1.14353	.89022	.793	-1.4052	3.6922
	Other	-2.84746	2.57359	.879	-10.2157	4.5208
Combined Level Principal	Elementary Placement	.13823	1.16586	1.000	-3.1997	3.4761
	Middle School Principal	2.94939	1.30760	.215	-.7943	6.6931
	High School Principal	.27053	1.30064	1.000	-3.4532	3.9943
	Central Office Administrator	1.41407	1.20385	.849	-2.0326	4.8607
	Other	-2.57692	2.69817	.932	-10.3018	5.1480
Central Office Administrator	Elementary Placement	-1.27584	.67828	.415	-3.2178	.6661
	Middle School Principal	1.53532	.90036	.529	-1.0424	4.1131
	High School Principal	-1.14353	.89022	.793	-3.6922	1.4052
	Combined Level Principal	-1.41407	1.20385	.849	-4.8607	2.0326
	Other	-3.99099	2.52605	.612	-11.2231	3.2411
Other	Elementary Placement	2.71515	2.50817	.888	-4.4658	9.8961
	Middle School Principal	5.52632	2.57711	.267	-1.8520	12.9046
	High School Principal	2.84746	2.57359	.879	-4.5208	10.2157
	Combined Level Principal	2.57692	2.69817	.932	-5.1480	10.3018
	Central Office Administrator	3.99099	2.52605	.612	-3.2411	11.2231

A significant difference also occurs in the area of developing a school vision and culture. Post hoc comparison analysis using the Tukey HSD is represented in Table 4.16. This table shows that there is a significant difference between central office administrators and elementary administrators.

Table 4.16: Tukey HSD, Developing a School Vision and Culture

(I) Administrative Placement	(J) Administrative Placement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Elementary Placement	Middle School Principal	1.71930	.67992	.118	-.2273	3.6658
	High School Principal	-.27869	.66317	.998	-2.1773	1.6199
	Combined Level Principal	1.03571	.90422	.862	-1.5530	3.6244
	Central Office Administrator	1.59821(*)	.54206	.039	.0464	3.1501
	Other	3.20000	2.00752	.603	-2.5473	8.9473
Middle School Principal	Elementary Placement	-1.71930	.67992	.118	-3.6658	.2273
	High School Principal	-1.99799	.81463	.141	-4.3302	.3342
	Combined Level Principal	-.68358	1.02051	.985	-3.6052	2.2380
	Central Office Administrator	-.12108	.71948	1.000	-2.1809	1.9387
	Other	1.48070	2.06251	.980	-4.4241	7.3855
High School Principal	Elementary Placement	.27869	.66317	.998	-1.6199	2.1773
	Middle School Principal	1.99799	.81463	.141	-.3342	4.3302
	Combined Level Principal	1.31440	1.00943	.784	-1.5755	4.2043
	Central Office Administrator	1.87690	.70368	.084	-.1376	3.8915
	Other	3.47869	2.05705	.538	-2.4104	9.3678
Combined Level Principal	Elementary Placement	-1.03571	.90422	.862	-3.6244	1.5530
	Middle School Principal	.68358	1.02051	.985	-2.2380	3.6052
	High School Principal	-1.31440	1.00943	.784	-4.2043	1.5755
	Central Office Administrator	.56250	.93433	.991	-2.1124	3.2374
	Other	2.16429	2.14692	.915	-3.9821	8.3107
Central Office Administrator	Elementary Placement	-1.59821(*)	.54206	.039	-3.1501	-.0464
	Middle School Principal	.12108	.71948	1.000	-1.9387	2.1809
	High School Principal	-1.87690	.70368	.084	-3.8915	.1376
	Combined Level Principal	-.56250	.93433	.991	-3.2374	2.1124
	Other	1.60179	2.02126	.969	-4.1849	7.3884

Other	Elementary Placement	-3.20000	2.00752	.603	-8.9473	2.5473
	Middle School Principal	-1.48070	2.06251	.980	-7.3855	4.4241
	High School Principal	-3.47869	2.05705	.538	-9.3678	2.4104
	Combined Level Principal	-2.16429	2.14692	.915	-8.3107	3.9821
	Central Office Administrator	-1.60179	2.02126	.969	-7.3884	4.1849

Additional post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD were run to determine where the difference lies on the developing and maintaining the instructional program subscale. Table 4.17 shows that the difference of perception of these questions could not be determined using the Tukey model. This may be attributed to the fact that the ANOVA, though significant at the p<.05, was barely significant at p=049.

Table 4.17: Tukey HSD, Developing and Maintaining the Instructional Program

(I) Administrative Placement	(J) Administrative Placement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Elementary Placement	Middle School Principal	2.45986	1.04787	.178	-.5407	5.4604
	High School Principal	.44025	1.01184	.998	-2.4571	3.3376
	Combined Level Principal	.54739	1.33452	.999	-3.2740	4.3688
	Central Office Administrator	2.26007	.80539	.058	-.0461	4.5663
	Other	-.55975	3.29647	1.000	-9.9991	8.8796
Middle School Principal	Elementary Placement	-2.45986	1.04787	.178	-5.4604	.5407
	High School Principal	-2.01961	1.26036	.597	-5.6286	1.5894
	Combined Level Principal	-1.91246	1.53156	.812	-6.2981	2.4731
	Central Office Administrator	-.19979	1.10152	1.000	-3.3540	2.9544
	Other	-3.01961	3.38104	.948	-12.7012	6.6619
High School Principal	Elementary Placement	-.44025	1.01184	.998	-3.3376	2.4571

48

	Middle School Principal	2.01961	1.26036	.597	-1.5894	5.6286
	Combined Level Principal	.10714	1.50713	1.000	-4.2085	4.4228
	Central Office Administrator	1.81982	1.06730	.529	-1.2364	4.8760
	Other	-1.00000	3.37004	1.000	-10.6501	8.6501
Combined Level Principal	Elementary Placement	-.54739	1.33452	.999	-4.3688	3.2740
	Middle School Principal	1.91246	1.53156	.812	-2.4731	6.2981
	High School Principal	-.10714	1.50713	1.000	-4.4228	4.2085
	Central Office Administrator	1.71268	1.37705	.815	-2.2305	5.6558
	Other	-1.10714	3.48056	1.000	-11.0737	8.8594
Central Office Administrator	Elementary Placement	-2.26007	.80539	.058	-4.5663	.0461
	Middle School Principal	.19979	1.10152	1.000	-2.9544	3.3540
	High School Principal	-1.81982	1.06730	.529	-4.8760	1.2364
	Combined Level Principal	-1.71268	1.37705	.815	-5.6558	2.2305
	Other	-2.81982	3.31391	.958	-12.3092	6.6695
Other	Elementary Placement	.55975	3.29647	1.000	-8.8796	9.9991
	Middle School Principal	3.01961	3.38104	.948	-6.6619	12.7012
	High School Principal	1.00000	3.37004	1.000	-8.6501	10.6501
	Combined Level Principal	1.10714	3.48056	1.000	-8.8594	11.0737
	Central Office Administrator	2.81982	3.31391	.958	-6.6695	12.3092

Chapter Five: Discussion

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether administrators at different administrator levels (elementary, secondary or central office) have different perceptions of and therefore preferences for interview questions within the ICIS for Principals. A sample of Missouri school leaders participated in the study by completing an electronic survey. The survey instrument was comprised of demographic questions as well as 60 interview questions clustered within five different domains. Participants rated each question on a five point Likert scale ranging from very important to not important.   In order to assess the reliability of the total survey instrument's scores and the five subscales, Cronbach's alpha was applied. The full scale and the five subscales were found to be reliable and to assess the same construct.

The full scale Principal Interview Question Perception Survey was analyzed using a One-Way ANOVA which indicated a difference of perception, and thus preference, of the 60 interview questions based on administrator level. Post hoc analysis on the full scale was inconclusive and an additional null hypothesis was explored to further identify the difference of perception. This resulted in identification of three subscales of the survey instrument and ICIS for Principals with significant differences of perception, and thus preference, based on administrator level. These three subscales included questions designed to identify qualified building leaders in the areas of managing the organization; developing a school vision and culture; and developing and maintaining the instructional program. Post hoc analysis of each of these subscales indicated differences between elementary and middle school principals as related to the questions on managing the organization and differences between elementary principals and central office on questions related to developing a school vision and culture. Post hoc analyses

of the subscale related to developing and maintaining the instructional program were inconclusive.

Conclusions

Research indicates principals at all levels make a difference in schools. In this age of accountability, hiring the best individuals to lead our schools becomes critical. Though research indicates the power of the principalship, practices related to hiring the best individuals are scant. In addition, research is limited in regards to differences in skill sets needed to successfully lead at different building levels.

Most school systems continue to utilize a hiring system that is unstructured and based on individual preferences rather than research-based criteria and best practices. The lack of a structured interview system compounds the potential need for differentiation in the interview system when hiring administrators for different building levels. To hire the best administrators to lead schools and positively impact student achievement, consideration should be given to the building level where that administrator will serve, the skills necessary to lead, and use of a structured interview process.

Implications for Future Studies

The ICIS for Principals satisfies the need for a structured interview tool and its reliability and validity will be tested in a study to be conducted with the Guilford County Schools in Greensboro, North Carolina by Angelique Kobler, Susie Ostmeyer and Joe DiPonio. In addition the Principal Interview Question Perception Survey was found to measure the same constructs according the Cronbach Alpha completed within this study. Future studies may include analysis

of the differences of perception and preference based on district location or size.   Future studies

could answer the question of whether or not there are differing perceptions of administrator

interview questions based on whether the school is in an urban, suburban or rural setting.   It

could also determine whether or not the size of the district makes a difference.   Each of these

studies, combined with the results of this study, could allow structured interviews to be

developed that specifically target the school level, setting and district size for which hiring

occurs.

Concluding Remarks

It is interesting to note that in both instances where a difference of perception could be

identified, the difference lay between elementary administrators and another administrative

group. In addition, the two subscales where a difference was clear measure very different types

of leadership. Questions related to managing the organization are more akin to the leadership

qualities found in transactional leaders. The questions related to developing a school vision and

culture relate most to actions often seen by transformational leaders.   These observations cause

the researcher to ponder whether or not administration is moving towards the aspects of balanced

leadership or whether different administrator levels remain loyal to prior leadership models

represented by transactional and transformational leadership.

Leadership, in general, is a broad and interesting subject of study. School leadership,

because of the human nature of our "product", is even more complex.   Further study of school

leadership will help schools of the 21st century evolve to meet the changing needs of our primary

customers – our students.

References

Anne Grosso DeLeon. (2006). The School Leadership Crisis: Have School Principals Been Left Behind? *Carnegie Reporter*, *4*(1).

Are Schools Facing a Shortage of Qualified Administrators? (2003). Research Brief, Santa Monica, California: RAND.

Ballou, D. (1996). Do Public Schools Hire the Best Applicants? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *111*(1), 97-133. doi: 10.2307/2946659.

Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bellis, S. J. (2007). *The development and field test of an employment interview system to identify successful middle school principals*. Unpublished Doctorial Dissertation, University of Kansas. Retrieved April 25, 2009, from http://www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1362531051&Fmt =7&clientId=42567&RQT=309&VName=PQD.

Blankstein, A. M. (2004). *Failure is Not an Option* (p. 276). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*(2), 130 - 141. doi: 10.1108/09578230010320082.

Blase, J. J. (1987). Dimensions of Effective School Leadership: The Teacher's Perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, *24*(4), 589-610. doi: 10.2307/1163181.

Brannon, D. (2009). What Does it Mean to be Highly Qualified?, *Academic Leadership Online Journal*, retrieved November 2009 from http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/What_Does_It_Mean_to_be_Highly_Qua lified.shtml

Breed, R. D. (1985, August). *Concurrent Validity of Two Administrator Selection Procedures*. University of Nebraska.

Bryant, M. T. (1990). A Study of Administrative Expertise in Participant Performance on the NASSP

    Assessment Center. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *3*(4).

Butler, K. (2008). Principal Preparation Programs. *District Administration*, *44*(10), 66-68,

Caldwell, T. G. (1993). Hiring Excellent Teachers: Current Interviewing Theories, Techniques, and

    Practices. Retrieved March 29, 2009, from

    http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED358512&site=ehost-live.

Coleman, D.G., Areglado, R., & Adams, R.C. (1998). *Establishing construct validity and reliability for*

    the NAESP professional developing inventory: simplifying assessment center techniques.

    Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego,

    CA, April 13-17, 1998.

Cushman, K. (1992, September). The Essential School Principal: A Changing Role in a Changing

    School. *Horace*, *9*(1).

Day, C., Leithwood, K., & Sammons, P. (2008). What We Have Learned, What We Need to Know

    More about. *School Leadership & Management*, *28*(1), 83-96.

De Leon, A. G. (2006). *The School Leadership Crisis: Have School Principals Been Left Behind?* New

    York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Donmoyer, R. (1995). A Knowledge Base for Educational Administration: Notes from the Field. In

    Donmeyer, R, Imber, M. & Scheurich, J. (Eds.) *The Knowledge Base in Educational*

    Administration: Multiple Perspectives (pp. 74-95). Albany, New York: State University of New

    York Press.

Emley, K., & Ebmeier, H. (1997). The Effect of Employment Interview Format on Principals'

    Evaluations of Teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *11*(1), 39-56. doi:

    10.1023/A:1007947220472.

Fullen, M. (1997). *What's Worth Fighting For in the Principalship*? New York, New York: Teachers

    College Press.

Fullen, M. (2005). *Leadership and Sustainability: System Thinkers in Action* (p. 116). Thousand Oaks,

    California: Corwin Press.

Gomez, J.J. (1985). *Final report on the evaluation of the management assessment center.* Miami, FL: Dade County School District, Office of Educational Accountability

Gray, S. P., & Streshly, W. A. (2008). *From Good Schools to Great Schools: What Their Principals Do Well* (p. 157). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of Successful Principal Leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *26*(4), 371-395.

Hallinger, P. & Heck R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32 (1), 5-44.

Henderson, J. E., & Brookhart, S. M. (1996). Leader Authenticity: Key to Organizational Climate, Health, and Perceived Leader Effectiveness. Retrieved March 29, 2009, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED396373.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., & Steffy, B. E. (1985). *Skills for Successful School Leaders* (Second Edition., p. 272). Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators.

Jacobs, K. D., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2006). How to Implement the Ways of Knowing through the Realms of Meaning in Human Resource Management: Ten Recommendations for Selecting Campus Administrators. *National Journal for Publishing and Mentoring Doctoral Student Research*, *3*(1). Retrieved March 28, 2009, from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED494799&site=ehost-live.

Knuth, R. K. (2004). Principal Performance and the ISLLC Standards: Implications for Principal Selection and Professional Development. *ERS Spectrum*, *22*(4), 4-9.

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership Capacity for Lasting School Improvement* (p. 128). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Leading Learning Communities: Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able To Do. (2008). (Second Edition., p. 147). Alexandria, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Littrell, J., & Foster, W. (1995). The Myth of a Knowledge Base in Administration. In Donmeyer, R, Imber, M. & Scheurich, J. (Eds.) *The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 32-46). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Lovely, S., & Development, A. F. S. A. C. *Staffing the Principalship* (p. 172).

Lovely, S. (2004). Leadership Forecasting: The development and selection of school leaders starts with the end in mind by considering future vacancies both known and unknown. *Leadership.*

Marks, H., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: an integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(3), 370-397.

Marx, G. (2006). *Future-focused Leadership: Preparing Schools, Students, and Communities for Tomorrow's Realities*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action* (p. 219). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results* (p. 191). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCrea, N. L., & Ehrich, L. C. (1996). Teaching and Learning about Managing People: Human Resource Management for Education Settings--A Queensland Case. *British Journal of Inservice Education*, *22*(2), 219-30.

Mitgange, L. D. (2003). Beyond the Pipeline: Getting the Principals We Need, Where They are Needed Most. The Wallace Foundation.

Nettles, S. M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the Importance of the Direct Effects of School Leadership on Student Achievement: The Implications for School Improvement Policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *82*(4), 724-736.

Peterson, K., & Kelley, C. (2001). Transforming School Leadership. *Leadership*, *30*(3), 8-11.

Prater, M. (2004). *The relative impact of principal managerial, instructional, and transformational leadership on student achievement*. Unpublished doctorial dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Pubmire, T. (1999, August 31). The Principal Shortage. Minnesota: Minnesota Public Radio.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. *The Elementary School Journal*, *83*(4), 427-452. doi: 10.2307/1001168.

Quaglia, R. J., & Quay, S. E. (2003). *Changing Lives Through the Principalship: A Reflective Guide for School Leaders* (p. 81). Alexandria, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Rammer, R. A. (2007). Call to Action for Superintendents: Change the Way You Hire Principals. *Journal of Educational Research*, *101*, 67-76.

Rockoff, J. E. (2003). *The Impact of Individual Teachers on Student Achievement: Evidence from Panel Data* (p. 40). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University. Retrieved June 19, 2009, from http://129.3.20.41/eps/pe/papers/0304/0304002.pdf.

Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R. J. (2002). *What Large-Scale, Survey Research Tells Us about Teacher Effects on Student Achievement: Insights from the Prospects Study of Elementary Schools* (p. 44). Research, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved June 19, 2009, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/29/d5/74.pdf.

Roza, M. (2003). *A Matter of Definition: Is There Truly a Shortage of School Principals?* (p. 74). Center for Reinventing Public Education: The Wallace Foundation.

Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Horn, S. P. (1997). Teacher and Classroom Context Effects on Student Achievement: Implications for Teacher Evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *11*(1), 57-67.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement* (p. 14). Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Value-Added

Research and Assessment Center. Retrieved June 19, 2009, from

http://www.mccsc.edu/~curriculum/cumulative%20and%20residual%20effects%20of%20teache

rs.pdf.

Scheurich, J. J. (1995). The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration: Post-positivist Reflections.

In Donmeyer, R, Imber, M. & Scheurich, J. (Eds.) *The Knowledge Base in Educational*

Administration: Multiple Perspectives (pp. 17-31). Albany, New York: State University of New

York Press.

Schmitt, N., Noe, R.A., Merritt, R., & Fitzgerald, M.P. (1984). Validity of assessment center ratings for

the prediction of performance ratings and school climate of school administrators. *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, 69, 207-213.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization* (1st ed.).

Broadway Business.

Shipman, N., & Murphy, J. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for*

Leaders. Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Shipman, N. J., Topps, B. W., & Murphy, J. (1998). Linking the ISLLC Standards to Professional

Development and Re-licensure. Retrieved March 28, 2009, from

http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED420697&site=ehost-live.

Skrla, L, Erlandson, D.A., Reed, E., & Wilson, A. (2001). *The Emerging Principalship*. Eye on

Education, Larchmont, NY.

The Broad Foundation. (2006). *Improving Principal Hiring: The New Teacher Project's Finding and*

Recommendations for Urban Schools. . The Broad Foundation.

Transforming Education: Delivering on Our Promise to Every Child. (2009). Washington, DC: The

Council of Chief State School Officers.

U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Status of Education Reform in

Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: Principals' Perspectives, NCES 98-025, by Carin

Celebuski, and Elizabeth Farris, Shelley Burns, project officer. Washington, DC: 1998.

Waters, T., & Kingston, S. (2005, October). The Standards We Need: A Comparative Analysis of Performance Standards Shows Us What is Essential for Principals to Know and Be Able to do to Improve Achievement. *Leadership*.

Watts, G. E. (1993). Effective Strategies in Selecting Quality Faculty. Retrieved March 29, 2009, from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED354046&site=ehost-live.

Weber, C. L., Colarulli-Daniels, R., & Leinhauser, J. A. (2003). A Tale of Two Principals. *Gifted Child Today*, *26*(4), 55-62.

Wendel, F. C., & Breed, R. D. (1988). Improving the Selection of Principals: An Analysis of the Approaches. *NASSP Bulletin*, *72*(508), 35-38. doi: 10.1177/019263658807250808.

Whaley, J. (2002). *Developing the Effective Principal: Hiring, Evaluation, and Retention Practices for the Superintendent.* Gaithersburg, Maryland: Aspen Publishers. Retrieved March 28, 2009, from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED474252&site=ehost-live.

Whitaker, K. (2001). Where Are the Principal Candidates? Perceptions of Superintendents. *NASSP Bulletin*, *85*(625), 82-92.

Whitaker, T. (2003). *What Great Principals Do Differently: Fifteen Things That Matter Most* (p. 117). Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

Appendix A: Principal Interview Question Perception Survey

ICIS Principal Perception

1. Default Section

The School of Education at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

We are conducting this study to better understand administrator preferences and perceptions related to principal interview questions. This will entail your completion of a questionnaire. The questionnaire is expected to take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The content of the questionnaire should cause no more discomfort than you would experience in your everyday life. Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of administrator preferences related to topics generally asked during the hiring of building principals.

Your participation is solicited, although strictly voluntary. Your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. It is possible, however, with internet communications, that through intent or accident someone other than the intended recipient may see your response.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is completed, please feel free to contact us by phone or mail.

Completion of the survey indicates your willingness to participate in this project and that you are at least age eighteen. If you have any additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429, write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, or email mdenning@ku.edu.

Sincerely,

Teresa Tulipana
University of Kansas
Student

Approved by the Human Subjects Committee University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus (HSCL). Approval expires one year from 1/15/2009. HSCL #14236

This questionnaire contains four demographic questions as well as 60 administrator interview questions representing five categories of administrator responsibilities. Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your input and time is valued and appreciated.

1. Please indicate your gender

( ) Female

( ) Male

2. Please classify your school district.

( ) Urban

( ) Suburban

( ) Rural

ICIS Principal Perception

3. Please indicate the size of the district for which you are employed.

- ◯ Less than 1000
- ◯ 1000-2500
- ◯ 2500-5000
- ◯ 5000-7500
- ◯ 7500-10,000
- ◯ 10,000-15,000
- ◯ 15,000+

4. Please indicate your current administrative placement.

- ◯ Elementary Principal
- ◯ Middle School Principal
- ◯ High School Principal
- ◯ Combined Level Principal (e.g. K-8 or K-12 buildings)
- ◯ Central Office Administrator
- ◯ Other

5. The following interview questions are designed to gather information on how well candidates manage the organization. Please rate them based on their importance in hiring high quality administrators.

	Very Important	High	Average	Low	Not Important
What processes would you use to hire the best teaching staff available?	○	○	○	○	○
What rights and limitations apply to free speech for students?	○	○	○	○	○
What does the term due process mean?	○	○	○	○	○
What organizational systems should a principal regularly monitor?	○	○	○	○	○
How do you effectively monitor and manage conflict among students, staff, or the extended school community?	○	○	○	○	○
How does the principal go about establishing a safe environment for staff and students?	○	○	○	○	○
Tell about one of your successful efforts to organize and lead others and explain why it succeeded.	○	○	○	○	○
How do you prioritize tasks or problems?	○	○	○	○	○
How should school performance data and school improvement plans be aligned in order to positively affect continuous improvement?	○	○	○	○	○
How should a principal respond to a parent's request for special treatment for their child?	○	○	○	○	○
Describe how you handled an urgent, important, non-routine decision.	○	○	○	○	○
How would you ensure students have fair and equal access to	○	○	○	○	○

educational opportunity?					
How would you ensure that instructional time is maximized for student learning?	○	○	○	○	○
Should parents be involved in the development of behavior norms and guidelines of the school?	○	○	○	○	○
As you determine line-item budget allocations, what criteria do you use to determine how much money each line receives?	○	○	○	○	○

6. The following interview questions are designed to gather information on how well candidates act with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Please rate them based on their importance in hiring high quality administrators.

	Very important	High	Average	Low	Not Important
How will you serve as a role model in the school?	○	○	○	○	○
How do you decide the ethically right thing to do?	○	○	○	○	○
What will you do when a staff member openly disagrees with you in a staff meeting?	○	○	○	○	○
Describe a situation when you might consider disregarding district regulations.	○	○	○	○	○
In what cases would you challenge assumptions and beliefs held by staff?	○	○	○	○	○
How do you go about establishing a system of accountability for student success?	○	○	○	○	○
How would you handle a teacher's request to provide a special reward to selected students for exemplary performance?	○	○	○	○	○
How would you address alleged discriminatory treatment of students by a teacher or coach?	○	○	○	○	○
What strategies do you embrace use to reinforce transparency in decision-making?	○	○	○	○	○
What are the effects of a principal behaving in a trustworthy manner?	○	○	○	○	○

Page 5

64

7. The following interview questions are designed to gather information on how well candidates develop a school vision and culture. Please rate them based on their importance in hiring high quality administrators.

	Very Important	High	Average	Low	Not Important
How would you lead the process of developing a school vision as principal?	○	○	○	○	○
How would you address the problem of staff indifference or resistance to your school's vision statement?	○	○	○	○	○
How does a school maintain its focus on vision?	○	○	○	○	○
What criteria would you use to evaluate a school vision statement?	○	○	○	○	○
How important is it to building a shared vision for the school and why?	○	○	○	○	○
How would you go about facilitating the development of a school-wide vision?	○	○	○	○	○
Describe how a shared vision helps shape the educational program of the school.	○	○	○	○	○
If it becomes obvious that a specific school practice needs to change, how would you go about that task?	○	○	○	○	○
How would you align a school's teaching and learning with its' vision statement?	○	○	○	○	○

ICIS Principal Perception

8. The following interview questions are designed to gather information on how well candidates collaborate with families and community members. Please rate them based on their importance in hiring high quality administrators.

	Very Important	High	Average	Low	Not Important
How would you "market" your school?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How should the schools and the community collaborate?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How will you develop relationships with community leaders and why is that important?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How will you develop relationships with community leaders and why is that important?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How can the school and community serve one another as resources?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Why is it important to involve stakeholders in the decision making process?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How should you use community agencies (health clinics, social services, psychologists) within the school? Or should they be in the school at all?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How will you develop key lines of communication with community policy makers?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
What regular, deliberate procedures would you use to ensure that your school maintained a visible, positive presence in its community?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Should families be involved in making decision's about their	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

child's education?

How do you plan collaboration with families and school community?	○	○	○	○	○

9. The following interview questions are designed to gather information on how well candidates develop and maintain the instructional program. Please rate them based on their importance in hiring high quality administrators.

	Very Important	High	Average	Low	Not Important
What are some principals of effective instruction?	○	○	○	○	○
What does student diversity mean for educational programs?	○	○	○	○	○
How do you make professional development an integral part of school improvement?	○	○	○	○	○
How do you ensure that multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students?	○	○	○	○	○
Why is it important to establish high standards for the staff and students?	○	○	○	○	○
How do you go about establishing high standards for students and the staff?	○	○	○	○	○
What is the function of IEPs for students with disabilities?	○	○	○	○	○
What should be the role of assessment in instructional improvement?	○	○	○	○	○
When you visit teachers' classrooms, what should you observe?	○	○	○	○	○
What process would you use to analyze instruction and student learning?	○	○	○	○	○
How would you go about providing detailed feedback to teachers that supports instructional	○	○	○	○	○

ICIS Principal Perception

improvement?					
How do teaching and learning relate to a school's overall purpose?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How do you help a struggling teacher?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How do you coordinate and integrate efforts to improve teaching and learning?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How will you monitor school success?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
As the building principal, how will you determine if learning is occurring for all students?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Appendix B: ISLLC Standards 2008

Standard 1

An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

Functions:

A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission
B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning
C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals
D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement
E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans

Standard 2

An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Functions:

A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations
B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program
C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students
D. Supervise instruction
E. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress
F. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff
G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction
H. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning
I. Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program

Standard 3

An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Functions:

A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems
B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources
C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff
D. Develop the capacity for distributed leadership
E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning

Standard 4

An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Functions:
A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment
B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources
C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers
D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners

Standard 5

An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Functions:
A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success
B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior
C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity
D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making
E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling

Standard 6

An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Functions:
A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers
B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning
C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies